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

03020106 CU Rating Form

Offeror:	
Site Name:	
River Basin / Catalog Unit:	**White Oak 03020106**
RFP Number:	**16-1546261861**
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 descriptionsof 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 beprovided 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 ONLY. 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		Non-functioning riparian buffer / wetland vegetation								
		Sediment								
		Nutrients								
		Fecal Coliform								
		Other								
Hydrology		Peak Flows								
		Artificial Barriers								
		Ditching/Draining								
		Other								
Habitat		Habitat Fragmentation								
		Limited Bedform Diversity								
		Absence of Large Woody Debris								
		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	$\left(\frac{Total\ Restoration + Total\ Enhancement\ Feet}{Restoration + E\ I\ Feet + \left(\frac{E\ II\ Feet}{2}\right)}\right)$	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)	