Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria 03020201 Rating Form	
Offeror:	
Site Name:	
River Basin / Catalog Unit:	Neuse 03020201, Outside Falls Lake
RFP Number:	16-416890594
Date of Site Evaluation:	
Type/Amt of Mitigation Offered:	
Proposal Review Committee:	
Alternate Attendees:	

Section 1. Minimum Requirements

	Yes/No or N/A
1- Does DMS agree with the overall mitigation approach presented? [The Technical Proposal must: A) clearly identify the extent of the proposed easement, B) and buffer zones and C) show all stream channels and concentrated flow paths with stream identifications or ditch designations and subject/non-subject designation].	
2- Does DMS agree with the proposed credit structure(s) described in the proposal? [Are all ROWs or utilities/areas not subject to buffer credit due to infrastructure or property rights clearly identified].	
3- Does DMS agree that there is a high likelihood of success for the proposed work given existing onsite conditions? [Is the soil condition appropriate for proposed plantings, what is the existing hydrology, is the existing vegetation likely to present competition for proposed plantings]?	
4- Does the proposal document compliance with all current NC state buffer rule eligibility requirements?	
An answer of No in this section means the Technical Proposal is rejected. Continue or Reject?	

Section 2. Functional Uplift Evaluation

Function	Functional Stressor	Functional Uplift Potential					Planning Identified Stressor		
	Check boxes below to identify stressors addressed by proposal.	Complete this section for identified functional stressors ONLY. 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		
							~~TLW~~ TRA	RWP	LWP
Water Quality	☐ Sediment	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	☐ Nutrients	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	☐ Fecal Coliform	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	☐ Other	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
Hydrology	☐ Peak Flows	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	☐ Non-Diffuse Flow	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	☐ Other	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
Habitat	☐ Lack of Riparian Canopy	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
	☐ Other	Low	Moderate	High	Very High				
Function and Planning Subtotal	Total Count					Total Count			
	Multiplier	x 1	x 3	x 6	X10	Multiplier	x 2	X 4	X 6
	Count x Function Multiplier					Count x Planning Multiplier			
	Sum of Function	A				Sum of Planning	B		
	Total Function[A] and Planning[B] =	C							

Section 3. General

	1 point	3 points	6 points	10 points	
Physical constraints or barriers	>5%	2-5%	<2%	None	
Project Density	>10	>8-10	>4-8	</= 4	
Connectivity to another permanently protected area	NO	N/A	1 area	2+ areas	
Resource drains to 303(d) waters	NO	YES	N/A	N/A	
Invasive/Nuisance Species Treatment Necessary	YES	NO	NO and no seed source	N/A	
Total General					D

Section 4. Final Score and Proposal Rating

Total Function and Planning	C
Total General	D
Final Score (C + D)	
Proposal Rating (Final Score x 0.01	