

Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria
8-digit CU Rating Form

Offeror:	
Site Name:	
River Basin / Catalog Unit:	
RFP Number:	
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 ?	

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> . Select the option that best describes the uplift potential for the majority of the project area.					Check box below if stressor is identified through watershed planning		
							TRA	RWP	LWP
Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-functioning riparian buffer / wetland vegetation	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sediment	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrients	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fecal Coliform	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
Hydrology	<input type="checkbox"/> Peak Flows	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Artificial Barriers	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ditching/Draining	Low	Moderate	High					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/> Habitat Fragmentation	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Bedform Diversity	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Absence of Large Woody Debris	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
Functional and Planning Subtotal	Total Count					Total Count			
	Multiplier	x 1	x 3	x 6	x 10	Multiplier	x 2	x 4	x 6
	Count x Function Multiplier					Count x Planning Multiplier			
	Sum of Function	A				Sum of Planning	B		

Adjusted Risk Factor

Total Stream Feet	Restoration Feet	Enhancement Feet	$\left(\frac{\text{Total Stream Feet}}{\text{Restoration Feet} + \left(\frac{\text{Enhancement Feet}}{2} \right)} \right)$	Risk Adjusted Score (Sum of Function^A X Factor^C)
			c	d

Risk Adjusted Score^D + Planning^B = E **Total Function and Planning**

Section 3. General

	1 point	3 points	6 points	10 points	
What percent of the request does the proposed wetland project provide? (if applicable)	< 25%	25-50%	50-75%	>75%	
What percent of the request does the proposed stream project provide? (if applicable)	< 25%	25-50%	50-75%	>75%	
Physical constraints or barriers	>10%	5-10%	<5%	None	
Easement Continuity	>12	8-12	0-8		
Project Density	>10	8-10	4-8	<4	
Total					F

Section 4. Final Score and Proposal Rating

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

Comments: