



## 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)

DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R

Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis Evaluation Scoring Matrix

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET										
Category	Points Possible	Copperhead Environmental Consulting	ERO Resources Corp.	GSI Environmental	Grouse Mountain	KLJ Engineering	Morrison-Maierle	Pinyon Environmental	Terracon Consultants	Tetra Tech
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>										
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	100	90.0	83.0	79.0	91.0	67.0	84.0	80.0	70.0	94.0
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50	45.0	43.0	40.0	46.0	33.0	43.0	40.0	38.0	46.0
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50	45.0	44.0	45.0	45.0	35.0	44.0	42.0	37.0	45.0
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>										
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100	91.0	92.0	87.0	88.0	80.0	82.0	83.0	78.0	95.0
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100	89.0	88.0	82.0	86.0	75.0	84.0	75.0	38.0	95.0
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100	85.0	88.0	80.0	87.0	78.0	80.0	75.0	79.0	95.0
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100	92.0	87.0	84.0	92.0	80.0	84.0	81.0	80.0	95.0
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>										
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50	45.0	43.0	45.0	46.0	40.0	44.0	45.0	40.0	47.0
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50	45.0	45.0	45.0	46.0	40.0	45.0	45.0	40.0	44.0
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50	42.0	45.0	42.0	46.0	35.0	41.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable	25	20.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	22.0	21.0	22.0	18.0	22.0
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25	20.0	21.0	22.0	22.0	21.0	20.0	23.0	19.0	22.0
<b>References Section 4.2.4</b>										
Minimum of 3 Complete References	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
<b>Cost Proposal Fixed Price Section 5.1</b>										
	200	172.6	124.1	103.6	114.2	200.0	187.8	86.4	131.5	96.2
<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	50	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
		932	876	828	882.2	856.0	909.8	792.4	763.5	891.2

Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Copperhead Environmental Consulting			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>			
<b>Evaluated RFP Section</b>	<b>Point Values</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments</b>
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>	90.0	High level of capability. 1 comparable EA, 1 Comparable CE. 3 other region 1 support contracts . Many other examples in other NF. Similar Experience in region 1. High ability to conduct work.
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>	45.0	100 + BA with clearly defined experience with additional sensitive species (including ungulate, avian, and other applicable species) Recently performed analysis on region 1, addressed reasonable sensitive species Completed applicable analysis in comparable regions for FS sensitive species.
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>	45.0	No history of requested timeline extension. 1 example of successful expedited project projects completed in a timely manner and utilized project management tools to keep projects on schedule. No evidence of projects extending past deadlines. Included instance of accelerated timeline.
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>	91.0	Full Team Resource coverage. All resources provided with clear coverage. All resource areas have full coverage, with additional use of local contractor to conduct field data collection.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	<b>100 Points</b>	89.0	Clear experience with resource areas. Full coverage of resource personnel (including Silv, and fire fuels.) Full Coverage, one limitation is lack of PE engineer for Transportation.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	<b>100 Points</b>	85.0	Adequate resource coverage with limited overlap. Number of specialist put on a scale. 13 in total. Adequate resource coverage with limited overlap where resource analysis intensity is required.
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	<b>100 Points</b>	92.0	Kari Buck, high level of experience education and qualification. highly experienced in this field, clear representation of applicable project history and ability. Project manager Kari Buck has 12+ years working on projects of similar scope and scale, additionally has high level of experience as IDT lead.
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	<b>50 Points</b>	45.0	Proposal is clear and concise. Narrative is easily followed. Clearly written easy to follow, lacking table to identify team member and resources. Clearly written and effective narrative. Clearly lays out proposal.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>	45.0	All sections are covered with same layout found in RFP. Covered in good depth. Addressed all proposal requirements. Effectively captures all RFP requirements. Very Clearly laid out proposal.
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>	42.0	Well defined QAQC process with 2 step review (one of which is a technical editor). In house QC plan. Lacking some detail. Multi step process, but not very detailed.
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	<b>25 Points</b>	20.0	Introduces PM and early phases. Does not explore other major milestones in detail. Explores all deliverables , but lacks detail. Gives all details and covers project milestones, but lacks detail.
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	<b>25 Points</b>	20.0	Utilized straightforward GIS approach. General concepts are captured. Past experience identified. Detailed strategy to capture how they would analysis data. Outlines straightforward approach that identified FS procedure, does not outline specific tools for use.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Copperhead Environmental Consulting</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	172.6	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).		50.0	
		931.6	

Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: ERO Resources</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>			
<b>Evaluated RFP Section</b>	<b>Point Values</b>	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>		Reasonable experience in region 1 completing Large Scale NEPA. Additional large scale NEPA is outlined in later sections, support capability. Lacking Directly outlined Vegetation experience in selected projects.  Included FS R1 vegetation projects, did not explicitly cite vegetation projects.  Ability to conduct similar projects, including FS project in CGNF, did not cite veg project fully. 83.0
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>		Brief Section Outlining ability / understanding of R1 species of concern. Experience suggests understanding in navigating potential ESA needs.  Recent experience in TES sensitive species in CGNF, capable of requirements.  Applicable experience in CGNF including recent experience with bats and other wildlife resource on the west side of the forest.. 43.0
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>		Two strong examples of timeline adherence on complex highly public projects. Company Philosophy supports timeline importance.  Described projects accurately. Outlined major projects that fell in a reasonable timeline (within 2 months on a 14 month timeline), reasonably explain delays.  No documentation of significant delays and portray company approach and philosophy to timeline adherence. 44.0
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>		Structure and coverage of all resource with 3 partner organizations.  Team is well laid out with resource coverage.  92.0 Supplied individuals with high level project management experience.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	<b>100 Points</b>		Silv and fuels has experience gap in silv and fuels.  Teams have high level of resource coverage. Major gaps in silv and fuels, particularly fuels modelling.  Subcontractor coverage offers transportation expertise but does not cover key fuels gaps. 88.0
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	<b>100 Points</b>		expansive team, appropriate amount of people for resource coverage.  expansive team, large amount of people for resource coverage  88.0 Adequate coverage.
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	<b>100 Points</b>		high level of education and applicable experience. minimal vegetation treatment. Many other core responsibilities that are not specific to NEPA.  High level project management with long term experience.  High level of project management experience including some NEPA work on Custer Gallatin. 87.0
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	<b>50 Points</b>		Proposal is clearly written and sections mostly align with RFP. Some organizational choices (splitting reference projects) impacted readability.  Clearly written and understandable.  43.0 Clearly laid out plan.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>		All sections are covered with same layout found in RFP. Covered in good depth... all sections detailed, complete and provided all schedule components... all requirements for RFP are met with well laid out work schedule. 45.0
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>		QAQC represents systematic approach with clear steps to achieve goals.  In house QAQC plan clearly Lays out approach.  45.0 Good QAQC plan to achieve quality.
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	<b>25 Points</b>		Itemized work plan covers key deliverables in depth. Schedule is fairly aggressive, but detailed breakdown suggest consideration.  workplan addresses all deliverables with fair schedule.  23.0 workplan addresses all deliverables with clearly laid to schedule.

Offeror (Company) Name: ERO Resources			Total Points Awarded:
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points		Utilized straightforward GIS approach. General concepts are captured. Calls on several GIS specialists.  decent strategy for data management, lacking some detail.  Gives examples of previous GIS strategy and specific GIS specialist on the Team.
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	124.1	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).		50.0	
		876.1	

Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
Offeror (Company) Name: GSI Environmental			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
EVALUATION CRITERIA			
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	100 Points	79.0	Ability to complete NEPA is reflected. Projects Lacking FS / R1 Specificity. NEPA is primarily for Mining, lacking vegetation projects. Most experience is mining, capability to complete projects, but lacking vegetation experience.
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	40.0	Ability to complete NEPA is reflected. Projects Lacking FS / R1 Specificity. Listed projects with BA in mining context. No direct experience with eastern Montana, and NLEB, but some experience with ESA TSP
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	45.0	Listed projects suggest timelines were adhered to. Examples listed with timeline adherence. Shows proven examples to hit project timelines...
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	87.0	Reasonable coverage with utilization of subcontractors to fill some gaps. Coverage of resources with. Laid out who will be doing each resource, each specialist appears to have the experience to do so.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	82.0	Limited NEPA experience across some resources. Resume show clear experience in resource areas, nepa experience lacking. NEPA analysis not covered well, otherwise resource area coverage adequate.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	80.0	Generally provide solid coverage. Some members covering multiple resources. 11 specialists on the lighter staff amount for needed resources. Several resource areas are being covered by limited staff numbers, could be problematic for some resources .
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	84.0	Experience is primarily in mining issues. Mostly with BLM or BoR. Some instances of NEPA QAQC but limited full length NEPA Efforts. No vegetation driven project experience. Lacking NEPA Veg experience, in depth PM experience. In depth PM experience but lacking VEG experience
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	45.0	Clearly written, Good use of figures to summarize information. Well laid out clearly written, good table use. Lays out roles for staff and clearly defines intended approach on project.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	45.0	All sections are covered with same layout found in RFP. Covered in good depth. All RFP requirements addresses. Answered all things required in RFP
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	42.0	General QAQC Approach. Would accomplish goals if implemented. Explained roles and chain of command. Lays out roles of staff and who is responsible for what in QAQC plans.
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	23.0	Strong Pow that shows consideration of provided materials and apparent understanding of expectations of CGNF approached under NEPA. Work plan covers all deliverables. Clearly laid out that they know the process and have worked on large complex projects.
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	22.0	draws directly from GIS standard in SOW reflects strong understanding of GIS requests. States plans and products that are required for projects. Clearly states GIS approach in response to project needs.
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	103.6	

Offeror (Company) Name: GSI Environmental			Total Points Awarded:
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
Equal Pay for Montana Women	5% Bonus Points		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).		50.0	
		827.6	



Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Grouse Mountain			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>			
<b>Evaluated RFP Section</b>	<b>Point Values</b>	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>		Representative projects in region 1 that demonstrate ability to complete project of this Scope / scale. additional NEPA projects conducted outside of Region 1 that have similar Scope and Scale. Field work components for data collection.  Recently completed EA and CE, clear ability to complete similar project scope and scale.  Recently completed EA and CE, clear ability to complete similar project scope and scale. evidence of ability to complete veg projects. 91.0
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>		Extensive Experience with region 1 wildlife support (BE and BA). Additional wildlife project support comes from adjacent FS regions.  Recently complete BE/BA in R1 with similar scope and scale.  lots of experience in Montana sensitive species. Lacking some experience on east side projects. 46.0
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>		Recent project experience shows capability to conduct projects of similar scope and scale. Timeline adjustments due to project complexities as opposed to contractor error.  Honest portrayal of timeline issues with reasonable , other wise completed most project on fair timeline.  Majority of projects completed on time with larger project seeing some delays, delays appear to be out of contractor control with reasonable explanation and course correction., 45.0
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>		Each person is listed with reasonable resource coverage.  Clear listing of staff with resource coverage 88.0 Structure is a bit confusing overall reasonable resource coverage
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	<b>100 Points</b>		High level of expertise. Some areas spread a bit thin.  Unclear on silvicultural experience. Overall reasonable expertise. 86.0 Individual resource areas show high level of expertise, silve resource is lacking prescription experience.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	<b>100 Points</b>		overall good resource coverage, one resource specialist covering multiple resources.  17 team members grant full coverage. 87.0 Lacking silv, and one resource specialist covering multiple resources which could be limiting .
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	<b>100 Points</b>		Clearly state NEPA experience with adequate experience and direct involvement on example projects/  Applicable experience in r1 with fuels and veg projects. 92.0 Clearly defined project experience.
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	<b>50 Points</b>		Proposal is clearly written with a simple and understandable approach.  Good organization , matched RFP outline. 46.0 Good layout , followed RFP outline
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>		Directly responded to RFP with language referenced in RFP and use of associates sections for organization.  All RFP requirements addresses. 46.0 Answered all things required in RFP
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>		Identifies extensive peer review process. ensures POC will maintain consistency throughout document. established QACA training protocol identified, with multiple review and technical edits.  Does not lay out exact procedures but covers process well. 46.0 Covers process, lacking some detail, but provides necessary depth.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Grouse Mountain</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	<b>25 Points</b>		Work Plan concisely covers major project phases and provides insight into potential efficiencies to expedite process.  Work plan covers all deliverables.
		23.0	Clearly laid out good use of tables.
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	<b>25 Points</b>		GIS Management plan promotes data quality and purpose built approach specifically for the project.  Does not list tool that they will be using but does define how they will complete this project.  Utilized GIS staff to train resource area specialist, and implement GIS data management.
		22.0	
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	114.2	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).			
		50.0	
		882.2	

**Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis**

**DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: KLJ Engineering</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>			
<b>Evaluated RFP Section</b>	<b>Point Values</b>	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>	67.0	Complex projects in Montana. Some contain applicable skills required under FS NEPA, but many of the projects are not of the same complexity.  Some ea. lacking projects of scope or scale.  Projects are more geared toward engineering, limited experience with forest service wildlife. limited experience working in forested ecosystems.
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>	33.0	Multiple instances of T&E species coverage and other applicable sensitive species efforts (Not in FS format).  BAs were not mentioned and did not display ability to complete them, limited defines experience in larger wildlife context.  No experience with long eared bat, limited experience with BA ability, does not have explicit experience in FS ecosystems.
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>	35.0	Listed timelines suggest adherence.  Does not list previous experience of completing projects all projects listed as on going.  No evidence of completing project. Does not explicitly describe project completion or reasoning for delay / completion
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>	80.0	Resource areas have reasonable coverage, but does not have adequate NEPA experience  Team is experienced in various aspects of the projects, but lack NEPA Applicability.  Team has reasonable coverage, but does not have adequate NEPA Coverage.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	<b>100 Points</b>	75.0	some resource specialists are lacking key resource areas including silviculture.  General coverage is adequate, but lacking key resource areas particularly silviculture and NEPA writing .  Coverage is there, but lacking NEPA and Silv expertise.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	<b>100 Points</b>	78.0	Staff seems adequate, no areas are being stretched, to thin, but there are key gaps in silviculture.  13 team members that lack some key experience.  reasonable team size but there are some major gaps, especially in silviculture
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	<b>100 Points</b>	80.0	Applicable resource education and training .  Evidence of NEPA project Experience. No FS NEPA. Distant FS soils experience  NEPA project ability , but no FS NEPA
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	<b>50 Points</b>	40.0	Clearly written, understanding of project complexity lacking.  Well laid out and designed project plan.  Needs more elaboration does plan for meeting which I like
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>	40.0	All major sections are listed and covered in reasonable depth.  RFP requirements not completed, (BA,timelines).  Responded to all required sections of the RFP, but did not give examples of meeting project deadlines, no direct experience writing BAs listed. Did not lay out super well
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>	35.0	QAQC is general with few details.  Lacking specifics.  Laid out good measures for QA/QC and included 508 Compliance, sort of just says we will do it
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	<b>25 Points</b>	22.0	Workplan is realistic and calls out efficiencies to stick to tight timeline.  Workplan addresses all deliverables, timeline reasonable.  Logical and easily meetable project goals

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: KLJ Engineering</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	<b>25 Points</b>		Solid general understanding of GIS needs. Utilized details from RFP. GIS mgmt. clearly conveyed experience in managing GIS data. GIS data management plan clearly laid out including products used and plan for data management
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	200.0	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).		50.0	
		856.0	

Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Morrison-Maierle			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
EVALUATION CRITERIA			
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	100 Points	84.0	Shows 1 CE and 1 EA in Region 1 with similar complexity. Additional listed NEPA are related but not directly applicable to project PA.  Clearly highlights experience in USFS R1, vegetation mgmt. but project of lower complexity.  Has experience with veg projects in USFS R1 one is only a CE though. Other is as a subcontractor and not finished. Similar scope and scale for projects.
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	43.0	ESA and TES species considerations found throughout projects. Evidence of capability.  BA's in R1 for similar species addressed in example projects.  Have completed BAs for past projects. Not listed in its own section listed in past projects
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	44.0	Listed projects suggest timelines were adhered to.  Detailed account of example project timelines and how they worked to stay on track despite delays. Other examples included specific timelines with delivery.  Have had some delays on pervious projects, but nothing too bad. Seems as though it was out of their control.
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	82.0	Some members are taking resource area responsibilities where they don't have a clear linkage to experience. In some cases, other team members do. (Scenery, Rec).  Project team has coverage, availability percentages unclear, multiple resources falling on individuals.  Proposal does a nice job to show the availability and capacity to work on this project. Some specialists do not have direct project experience in their assigned area.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	84.0	Most experience areas are captured, silv is lacking some true experience, education, limits experience or resource specific qualifications.  Knowledge and project experience identified. Some team members tasked with covering resources not reflected in experience.  Reasonable resource coverage. Silviculture specialist shows very little silviculture training/experience.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	80.0	9 teams members could be stretched quite thin, staff with multiple resources may find it difficult to handle everything.  9 Team members, some lack of experience, multiple resource coverage.  Staff seems adequate with dedicated engineer and a silv specialist. Roles and responsibilities seem shared between some resources
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	84.0	Recent project experience suggest good ability to conduct NEPA. Lacking some formal NEPA Training.  Team leader shows some relevant experience as project manager, some experience with complex NEPA projects, subcontract PM.  PM has recent experience with managing NEPA projects for vegetation and other types of projects. Seems capable on doing this one as well.
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	44.0	Format is clear and concise. Provide majority of information.  Clear and understandable, good layout.  Fieldwork needs are laid out and meeting schedule proposed
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	45.0	Language from RFP is not blatant, would like to see slightly more parallel. Concise layout of sections. Appreciate section breakouts.  All RFP requirements addressed, sections well organized.  All requirements met
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	41.0	QA/QC is brief, but offers good coverage.  Very brief, field survey plans will be verified to eliminate inefficiency.  Lacking some detail, but good overall

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Morrison-Maierle</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	<b>25 Points</b>		Workplan effectively considers major project milestones. Schedule is concise but viable. Workplan addresses all deliverables, timeline reasonable. Work plan lays out steps clearly from initial kick off to submission of project and gives reasonable timeline 21.0
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	<b>25 Points</b>		GIS section present but not extensive / without callouts for standards in RFP. Very brief, but mentioned adherence to FS guidelines and file management. GIS data strategy is short and does not have much description, but does have the required information. Could be good to have a little more elaboration 20.0
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>		187.8
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).			50.0
			909.8

Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pinyon Environmental			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>			
<b>Evaluated RFP Section</b>	<b>Point Values</b>	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>	80.0	NEPA experience but most projects lacking regional specificity or FS involvement.  Relevant EA experience in R1, not FS or veg mgmt. Relevant EA experience in other regions  Some experience with Montana on current projects. Most highlighted projects are in the SW and Colorado. They do have experience with large scale veg projects highlighted though and a good breadth of experience.
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>	40.0	Evidence of wildlife capabilities. Primarily in different regions or areas not applicable to eastern Montana.  Some BA experience. Did not highlight BA's within R1, with relevant species. Did not address directly.  Reading through previous projects I am certain that they will be able to create the BA documents, but have not done so in this region. No NLEB experience listed.
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>	42.0	States adherence to timeline.  Example project timelines were shown, but not reference timelines.  One mention of meeting deadlines on past projects, but the dates on listed projects seem reasonable for their scope and scale.
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>	83.0	All resources were covered. Directly applicable expertise was limited and was not fully explained.  Resources covered and team structure defined. Experience and ability lacked clarity.  Team structure clearly laid out and explained as well as who will be working in what resource area.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	<b>100 Points</b>	75.0	Exact resource duties not fully defined. BA experience limited  Proposal does not clearly identify expertise in the resources that each team member would be completing. Fuels/fire/silv experience absent from team members. Wildlife team member did not include any experience in preparing BA's.  No dedicated silv, but NEPA coordinator is listed to do silv/fire fuels. he could be stretched thin. Does not have a ton of documented experience doing so. No engineer on staff for transportation analysis.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	<b>100 Points</b>	75.0	Limited dedicated staff members, resources areas are covered, but many members are responsible for several resources.  9 team members, some members currently involved with other projects.  No engineer on staff for transportation analysis. The person listed for carbon climate, fire fuels and silv does not have much experience doing so
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	<b>100 Points</b>	81.0	Strong closely related experience. Shows NEPA training/experience, but with no vegetation project experience.  Team leader has relevant experience, lacking vegetation EA project management. She is also the team leader of ongoing projects.  PM has 7 years of documented history of leading teams with similar scope and scale projects and NEPA training. Lack of veg project exp
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	<b>50 Points</b>	45.0	RFP is clearly written and well laid out.  Clearly written, staff resumes did not indicate which resources they would cover.  Well written project plan with schedule of deliverables
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>	45.0	Responsive to RFP sections direct correlation between major sections in proposal.  All RFP requirements were addressed.  Requirements are met, but do not do a good job describing USFS R1 experience and BA experiences

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Pinyon Environmental</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>	45.0	Good QaQC plan, incorporates use of Project specific Quality Management Plan.  Clear QA/QC guidance, in-house Quality Program.  QA/QC process addressed. With 10 step process they have developed including 508 compliance
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	<b>25 Points</b>	22.0	Covers major steps and corresponding deliverables. Reasonable Project Schedule. On longer side but likely more realistic.  Workplan addresses all deliverables, timeline reasonable.  Work plan is well written and addresses all parts of the project with reasonable scheduled
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	<b>25 Points</b>	23.0	High Detail on GIS Strategy. incorporates mention of GIS Project record updates.  GIS plan addressed and with comply with USFS standards and quarterly updates.  sound GIS approach with Quarterly progress updates
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	86.4	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).		50.0	
		792.4	



Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Terracon Consultants</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>			
<b>Evaluated RFP Section</b>	<b>Point Values</b>	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>		Complex projects, Overall lack applicable regional / agency NEPA similarities.  Addresses history of completing NEPA projects, but does not include any examples of R1 FS veg mgmt. projects with similar scope/complexity.  No Veg project experience in R1, but experience with the permitting of energy projects. 70.0
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>		Project example support some wildlife capabilities. Not describes in detail in specific section. Addresses history of completing NEPA projects, but does not include any examples of biological assessments.  No experience in R1, but have experience with bat species studies. Bat NLEB consultation is a R9 process and they have experience there and believe they could complete the process but it not exploit 38.0
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>		Timelines were not listed.  Projects listed, no timelines  Demonstrates that they can and have completed projects but timelines not listed 37.0
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	<b>100 Points</b>		Team shows resource coverage. Some resources are covered very thorough where some others do not provide extensive example / evidence as it applies to FS NEPA.  Team shows resource coverage. Some resources are covered very thorough where some others do not provide extensive example / evidence as it applies to FS NEPA.  experience well documented and explained, but no experience with veg projects and USFS projects not documented 78.0
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	<b>100 Points</b>		Individuals show resource level expertise, but not in a NEPA context.  Relevant experience of team members for their resources, but not for NEPA. Some resources (soils, silv, fire and fuels, hydro) not clearly defined.  No dedicated silv and no experience doing so documented. All other areas seem covered. No projects in forested ecosystems. Expertise lacking in some resource areas for NEPA projects 79.0
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	<b>100 Points</b>		Staff levels are adequate.  18 team members, lacking experience in most resources.  No silv on project with experience writing silv prescriptions. Seem well covered elsewhere. Limited NEPA experience for agencies 79.0
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	<b>100 Points</b>		Team Lead demonstrates relatively low NEPA Experience, especially in a forest service NEPA context.  Team leader clearly has experience in managing complex projects. Lacking FS, vegetation, NEPA experience.  PM has experience managing large scale projects, but no experience with large scale veg projects: mostly energy and telecom. 80.0
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	<b>50 Points</b>		Some errors found throughout. Overall achieves requirements.  Clearly written and understandable, lacks clarity on requirements.  Well laid out plan and seems like they may not understand the project completely 40.0
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	<b>50 Points</b>		Mostly responds to RFP. Some errors or omissions, particularly around BA requirements.  Timelines, BA's not addressed. 40.0 Covered things but didn't talk about BA experience
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	<b>50 Points</b>		Expansive QAQC with well established methods for project tracking and project metric. Multi level review.  In house Quality program, well defined. 45.0 Have QA/QC plan, but not very specifically laid out

Offeror (Company) Name: Terracon Consultants		Total Points Awarded:	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	18.0	Generally correct, No BA required. Some mistakes identified with timeline concerns. Aggressive timeline is not problematic, but i feel as is complexity may be understated.  Workplan has unrealistic timelines.  Schedule of deliverables laid out with times matching timeline, aggressive
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	19.0	Minimal GIS consideration outlines, but section does reference needs.  GIS plan only covered under field work section.  GIS plan not laid out in its own section, but does show the data management strategies
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	131.5	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).		50.0	
		804.5	

Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis			
DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be based on pass/fail. Equal Pay for Montana Women is worth 5% bonus points.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Tetra Tech			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
EVALUATION CRITERIA			
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments
<b>COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Highlight experience with similar scope, scales and complexity within Forest Service Region 1. (wildlife, vegetation, aquatics, hydrology, etc). Section 4.2.1 (a).	100 Points	94.0	Extensive Experience in region 1 (20ces) with Clear experience in large scale FS NEPA across additional regions. Several beneficial experience include ESA, CARA/Comment, Tribal Consultation. Included R1 FS vegetation management project with similar scope and complexity, larger scale. Other examples of completing FS NEPA clearly shown to be larger scope, scale, complexity in similar. landscape (E Washington). Introduction paragraphs well written, highlight company experience with local professionals. experience in USFS R1 listed on ongoing veg projects, but other veg work happening outside R1. Similar scope and scale. Know USFS systems for project management.
B. Ability to complete ESA biological assessment and wildlife NEPA analysis in FS Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	46.0	BA and Wildlife analysis identifies in all 4 examples-with many examples consisting of complicated wildlife considerations. R1 Fuel Break example cites completion of BA's for listed species and wildlife NEPA analysis for on a signed decision. Experience with R1 BAs, but no NLEB work mentioned. I do feel that they are capable of doing so. Lots of complex wildlife issues in past projects
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	45.0	Many Projects ongoing, but all that were listed occur-ed in a reasonable time-frame with no contractor controlled delays. Included timelines for examples projects, but not original timeline for reference. Seems that they have been ranked well on past contracts and met schedules
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2</b>	<b>400 Points Possible</b>		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	95.0	Very well rounded team with clear delineation of resource experts. Cumulative skill suggest adequate coverage. Limited overlap and additional cover on key resources. Structure of team and resource coverage clear with experience and shown in chart Team structure clearly defined and roles clearly communicated along with experience highlighted
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	95.0	Each team member has a clearly defines role with little overlap. Very few do not have direct NEPA experience. Table 1 clearly shows the team members qualifications and experience, which directly reflect their expertise in respective resource areas. IE: Wildlife specialist BS/MS in wildlife. Botany specialist MS in botany. Hydrologist MS in hydrology. Silv has extensive relevant experience. Fire ecologist with extensive fire modelling experience. Knowledge and experience clearly laid out with past example projects. Little overlap. Most have direct USFS NEPA experience
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	95.0	22 core team individuals with access to additional support. 23 team members with experience in respective resource areas. Partnered with MFC. TT has a silv team as well as fire/fuels ecologist and a civil engineer. Covering 3 of the main areas of concern. Coverage for all resource seems good.
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	95.0	Project manager has extensive NEPA Experience with multi decade FS NEPA expedience and Past FS Employment. Clearly stated experience managing complex NEPA contracts in relevant projects, holds FS contractor profile, was project manager on 3 of the example projects. Project manager has lots of experience managing complex NEPA projects and seems well suited for this one.
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3</b>	<b>200 Points Possible</b>		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	47.0	Clearly written and well laid out. Great use of organizational chart and other organizational features. Excellent organization, proposal structure matches RFP. Plans are well laid out and describe each step in the process and how it will be completed.

Offeror (Company) Name: Tetra Tech			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	44.0	High level of responsiveness. All sections are covered in great detail. Unnecessary mention of BA.  All RFP requirements addressed in detail.  All requirements are met and clearly communicated
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	45.0	QA/QC is laid out clearly and logically. Appears robust and well thought out.  In-house quality program, review of deliverables, editorial review, technical review, final quality review .  QA/QC plans address steps taken to assure that data is correct and will continually take in agency feedback
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	22.0	Work plan shows a reasonable timeline with all key milestones / deliverables identified.  Workplan addresses all deliverables, timeline reasonable.  Work plan shows clear deadlines for deliverables and a planned schedule to meet those and reasonable schedule
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	22.0	GIS plan shows a strong understanding of organizational need. demonstrates solid past performance, but is limited in some reference to the requested GIS standards.  GIS management addressed, experience clear, did not cite specific data management strategy.  Laid out plan and experience using USFS databases for projects No tools mentioned
<b>REFERENCE Section 4.2.4</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>		
Minimum of three complete references.	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	Pass	
<b>COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1</b>	<b>200</b>	96.2	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>5% Bonus Points</b>		
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 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).		50.0	
		891.2	

**DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R**  
**Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis**  
**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.

**DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R  
Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis**

**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			
<b>Points Available</b>		<b>200</b>	
Lowest Cost		\$301,718.00	
<b>Vendor Name</b>	<b>Proposed Cost</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Notes:</b>
Copperhead	\$349,575.60	172.6	
ERO	\$486,212.00	124.1	
GSI Env.	\$582,676.00	103.6	
Grouse Mountain	\$528,382.00	114.2	
KLJ	\$301,718.00	200.0	
Morrison-Maierle	\$321,354.00	187.8	
Pinyon	\$698,133.70	86.4	
Teccacon	\$458,800.00	131.5	
Tetra Tech	\$627,388.00	96.2	
Vendor # 10		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 11		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 12		#DIV/0!	

## Scoring Calculator

Superior High	100.0%
Superior Low	94.0%
Good High	94.0%
Good Low	74.0%
Fair High	74.0%
Fair Low	59.0%
Failed High	59.0%
Failed Low	0.0%

### Total Points Available

Score	1000
Superior (95-100%)	940 - 1000
Good (75-94%)	740 - 940
Fair (60-74%)	590 - 740
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 590

## Technical Scoring Session

DNRC-RFP-2025-1276R  
Chalk Buttes EA NEPA Analysis Evaluation Scoring Matrix

Date  
Time

Location: Virtual

Evaluation Committee Members: David Origer, Clay Harris, Jabus Smith, Don Ulrich  
Subject Matter Experts: David Origer, Clay Harris, Jabus Smith, Don Ulrich  
Contracts Officer: David Origer

Order of Evaluation: Random  
Scoring Method: Consensus

## Product Demo/Interview

Date  
Time

Location

Order of Demonstration/Interview: Alphabetical, random, etc.  
Scoring Method: Must be consistent with the scoring method used for the technical scoring