

Instructions:

1. **Immediately save this with your new, desired filename.**
2. Fill out all areas highlighted in yellow.
3. Place the letter "x" in appropriate box for multiple choice questions.

Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria

03030005 CU Rating Form

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Offeror: | |
| Site Name: | |
| River Basin / Catalog Unit: | Cape Fear 03030005 |
| RFP Number: | 16-745736968 |
| Date of Site Evaluation: | |
| Type/Amt of Mitigation Offered: | |
| Proposal Review Committee: | |
| Alternate Attendees: | |

Section 1. Minimum Requirements

| | Yes/No or N/A |
|---|------------------|
| 1- For stream mitigation projects, does the Technical Proposal adequately document the historical presence of stream(s) on the project site, provide the drainage areas (acres) and provide accurate, process-based descriptions of all project stream reaches and tributaries? | |
| 2- For proposals that include wetland mitigation, does the technical proposal adequately document the presence of hydric soil indicators (including soil boring logs prepared by a Licensed Soil Scientist and a map showing soil boring locations and mapped soil series)? | |
| 3- For proposals that include wetland mitigation, does the proposed success hydroperiod follow the IRT Guidance for the project site and soil series? If the proposed hydroperiod differs from the IRT guidance, justification must be provided in the RFP. | |
| 4- Does the proposal adequately document the physical, chemical and/or biological impairments that currently exist on the project site? | |
| 5- Does DMS agree with the overall mitigation approach (proposed levels of intervention) presented? [The Technical Proposal must demonstrate that the proposed mitigation activities are appropriate for existing site conditions and watershed characteristics (e.g., adjacent land use/land cover), and are optimized to yield maximum functional gains.] | |
| 6- Does DMS agree with the proposed credit structure(s) described in the proposal? | |
| 7- Does the proposed project avoid significant adverse impacts to existing wetlands and/or streams? | |
| 8- Does the proposal adequately describe how the project will advance DMS watershed planning goals? | |
| 9- For any proposed Priority 2 restoration, is P2 justified and/or limited to "tie-ins"? | |
| An answer of No in this section means the Technical Proposal is rejected. Continue or Reject ? | REJECT |

Section 2. Functional Uplift Evaluation

| Functional Category | Functional Stressor | Functional Uplift Potential | | | | | Planning Identified Stressor | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-----|------|-----------|------------------------------------|--|--------------|-----|
| | Check boxes below to identify stressors addressed by proposal. | Complete this section for identified functional stressors <u>ONLY</u> . Place an X under the option that best describes the uplift potential for the majority of the project area. | | | | | Place an X below if stressor is identified through watershed planning - only count the MOST LOCAL plan. | | |
| | | Low | Mod | High | Very High | | TRA | RWP | LWP |
| Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-functioning riparian buffer / wetland vegetation | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Sediment | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Nutrients | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Fecal Coliform | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | | | | | | | |
| Hydrology | <input type="checkbox"/> Peak Flows | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Artificial Barriers | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Ditching/Draining | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | | | | | | | |
| Habitat | <input type="checkbox"/> Habitat Fragmentation | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Bedform Diversity | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Absence of Large Woody Debris | | | | | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | | | | | | | |
| Functional and Planning Subtotal | Total Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total Count | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Multiplier | x 1 | x 3 | x 6 | x 10 | | x 2 | x 4 | x 6 |
| | Count x Function Multiplier | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Count x Planning Multiplier | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Sum of Function | ^A | | | | | Sum of Planning | ^B | |

Adjusted Risk Factor

Only Applicable if this Box is Checked

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| Total Restoration and Enhancement Feet | Restoration and Enhancement I Feet | Enhancement II Feet | $\left(\frac{\text{Total Restoration} + \text{Total Enhancement Feet}}{\text{Restoration} + \text{E I Feet} + \left(\frac{\text{E II Feet}}{2}\right)} \right)$ | Risk Adjusted Score (Sum of Function ^A X Factor ^C) |
| | | | C | D |
| Risk Adjusted Score ^D + Planning ^B = Total Function and Planning | | | | E |

Section 3. General (place an X in the appropriate box)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|---------|--------|--------|---|
| | 1pt | 3 pts | 6 pts | 10 pts | |
| Physical constraints or barriers | >5% | 2-5% | <2% | None | |
| Project Density | >10 | >8 - 10 | >4 - 8 | </=4 | |
| Total General | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | F |

Section 4. Final Score and Proposal Rating

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Total Function and | E |
| Total General | F |
| Final Score (E + F) | |
| Proposal Rating (Final Score x 0.01) | |