



MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor
Misty Ann Giles, Director

doa.mt.gov

406.444.2460

doadirector@mt.gov

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Solicitation Title/Event Name:

Solicitation Number:

Solicitation Close Date:

Notice of Intent to Award Post Date:

Issuing Contracts Officer contact information:

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

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

Apparent Successful Offeror(s)

Unsuccessful Offeror(s)

**DNRC-RFP-2025-1277R
Monture McCabe EA NEPA Analysis**

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET						
Category	Possible Points	Copperhead	ERO Resources	Grouse Mountain	Sundance	Tetra Tech
COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS SECTION 4.2.1	200					
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	95	86	99	91	95
B. Ability to complete Biological Assessments for species listed in the Endangered Species Act occurring in Forest Service Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50	48	43	50	40	45
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50	46	45	47	46	45
QUALIFICATIONS AN EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2	400					
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100	93	92	94	87	95
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100	91	93	91	59	95
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100	92	95	92	59	95
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100	95	92	97	59	95
PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3	200					
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50	45	43	45	38	46
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50	45	45	45	37	45
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50	45	45	45	42	45
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25	23	23	23	23	23
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25	22	23	22	21	22
REFERENCES Section 4.2.4	Pass/Fail					
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1	200	200.0	121.9	111.9	112.1	127.9
EQUAL PAY FOR MONTANA WOMEN	50	50	50	50	50	50

990

897

912

764

924

DNRC-RFP-2025-1277R

Monture McCabe EA NEPA Analysis

Individual Scoring Matrix

The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel, and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated using the scoring guide below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below. Offerors will be awarded 5% bonus points for Equal Pay for Montana Women. References will be based on pass/fail. The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 1,000 points.

Offeror (Company) Name: Copperhead			Total Points Awarded: 991
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1	200 Points Possible		
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	95	Recent FS R1 NEPA experience with veg mgmt. Provided examples of Vegetation Management Projects with USFS in R1, similar project purpose and need, and treatment types High level experience across multiple National Forests. Multiple applicable R1 projects (include BAs, specialist reporting, and other NEPA components)
B. Ability to complete Biological Assessments for species listed in the Endangered Species Act occurring in Forest Service Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	48	Recently performed analysis and completed BA's of applicable species for FS in R1. Griz, wolverine, lynx, bull trout, wbp Provide examples of recently complete BA's in R1 More than 100 BAs with many occurring in R1. Specifically mentions experience with species occurring in project area.
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	46	Cited management tools to keep project on schedule, provided projects completed on schedule Indicate all efforts will be made to meet or exceed timelines. Provides a plan demonstrating methods to achieve milestones References projects that were completed on time. Outlines experience working on project son expedited timelines with example.
QUALIFICATIONS AN EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2	400 Points Possible		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	93	PM and IDT Lead have ample relevant experience, all resources covered. Project team small but experienced Proposal explains approach, structure and experience of proposed team Resource coverage with individual members possessing R1 FS NEPA Experience
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	91	Provides resumes and clearly identifies designated role of staff Wildlife biologist lacks educational requirements, but was primary author on BA in MT with similar spp. Silv specialist has forestry degree and experience in veg mgmt. in R1. Botany specialist high level of Individual team members especially those offering high-level support, are qualified and show adequate experience. Some limitation may exist in fisheries / hydrology resources experience.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	92	12 team members, strong leadership specialists are qualified for resource areas Identified key personnel are adequate to complete the project Adequate staffing for resource coverage. Multiple resources are covered by single specialist. Field requirements may prove demanding on limited field staff.

Offeror (Company) Name: Copperhead		Total Points Awarded: 991	
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	95	30 years of experience, PM on recent R1 NEPA example Project Manager has extensive background and experience in overseeing environmental projects Marty has 30 years experience in Environmental Analysis. In depth experience with FS NEPA management (R1).
PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3	200 Points Possible		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	45	Clearly written and understandable, follows RFP format Explains approach, and keys to delivering successful on time project. Plan is clear and well designed Proposal is clear and concise. Narrative is easily followed. Use of visual aids/ figures would strengthen.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	46	Addresses all RFP requirements proposal indicates will be responsive with meetings and needs Responds clearly to all RFP sections. Offers decent coverage with applicable information per section.
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	45	Outlines quality control plan and procedures In depth QAQC plan described with consistency checks and technical review In depth QAQC plan described with consistency checks and technical review.
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	23	Reasonable timeline, logical workflow Provides table with schedule summarizing proposed deliverables. Plan is clear and logical Plan covers all key deliverable. Could have been more elaborate. Assumptions offer great level of detail and portray understanding of project
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	22	Overview covers previous experience with FS data mgmt. and field data collection References experience with FS spatial data and outlines experience and plan to meet DNRC and FS requirement's Utilized straightforward GIS approach. General concepts are captured. Project specie needs are recognized and supported by past experience.
REFERENCE Section 4.2.4	Pass/Fail		
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1	20% of points for 200 possible points	200	
EQUAL PAY FOR MONTANA WOMEN	5% bonus points	50	
		991.0	

Individual Scoring Matrix

The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel, and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated using the scoring guide below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below. Offerors will be awarded 5% bonus points for Equal Pay for Montana Women. References will be based on pass/fail. The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 1,000 points.

Offeror (Company) Name: ERO Resources			Total Points Awarded: 896.9
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1			200 Points Possible
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	86	R1 EA/EIS experience, no veg mgmt. Provide examples of large scale complex mining projects. Support roles in Vegetation management projects. Lead role in Vegetation project in R9 Noted experience in region 1 completing Large Scale NEPA. Large scale NEPA outlined in later sections, support capability. Lacking Directly outlined Vegetation experience in selected projects.
B. Ability to complete Biological Assessments for species listed in the Endangered Species Act occurring in Forest Service Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	43	R1 BA and NEPA wildlife analysis experience with similar species Have recent experience with preparing BA's for projects in R1, Have experience supporting multiple projects Outlines experience with R1 Sensitive species. Notes experience with BE generation and experience as technical review of applicable BA Unsure if they wrote those BAs directly. Mention of slightly less applicable BA under ESA section 7 review
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	45	Clearly demonstrates timeline adherence. Includes example project timeline and actual timeline Indicate success in meeting project timelines. Mine project example Project examples with adherence to standard and expedited timelines. Mentions project with unforeseen complications and ability to overcome delays.
QUALIFICATIONS AN EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2			400 Points Possible
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	92	Explains approach and structure of proposed team Identifies 4-person leadership team, PM, NEPA specialist, deputy PM, principal advisor. Structure of teams, coverage of resources clearly shown Team structure is adequate. Many team members experience are not directly applicable to R1 Veg NEPA
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	93	Wildlife specialists have goshawk, flam owl, griz, lynx, wolverine experience. Silv specialist forestry degree, some silv experience. Fisheries PhD and experience. Soils MS and experience Provides tables and lists clearly displaying staff KSA and resource area Resource Areas are covered with high level experience and education
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	95	26 personnel, across 4 companies. Experience in each resource in similar projects Identified key personnel are adequate to complete the project 26 Staff members with coverage for independent resources as well as project management team.
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	92	Project manager was Deputy PM on examples projects, one veg mgmt. project. Clearly experienced in NEPA mgmt. Directly relevant experience lacking Identified Project Manager has solid background and experience in Forest MGMT projects Forestry PhD and applicable experience. Primary FS Veg projects are not centered in R1. NEPA experience but not direct focus.

Offeror (Company) Name: ERO Resources		Total Points Awarded: 896.9	
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3	200 Points Possible		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	43	Clearly written and understandable, follows RFP format Well laid out and clear project plan Proposal is well written in a standard narrative format. Originally overlooked some project specific details that were useful in understanding work history.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	45	Addresses all RFP requirements Sections match RFP layout Indicates meeting RFP requirements and needs.
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	45	Detailed QAQC with specific measures QAQC represents systematic approach. Plan covers all stages from planning to review Indicate Project Manager will ensure quality control. Outlines QC plan.
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	23	Reasonable timeline, logical work plan Logical and reasonable workplan, provide Table with schedule milestones Work plan displays an accurate portrayal of deliverables over time. Timeline appears reasonable given project complexity.
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	23	Brief but detailed strategy, experience with ESRI products. Indicates GIS approach will meet all DNRC requirements Straightforward GIS approach. Lacks detail or consideration for state hosted data
REFERENCE Section 4.2.4	Pass/Fail		
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1	20% of points for 200 possible points	121.9	
EQUAL PAY FOR MONTANA WOMEN	5% bonus points	50	
		896.9	

Monture McCabe EA NEPA Analysis

Individual Scoring Matrix

The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel, and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated using the scoring guide below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below. Offerors will be awarded 5% bonus points for Equal Pay for Montana Women. References will be based on pass/fail. The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 1,000 points.

Offeror (Company) Name: Grouse Mountain			Total Points Awarded: 911.9
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1			200 Points Possible
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	99	Recent experience in FS R1, LNF veg mgmt. project in the vicinity of MM project area with wildlife, veg, aquatics, hydrology, etc. Provided examples of similar Vegetation Management Projects in similar project area within R1, working in coordination with USFS and MT DNRC High level project experience on LNF including highway 83 which is extremely applicable. Additional NEPA projects conducted outside of Region 1 that have similar Scope and Scale.
B. Ability to complete Biological Assessments for species listed in the Endangered Species Act occurring in Forest Service Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	50	High level project experience on LNF including highway 83 which is extremely applicable. Additional NEPA projects conducted outside of Region 1 that have similar Scope and Scale. Provide examples of recently complete BA's in R1 Extensive Experience with region 1 wildlife support (BE and BA). With directly applicable experience in Sorrel Springs and Highway 83. Additional wildlife project support comes from adjacent FS regions.
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	47	Provided dates of project completion in relation to original timeline. Provided honest account of project timeline and working to keep project on track despite unforeseen delays. Cited lessons learned and changes incorporated into workflow to manage similar projects Indicate all efforts will be made to meet or exceed timelines. Provide references and examples of projects Recent project experience shows capability to conduct projects of similar scope and scale, in a timely manner. Delays largely due to external pressure.
QUALIFICATIONS AN EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2			400 Points Possible
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	94	Identifies PM, 2 experienced principals, and a designated nepa specialist for support. Strong hydro experience, wildlife team is has great coverage and experience. Team leader for many resource areas is also primary author for fire/fuels. Project team does not reflect experience/ability in silviculture or fire/fuels Proposal explains approach, structure and experience of proposed team adequately Strong Team Structure with resource / program management staff. Bulk of staff have directly applicable project experience.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	91	Resource areas coverage. Does not identify silviculture prescription writing/ experience Provides staff resumes and clearly identifies designated role of staff High Level education and expertise to support project needs. Some resources with shared coverage.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	92	18 team members, project management shows great experience. Identified key personnel are adequate to complete the project 18 team members, project management shows great experience.
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	97	PM has 13yrs experience, was PM on example project of similar scope/scale/complexity with R1, FS, LNF, veg project experience The identified Project Manager/Point of Contact has strong background and experience managing projects of similar of scope and scale Hilary has directly applicable R1 Veg experience that mimic scope of proposed projects. Education and certificates strongly support necessary work.

Offeror (Company) Name: Grouse Mountain			Total Points Awarded: 911.9
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3	200 Points Possible		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	45	Clearly written and understandable, follows RFP format Project plan is well explained and well written Proposal is clearly written with a simple and understandable approach.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	45	Addresses all RFP requirements Directly responded to RFP with language referenced in RFP and use of associates sections for organization Provides plan for accomplishing all requirements.
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	45	Brief overview of QAQC, 2 qualified reviewers. Proposal outlines quality control plan and procedures. Identifies extensive peer review process. ensures POC will maintain consistency throughout document. established QACA training protocol identified, with multiple review and technical edits.
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	23	Reasonable timeline, logical and clearly experienced. Addressed using lessons learned from similar projects. Provides chart summarizing proposed work plan. Plan is clear and logical. Schedule offers a realistic time frame for all requested deliverables with an achievable timeframe.
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	22	Brief overview of approach, training by GIS specialists, templates for consistency. Outlines GIS plan including data mgmt., map standards etc. GIS Management plan promotes data quality and purpose built approach specifically for the project. Independent QA review.
REFERENCE Section 4.2.4	Pass/Fail		
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1	20% of points for 200 possible points	111.9	
EQUAL PAY FOR MONTANA WOMEN	5% bonus points	50	
		911.9	

DNRC-RFP-2025-1277R			
Monture McCabe EA NEPA Analysis			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel, and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated using the scoring guide below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below. Offerors will be awarded 5% bonus points for Equal Pay for Montana Women. References will be based on pass/fail. The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 1,000 points.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Sundance Consultants			Total Points Awarded: 764.1
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1			
	200 Points Possible		
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	91	R1 FS EA, veg mgmt. NEPA Services IDIQ, R4 IDIQ with 10 task orders. Projects of similar resource areas with veg mgmt. 3 Projects provided demonstrate similar needs as the Monture McCabe project. Unclear on the size, potential issues, and complexities of these projects. Appear to have led to a signed decision. Several applicable region 1 projects of similar scope and scale. No projects occurring in MT/LNF
B. Ability to complete Biological Assessments for species listed in the Endangered Species Act occurring in Forest Service Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	40	Highlighted some BA experience, mostly in R4. Reference completing BA's for projects provided as reference...Extensive experience with region 1 ESA Species. Only one project explicitly lists Grizzly, Lynx, Wolverine. Reference completing BA's for projects provided as reference
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	46	Clearly shown expected project timeline and actual project timeline. From timelines indicated on reference project all timelines were met and no issues were reported, Timelines all adhered to with no performance issues identified.
QUALIFICATIONS AN EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2			
	400 Points Possible		
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	87	Experience is clear but not fully covered, coverage of all resources with experience in each resource. Project Team appears to have all required structure and experience to meet needs of this project. Attachment A with individual resumes is not include with provided information so verification of individual experience was undetermined. Team structure appears to cover all resource areas with additional personal listed to support policy and litigation. Lacking resumes to offer in depth review
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	59	Rec specialist former LNF DR. Soils PhD. Fisheries PhD candidate. Silv forestry degree with experience. Wildlife Bio does not show education background, some experience in performing field work. *Did not include resume attachment. Individual resource coverage appears adequate with high level coverage. Lacking resumes to offer in depth review
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	59	19 team members with experience in each resource. Addresses deep bench in case of staffing issues. Staff listed in Table 2. appears to be adequate to complete the project. Attachment A with individual resumes is missing from provided information. Unable to verify. Listed team size is adequate and offers good resource coverage, Lacking resumes to offer in depth review
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	59	No resume. 34 years experience in NEPA, 22 years in fed agencies. Team leader appears to have highly applicable skills in NEPA and ESA. Lacking resumes to offer in depth review. Team Leader is identified and appears to be well qualified. Attachment A with individual resume is missing from provided information. Unable to verify

Offeror (Company) Name: Sundance Consultants			Total Points Awarded: 764.1
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3	200 Points Possible		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	38	Did not clearly display RFP sections. Example text boxes were difficult to evaluate. Provides a good overview of their approach: clearly described. Well written. Concise but detailed coverage of various sections.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	37	Did not include resume attachment. Otherwise met all RFP requirements. Defines key elements, and strategies to ensure success. Proposal is responsive to requirements and uses intuitive layout to closely follow RFP. However, Resumes were omitted.
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	42	Brief overview of QAQC. Describes Quality Control Program and outlines process. Provides strong QAQC approach
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	23	Reasonable timelines, logical workflow and highlights methods Project work plan and work schedule are clear and logical. Table 3. provides a project timeline with a clear and reasonable schedule Workplan highlights strong systematic approach with reasonable schedule. Lacking project specific details.
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	21	Clearly identifies process and approach. Adheres to requested GIS products. Brief overview, covers strategy, Proposal outlines their process, plan and will meet DNRC needs.
REFERENCE Section 4.2.4	Pass/Fail		
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1	20% of points for 200 possible points	112.1	
EQUAL PAY FOR MONTANA WOMEN	5% bonus points	50	
		764.1	

DNRC-RFP-2025-1277R

Monture McCabe EA NEPA Analysis

Individual Scoring Matrix

The Company Experience and Qualifications, Qualifications and Experience of Proposed Personnel, and Project Plan and Proposed Quality will be evaluated using the scoring guide below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below. Offerors will be awarded 5% bonus points for Equal Pay for Montana Women. References will be based on pass/fail. The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 1,000 points.

Offeror (Company) Name: Tetra Tech		Total Points Awarded: 723.9	
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
COMPANY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS Section 4.2.1		200 Points Possible	
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	95	Recent FS R1 NEPA with vegetation mgmt. experience in similar resource areas. Provided examples of Vegetation Management Projects with USFS in R1, similar project purpose and need, and treatment types. 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
B. Ability to complete Biological Assessments for species listed in the Endangered Species Act occurring in Forest Service Region 1. Section 4.2.1 (b).	50 Points	45	Completed R1 BA's for griz, lynx, wolverine, wbp, bull trout. Did not call out in separate section. Provided examples of recently complete BA's in R1. Well defined experience with consistent BA experience on similar scope / scale.
C. Complete projects adhering to and the ability to complete projects and reasonable timelines. Section 4.2.1 (c).	50 Points	45	Included completion timelines but not reference timelines . Indicate all efforts will be made to meet or exceed timelines. Provides a plan demonstrating methods to achieve milestones. No issues with references. some projects listed are ongoing. Projects appear to be on track.
QUALIFICATIONS AN EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL Section 4.2.2		400 Points Possible	
A. Experience and ability of proposed project team reflecting structure and coverage. Section 4.2.2 (a).	100 Points	95	Structure of team and resource coverage very clearly shown in chart. Proposal clearly explains approach, structure and experience of proposed team. High level structural support for all resources. Most recourses areas have redundant coverage.
B. Clearly identifies expertise and knowledge in resource area. Section 4.2.2 (b).	100 Points	95	Table 1 clearly shows the team members qualifications and experience, which directly reflect their expertise in respective resource areas. 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. Proposal provides resumes and with experience detailed and demonstrates quality staff for appropriate specialist needs. High level expertise across resource areas. Fisheries staff may be light / stretched thin. Overall, great resource coverage.
C. Staff resources are adequate to complete the project. Section 4.2.2 (c).	100 Points	95	23 team members with experience in each resource. Key staff and partners are adequate to complete the project. 24 high level staff members leading resources with additional support available.

Offeror (Company) Name: Tetra Tech			Total Points Awarded: 723.9
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
D. Team leader has experience and skills adequate to manage complex NEPA projects. Section 4.2.2 (d).	100 Points	95	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 a solid experience record managing large complex environmental projects. Highly experienced with FS NEPA in Region 1 (Past employment), carries multiple FS credentials and understanding of internal process.
PROJECT PLAN AND PROPOSED QUALITY Section 4.2.3	200 Points Possible		
A. Clearly written and understandable. Section 4.2.3 (a).	50 Points	46	Excellent organization, proposal matches RFP. Proposal explains approach, and keys to delivering successful on time project. Plan is clear and well designed. Clearly written and well laid out. Great use of organizational chart and other organizational features.
B. Responsiveness to RFP requirements. Section 4.2.3 (b).	50 Points	45	All RFP requirements addressed in detail. Proposal follows process to meet the needs of the DNRC. High level of responsiveness. All sections are covered with direct link to RFP.
C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Section 4.2.3 (c).	50 Points	45	In-house quality program, review of deliverables, editorial review, technical review, final quality review.... Outlines in-depth quality control plan and procedures... Plan is clear and logical. Ensures use of multi level internal review
D. Workplan demonstrates knowledgeable, logical, reasonable approach. Section 4.2.3 (d).	25 Points	23	Workplan addresses all deliverables, clear experience, timeline reasonable. Proposal provides chart summarizing proposed work plan. Plan is clear and logical. Work plan covers deliverables in good depth. Timeline is reasonable.
E. Outline GIS Management Strategy. Section 4.2.3 (e).	25 Points	22	GIS management addressed, experience clear, did not cite specific data management strategy. Has experience with GIS and FS processes. Will meet DNRC requirements. Limited strategic components. Past experience supports strong GIS capabilities.
REFERENCE Section 4.2.4	Pass/Fail		
Minimum of three complete references.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
COST PROPOSAL FIXED PRICE Section 5.1	20% of points for 200 possible points	127.9	
EQUAL PAY FOR MONTANA WOMEN	5% bonus points	50	
		923.9	

DNRC-RFP-2025-1277R
Monture McCabe 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-2025-1277R
Monture McCabe 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		
Points Available	200	
Lowest Cost	\$622,745.00	
Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Notes:
Copperhead	\$622,745.00	200.0
ERO Resources	\$1,021,886.00	121.9
Grouse Mountain	\$1,112,892.00	111.9
Sundance	\$1,110,680.06	112.1
Tetra Tech	\$973,714.00	127.9
Vendor # 6		#DIV/0!
Vendor # 7		#DIV/0!
Vendor # 8		#DIV/0!
Vendor # 9		#DIV/0!
Vendor # 10		#DIV/0!
Vendor # 11		#DIV/0!
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	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-2025-1277R

Monture McCabe EA NEPA Analysis

9-Apr-24

2:30-5:00

Virtual: Teams

Evaluation Committee Members:

Dave Origer, Clay Harris, Aaron Kim

Contracts Officer: Rhonda Peters

Order of Evaluation: Alphabetical as
submitted in eMACS

Scoring Method: Consensus