



## 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)

**MDT-RFP-2025-1944R  
Wetland Mitigation Monitoring**

**SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET**

Category	Possible Points	Confluence Consulting	DJ&A	Morrison-Maierle	RE/SPEC	Tetra Tech	WESTECH	Water & Environmental
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>	<b>250</b>							
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	190	143	155	182	141.0	143.0	147.0
Computer Systems and Software	25	25	25	25	25	21.0	25.0	25.0
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	24	17	19	21	18.0	14.0	17.0
<b>Provision of Services</b>	<b>200</b>							
Methods/Work Plan	150	140	98	115	133	92.0	100.0	98.0
Timeline	50	46	38	38	50	23.0	13.0	25.0
<b>References</b>								
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail							
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>	<b>350</b>							
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	100	57	78	83	58.0	65.0	72.0
Staff Experience	150	140	118	132	147	105.0	85.0	117.0
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	100	63	67	82	60.0	65.0	70.0
<b>Cost Proposal</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>166.8</b>	<b>164.5</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>171.7</b>	<b>173.9</b>	<b>109.0</b>
		<b>931.8</b>	<b>723.5</b>	<b>721.2</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>689.7</b>	<b>683.9</b>	<b>680.0</b>
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>50.0</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		<b>981.8</b>	<b>773.5</b>	<b>771.2</b>	<b>973</b>	<b>739.7</b>	<b>733.9</b>	<b>730.0</b>

<b>MDT-RFP-2025-1944R</b>			
<b>Wetland Mitigation Monitoring</b>			
<b>Individual Scoring Matrix</b>			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Ability to Perform the Services, Provision of Services will be scored using the point structure below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be evaluated on pass/fail.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Confluence Consulting</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 981.8</b>
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>			
	<b>250</b>		
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	190	First 3 sections were mainly cut and paste of the Scope of Services, but other sections were pretty good. Extensive experience and knowledge of the project criteria.
Computer Systems and Software	25	25	Software all compatible for working with MDT and for transferring report information to MDT using the State File Transfer Service.
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	24	Did not mention any state, federal regulations, in guidelines
<b>Provision of Services</b>			
	<b>200</b>		
Methods/Work Plan	150	140	Concerns with lead scientists at each site to prepare reports and consistency of reports. Concerns with wetland technician repairing reports. Wetland plan clearly defined and outlined in proposal.
Timeline	50	46	Presentation on tasks and schedule could have been expanded. Narrative explained staff time and percentages, should have been in a chart form. Indicate that if changes are to occur to project schedule, they would coordinate with MDT.
<b>References</b>			
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail		
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
	<b>350</b>		
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	100	Has held the existing wetland monitoring contract since 2019. Well versed in the MDT methodologies and requirements. Previous experience with MDT monitoring program and Corps reporting standards and documenting performance standards and Figures to track success of the MDT mitigation sites including both stream and wetland assessments and determination of wetland credit acres and functional credits.
Staff Experience	150	140	Wetland scientists on Staff with extensive experience in wetland delineations & monitoring, stream assessments & monitoring and functional assessments using the MWAM. Extensive experience in compensatory wetland monitoring report writing.
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	100	Identified three compensatory monitoring projects for the MDT Wetland and Stream Monitoring contracts and for the Beartooth Highway wetland mitigation monitoring over the past 5+ years.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
	<b>200</b>	<b>166.8</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</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		981.8	

<b>MDT-RFP-2025-1944R</b>			
<b>Wetland Mitigation Monitoring</b>			
<b>Individual Scoring Matrix</b>			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Ability to Perform the Services, Provision of Services will be scored using the point structure below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be evaluated on pass/fail.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: DJ&amp;A, P.C.</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 773.5</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>	<b>250</b>		
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	143	Indicated that they did inventory studies and evaluations, but no monitoring efforts. Also there was no acknowledgement of following previous work at the nine mitigation sites. Emphasized using the new OHWM delineation manual and stream assessment methods on MDT sites, even when it wasn't called for in the RFP.
Computer Systems and Software	25	25	Firm has computer and data collection systems compatible with MDT software for exchange of documents and information.
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	17	They indicate that they reviewed and understand MDT's wetland monitoring report requirements and guidelines, but lack specifics. A lot of "we will" or "We understand" with no substance.
<b>Provision of Services</b>	<b>200</b>		
Methods/Work Plan	150	98	Talks about their field teams, but minimal coordination with MDT. Lacking methods of how they were going to conduct the work. Nothing about how they plan to work, or what activities will be undertaken by their teams.
Timeline	50	38	Concerns with the availability of main staff in 2025, whereas 50% of the staff time was allocated to unknown staff members whose resumes and experience are not listed in submission. No ability to assess the expertise of the field crew for this RFP. Would think that the main staff would have a greater role in the 1st year of this project.
<b>References</b>			
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail	<b>PASS</b>	
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>	<b>350</b>		
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	57	Did not identify any specific types of projects that outline their experience in doing this RFP. Indicates that they have 4 decades of experience for the evaluation, monitoring and planning of projects across Montana. Would have like to have seen some of the monitoring experiences as it relates to this RFP. Lacking details..
Staff Experience	150	118	Tough to do field work remotely for this project. Also the 50% staff are not listed to evaluate their experience in conducting such work. Not at 50% or less time available.
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	63	Projects listed were primarily to conduct wetland delineations and functional ratings using MWAM for MDT and FHWA-western Lands - No wetland monitoring experience. BLM project was to conduct a PFC condition survey of streams within the project area. No specifics on the types of studies and techniques conducted for these projects. A lot of data collection, but not monitoring.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>164.5</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</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			773.5

<b>MDT-RFP-2025-1944R</b>			
<b>Wetland Mitigation Monitoring</b>			
<b>Individual Scoring Matrix</b>			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Ability to Perform the Services, Provision of Services will be scored using the point structure below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be evaluated on pass/fail.			
<b>93.2</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 771.2</b>
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>	<b>250</b>		
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	155	Little to no relevant experience in wetland monitoring such as belt transects, longitudinal profiles, paired points, etc. Lot of Feasibility study work outlined, not what this RFP is for. Think that MWAM is solely identifying wetland values for a project that may require mitigation.
Computer Systems and Software	25	25	Firm has computer and data collection systems compatible with MDT software for exchange of documents and information.
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	19	Will follow existing monitoring reports, no real plan or understanding of what RFP entail. No mention of MT Stream Mitigation Procedures.
<b>Provision of Services</b>	<b>200</b>		
Methods/Work Plan	150	115	No clear understanding of monitoring efforts as they indicated that they would work to develop performance standards for the Johnson mitigation site. Those are already in place and approved by Corps as they are for all mitigation sites prior to monitoring efforts. Work plan was difficult to follow. Multiple teams of staff conducting the work and lack of consistency in deliverables from site to site.
Timeline	50	38	A lot of this should have been in the work plan. Needed to have availability of staff to conduct the work. Standard project schedule indicating DRAFT monitoring reports by October 15th and Final monitoring reports by February 1st. Field work to kick-off in May. needed more details and specifics.
<b>References</b>			
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail	PASS	
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>	<b>350</b>		
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	78	The previous related project experience indicates wetland delineations and mitigation, we are not looking for mitigation, we are requesting to evaluate and monitor the success of MDT mitigation sites. No permits or regulatory compliance necessary, and this RFP does not need any remediation or restoration actions. Alot of pre-construction feasibility and design for mitigation efforts.
Staff Experience	150	132	A few pending PWS certifications and lots of wetland delineation experience. Sandefur is the most qualified of the staff.
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	67	Only one of the projects actually represents a monitoring effort, the other projects were simply corridor evaluations of wetlands. Would have liked to have seen other monitoring efforts.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>92.2</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</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		771.2	

MDT-RFP-2025-1944R			
Wetland Mitigation Monitoring			
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 Ability to Perform the Services, Provision of Services will be scored using the point structure below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be evaluated on pass/fail.			
Offeror: RE/SPEC, INC.			Total Points Awarded: 973
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>	<b>250</b>		
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	182	Needed to go into more details as MDT is going to provide the new format. Needed more details on how they were going to go through the tasks. Focusing on old methodology with 2019 reports, MDT has changed the format since then to comply with Corps changes..
Computer Systems and Software	25	25	Well versed and compatible with MDT computer operating systems to provide continuity on reports and data files appropriate for environmental resource field work for MDT.
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	21	Basically six bullet points on monitoring requirements and did not go into the specifics for MDT guidelines concerning specifications, guidelines, Federal or State laws concerning invoicing.
<b>Provision of Services</b>	<b>200</b>		
Methods/Work Plan	150	133	Consistency with past monitoring efforts as to timing of wetland of wetland site visits to match previous monitoring. Like the consistency of teams conducting the site visits. MDT no longer uses spreadsheets for tracking comments/edits. .
Timeline	50	50	Presented the project schedule in a very accurate and enjoyable method for both he project schedule an also a workload table.
<b>References</b>			
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail		
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>	<b>350</b>		
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	83	Did not get into the details of the work they had previous experience with in monitoring MDT mitigation sites. Not looking for experience in other activities that were mentioned. Would have liked focus on the efforts from past monitoring.
Staff Experience	150	147	Experienced staff for wetland delineations for majority of staff. Limited experience for one staff member >2 years.
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	82	Only one of the projects was for wetland monitoring and that was the Clark Fork River Phase 1 Vegetation and Wetland Monitoring. The MDT Natural Resources Evaluations and Studies Contract was not wetland monitoring, but wetland delineations for projects. Wetland delineations were conducted at the Jack Creek and Little Muddy sites, not monitoring events HDR/RESPEC were not tasked with transects or other monitoring activities such as transects, photo points, etc.. Baseline delineations and a functional assessment were conducted for Ducks Unlimited at Westby, not monitoring.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	Lowest cost
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</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		973.0	

<b>MDT-RFP-2025-1944R</b>			
<b>Wetland Mitigation Monitoring</b>			
<b>Individual Scoring Matrix</b>			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Ability to Perform the Services, Provision of Services will be scored using the point structure below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be evaluated on pass/fail.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Tetra Tech</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 739.7</b>
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>			
	<b>250</b>		
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	141	This is just a cut and paste of the SOS with little details of how the work is going to be completed.
Computer Systems and Software	25	21	No mention of computer software used by firm. Simply indicates that they have software compatible with MDT. Little specifics or details.
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	18	There is no mention of MDT invoices, progress reports, schedules, and who is the project specialist for Tetra Tech as it is not mentioned.?
<b>Provision of Services</b>			
	<b>200</b>		
Methods/Work Plan	150	92	Very brief section with little details on the work plan and/or how the work is to be completed.
Timeline	50	23	Did not meet the requirements for the company to provide a timeline for completing the work. Standard timeframe directly from RFP, did not explain in details or define a schedule.
<b>References</b>			
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail	<b>PASS</b>	
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
	<b>350</b>		
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	58	Very little details with little substance about the related project experience.
Staff Experience	150	105	Experience for wetland delineations is there but little monitoring experience.
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	60	These projects provided limited experience to provide the services under this contract. If this were contract for developing MDT mitigation sites they would be in the running. However, that is not this RFP.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
	<b>200</b>	<b>171.7</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</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		<b>739.7</b>	

MDT-RFP-2025-1944R			
Wetland Mitigation Monitoring			
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 Ability to Perform the Services, Provision of Services will be scored using the point structure below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be evaluated on pass/fail.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: WESTECH Environmental Services</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 733.9</b>
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>	<b>250</b>		
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	143	Mentions that many of staff have advanced hydric soils training but nothing on resumes. Did not follow Scope of Services with no details on their technical expertise . No details on experience. Feels like this SOS is for as feasibility study rather than for a monitoring contract.
Computer Systems and Software	25	25	Appear to be well versed in computer operating systems such as AutoCAD, ArcGISPro, HEC-RAS, modeling, mapping and reporting.
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	14	No real discussions on MDT standards and guidelines. Very brief and insufficient response to provide details
<b>Provision of Services</b>	<b>200</b>		
Methods/Work Plan	150	100	Some concerns as WESTECH went off on a tangent indicating more or less that they were going to provide a list of services for things other than the wetland monitoring called for in the RFP. Aquatic Resources Findings report for avoidance, minimization and debit/credit calculations and mitigation - not asked for in this RFP? Permit application preparation - No permits necessary for this project. identifying potential environmental mitigation needs, feasibility and monitoring? Also indicated DRAFT mitigation Plan preparation, monitoring and performance standards? This proposal would have been appropriate if we were looking for a contractor to conduct feasibility through design of potential wetland mitigation sites. missed the details needed for this RFP. Project list was not included as identified in this section.
Timeline	50	13	No specific time frames or details as they refer to this monitoring contract.
<b>References</b>			
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail	Pass	
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>	<b>350</b>		
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	65	Brief write up with little details about how it related to the monitoring RFP. Projects referenced were all pre-project before monitoring occurred
Staff Experience	150	85	No discussion on qualifications but should have a summary of the staff resumes. Writeup is supposed to be a summary of the staff experience referencing the resumes.
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	65	Brief write up with little details about how it related to the monitoring RFP. Two of the projects referenced were all pre-project before monitoring occurred with only the Prickly Pear Creek being constructed.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>173.9</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</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			733.9



<b>MDT-RFP-2025-1944R</b>			
<b>Wetland Mitigation Monitoring</b>			
<b>Individual Scoring Matrix</b>			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Ability to Perform the Services, Provision of Services will be scored using the point structure below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria. References will be evaluated on pass/fail.			
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Water and Environmental</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 730</b>
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Ability to Perform Scope of Services</b>			
	<b>250</b>		
Knowledge of Scope of Services	200	147	Brief write up with very little detail could have used more information to bolster this category. Felt their RFP was not of par with what was requested. Indicates knowledge and experience of wetland monitoring and protocols, but does not reference any projects where they have completed such actions. Most experience seems to be in monitoring wildlife, and GIS spatial data and mapping products. Average at 147 score
Computer Systems and Software	25	25	Appear to be well versed in computer operating systems such as AutoCAD, ArcGISPro, HEC-RAS, modeling, mapping and reporting. Ecobot will be utilized for Data forms.
MDT Standards and Guidelines	25	17	No mention of MDT Specification, reports, invoices, etc. Looks
<b>Provision of Services</b>			
	<b>200</b>		
Methods/Work Plan	150	98	No mention of MDT and Kickoff meeting, not a clear work plan, generic responses, di not explain how they were going to do or how they were going to complete it.
Timeline	50	25	Indicated that they are fully prepared to meet all project schedules and timelines, but did not include any of the dates outlined in the proposal. Ie. October 15th, February 15th or March 1st. Unclear as to whether or not they understand the deadlines and they didn't include staff time availability and percentages.
<b>References</b>			
Complete contact information provided	Pass/Fail	<b>Pass</b>	Lacking information as they did not include dates within the last 5 years for the references.
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
	<b>350</b>		
Firm's Previous Related Project Experience	100	72	Hit on some of the SOS tasks, but not all and did not provide details on techniques they use. Lacks specifics and focuses on generalities. Did not provide any actual monitoring experiences and no dates for the references provided.
Staff Experience	150	117	Experience is limited and insufficient for this kinds of work.
Firm's Relevant Past Projects in Last 5 Years	100	70	Does not mention anything about the MWAM, most of the relevant projects was specifically for pre-construction and design. Relevant work some of the projects mentioned were still in design and/or incomplete. No monitoring projects.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
	<b>200</b>	<b>109</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
	<b>50</b>	<b>50.0</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		730.0	

**MDT-RFP-2025-1944R**  
**Wetland Mitigation Monitoring**  
**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.

**MDT-RFP-2025-1944R  
Wetland Mitigation Monitoring**

**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>		
<b>Lowest Cost</b>	142,763.36		
<b>Vendor Name</b>	<b>Proposed Cost</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Notes:</b>
Confluence	171,186.53	166.8	
RE/SPEC	142,763.53	200.0	
DJ&A	173,548.00	164.5	
Morrison	306,297.00	93.2	
Tetra Tech	166,270.00	171.7	
WESTECH	164,210.00	173.9	
Water & Environmental	262,000.00	109.0	
Vendor # 8		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 9		#DIV/0!	
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
<b>Superior (95-100%)</b>	940 - 1000
<b>Good (75-94%)</b>	740 - 940
<b>Fair (60-74%)</b>	590 - 740
<b>Failed (0-59%)</b>	0 - 590

## Technical Scoring Session

MDT-RFP-2025-1944R

Wetland Mitigation Monitoring

April 24 and April 25, 2025

Day One-1:00-4:30

Day Two-9:00-12:00 Noon

Meeting held by virtual Teams

Evaluation Committee Members:

Bill Semmens, Larry Sickerson, Larry  
Urban

Contracts Officer: Rhonda Peters

Order of Evaluation: Alphabetical

Scoring Method: Consensus, Average