

**State of Maine
Master Score Sheet**

RFA# 202303052

Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Bidder Name:		Belgrade	Coastal Maine Botanical Garden	Morrill	Orono	Plymouth	Pownal	Smith- field	Tremont	Veazie
Proposed Cost:		\$27,330	\$22,075	\$14,325	\$7,734	\$7,750	\$16,000	\$3,048	\$5,500	\$10,790
Scoring Sections	Points Available									
Section I: Eligibility	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Section II: Budget	25	22	22	22	23	15	16	10	23	5
Section III: Goals and Timeline	25	20	22	16	23	16	15	10	10	15
Section IV: Impact	20	10	18	17	18	14	15	8	15	12
Section V: Community Engagement	15	7	12	13	15	6	15	0	10	0
Section VI: Integrated Pest Management	10	0	8	8	9	7	8	1	5	7
Section VII: Coordinator	5	2	3	5	5	2	2	3	4	5
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>44</u>

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service



Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Jesse Dunbar, Tremont Town Manager 20 Harbor Drive Bass Harbor ME 04653
manager@Tremont.maine.gov

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Jesse:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any

time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service



Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Beckie Drew, Veazie Town Manager 1084 Main Street Veazie ME, 04401, bdrew@veazie.net

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Beckie:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service

Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Lorna Dee Nichols, Belgrade Town Manager, 990 Augusta Road, Belgrade ME 04917,
townmanager@townofbelgrade.com

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Lorna:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service



Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Garth Welch, IPM Specialist, Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens, 105 Botanical Gardens Drive Boothbay ME 04537, gwelch@mainegardens.org

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Garth:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any

time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service

Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Randy Place, Selectman, Town of Morrill, 44 Weymouth Road, Morrill ME 04952,
slectman@morrillme.org

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Randy:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service

Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Megan Hess, Environmental Services Coordinator, Town of Orono, 59 Main Street, Orono, ME 04473,
ryerxa@orono.org

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Megan:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service

Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Linda Seavey, 1947 Moosehead Trail, Plymouth, ME 04969, plymouth@midmaine.com

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Linda:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service

Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Nichole Clark, Administrator, 926 Village Road, Smithfield, ME 04978, townoffice@smithfieldmaine.us

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Nichole:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
Maine Forest Service

Janet T. Mills
Governor

June 13, 2023

Becky Taylor Chase, Town Administrator, 429 Hallowell Road Pownal, ME 04069,
administrator@pownalmaine.org

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards under RFA# 202303052, Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

Dear Becky:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry for Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders:

- Town of Belgrade
- Town of Morrill
- Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens
- Town of Orono
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Pownal
- Town of Smithfield
- Town of Tremont
- Town of Veazie

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tom Schmeelk", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Schmeelk
RFA Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
168 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0168
Email: Thomas.Schmeelk@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

SUMMARY PAGE: BELGRADE

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	22
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	20
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	10
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	7
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	0
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	2
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>61</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments:

Eligible (government entity, within identified area)

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	22

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Fairly thorough budget narrative and breakdown of costs.
- Did not address any costs in distributing information (if any?)
- In attached quotes inconsistency in identification of targets

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	20

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Eradication states as a goal, and is unrealistic
- Timeline is an issue (the funding award timing is not compatible with objectives of alleviating browntail impact in spring 2023)
- Package lays out target areas, which is appreciated
-

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	10

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Timing is a potential issue. The funding award timing is not compatible with objectives of alleviating browntail impact in spring 2023.
- Concern whether targeting appropriate life stages to mitigate impact
- Have unrealistic expectation of outcome (100% eradication)

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	7

Evaluation Team Comments:

Team will develop and distribute a trifold brochure

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	0

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Not clear if IPM considerations informed selection of trees to be treated
- Blanket statement that will treat within 30 days of award; will not be an appropriate time to treat from an IPM standpoint, or from a standpoint of getting significant value from the investment.
- Mention of treatment of moths is concerning (is the adult being targeted for treatment? That is not an IPM practice).

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Identification of Team

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	2

Evaluation Team Comments:

Team is clearly identified; qualifications are not listed; license of contractor is attached.

SUMMARY PAGE: CMBG

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	22
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	22
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	18
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	12
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	8
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	3
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>85</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments:

Non profit; work to be conducted within the area identified by the Division

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II
Budget**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	22

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Budget broken out and described in detail for the most part
- Would have liked to see more information in costs of signage
- Removal of dead branches may not be strictly browntail mitigation (area with heavy impact from other pests, drought...); but since not a restricted activity and may be due to BTM feeding in part, committee decided it was ok.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Goals**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	22

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Timeline as stated is an issue (Deliverables through Oct 24, agreement through June)
- More precise details on timing would have been helpful
- Otherwise seems realistic, well stated

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV
Impact**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	18

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Lack of detail in timeline makes it hard to determine if appropriate actions, but appears would mitigate impact if carried out appropriately.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Community Engagement**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	12

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Specific details, beyond signage, of how community engagement would be fostered
- Stated 120,000 visitors, but nothing re: direct engagement with those visitors (signage)

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Integrated Pest Management**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	8

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Using a variety of approaches, education, monitoring
- More details would be needed to determine if full adherence is creditable

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Coordinators**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	3

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Details on who is on the team provided in part, but clear identification of qualifications lacking for instance an Arborist is listed, but not ID'd.

SUMMARY PAGE: Morrill

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	22
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	16
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	17
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	13
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	8
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	5
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>81</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments: Government entity in eligible area

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	22

Evaluation Team Comments: Budget is well broken out, there are concerns about timing

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	16

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Timing of some activities is either not realistic or ideal
 - Treatment in late summer (identification of webs can be difficult; may end up treating areas that are lower priority once full extent of problem is known)
 - Treatment of eggs (Ovicide) is not a recommended practice
- ID of webs too early for best identification of target areas

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	17

Evaluation Team Comments:

- See prior comments on timing
- Education: reasonable and well developed approach
- Identification of target treatments sites or criteria for where management would happen is missing (hard to determine impact)

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	13

Evaluation Team Comments:

Lacking information on how people would be engaged in events and measurements of success; as mentioned in prior comments, overall good approach.

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	8

Evaluation Team Comments:

-Problems with biology and timing

+Using multiple approaches, working with professionals.

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Coordinators

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	5

Evaluation Team Comments:

Well identified

SUMMARY PAGE: Orono

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	23
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	23
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	18
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	15
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	9
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	5
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>93</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments: Government entity in eligible area

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	23

Evaluation Team Comments:

Thorough budget with good supporting details

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	23

Evaluation Team Comments: Issue with timeline; late-summer may not be able to identify all priority areas

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	18

Evaluation Team Comments: Most appropriate use of controls may not be in place due to timing of treatment (late-summer)

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	15

Evaluation Team Comments: Well outlined impacts/methods, well targeted, communication already in place

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	9

Evaluation Team Comments:

Pros: Data driven, education, monitoring

Con: timing not ideal to prioritize treatments.

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Coordinators

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	5

Evaluation Team Comments: Team well identified; involvement (support) from School IPM coordinator

SUMMARY PAGE: Plymouth

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility		
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	15
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	16
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	14
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	6
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	7
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	2
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>60</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments:

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	15

Evaluation Team Comments: Confusing description and lack of detail

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	16

Evaluation Team Comments:

Timing issue; should target treatment for spring 2024; award timeline not compatible with spring 2023 treatment

Eradication, 100%, not realistic

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	14

Evaluation Team Comments:

Public meeting and content both good to providing impact

Not clear how to get people in meeting

Not clear whether control is targeted to alleviate public impacts

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	6

Evaluation Team Comments: Good have public event planned; but not clear how recruit engagement

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	7

Evaluation Team Comments: Pos: Have a plan and will target sites

Neg: timing of treatment does not align with IPM practices; eradication/100% control is not an IPM goal (or realistic); Stress on appearance questioned.

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Coordinators

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	2

Evaluation Team Comments: More details re Roles, and qualifications could have been provided

SUMMARY PAGE: Pownal

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	16
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	15
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	15
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	15
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	8
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	2
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>71</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments: Municipality in eligible area

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	16

Evaluation Team Comments: Team unclear on \$6000 contract and how that ties to the narrative

Would like to see more details re: incinerator

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Issues with timeline (what is laid out vs. what is biologically appropriate)

Clipping should be earlier

Pesticide application may be better delayed to be able to prioritize areas not visible in summer

Education session with the park is in a month when there is little to do except avoid

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Problematic timeline as outlined prior

Like variety of approaches esp pole pruners; youth engagement; clipping parties

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	15

Evaluation Team Comments:

As outlined prior, seems that this application hits lots of good points for engagement

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	8

Evaluation Team Comments: Timeline is off, needs adjustment, otherwise many approaches (integrated) and well addressed.

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Coordinators

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	2

Evaluation Team Comments:

More details on how the team is managed/ what roles are

SUMMARY PAGE: Smithfield

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	10
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	10
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	8
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	0
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	1
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	3
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>32</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments: Municipality in eligible area

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	10

Evaluation Team Comments: Different number on cover and budget page, hard to figure out what they are asking for and what in the attached quotes would be included

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	10

Evaluation Team Comments:

Kill all, 100 Percent eradication, not a realistic goal (a sales pitch from prospective contractor?)

Timeline based on grant award with no regard for whether it is appropriate biologically.

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	8

Evaluation Team Comments: Cemetery heavy and no indication why. Are there other public spaces? Are these regularly used by public? Not enough details to understand approach

Timing issue as outlined previously

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	0

Evaluation Team Comments:

Nothing indicated

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	1

Evaluation Team Comments:

Kill all, 100 Percent eradication, not a realistic goal (a sales pitch from prospective contractor?)

Timeline based on grant award with no regard for whether it is appropriate biologically.

Only pesticides considered

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Coordinators

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	3

Evaluation Team Comments:

Team identified by name, lacked further detail

SUMMARY PAGE: Tremont

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	23
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	10
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	15
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	10
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	5
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	4
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>67</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments: Municipality in eligible area

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	23

Evaluation Team Comments:

Details are in there. More detail on the contracted amount would have been helpful

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	10

Evaluation Team Comments: Not very clearly stated timeline, more details would improve rating in all sections.

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Timeline details missing but hits three targets (mitigate town property; support resident management, education)

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	10

Evaluation Team Comments:

Providing mailers to residents and funding to residents

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	5

Evaluation Team Comments:

Timeline missing, hard to evaluate because of details that are lacking

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Coordinator

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	4

Evaluation Team Comments:

Could use additional details re roles (e.g. harbormaster)

SUMMARY PAGE: Veazie

Department Name: Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry

Name of RFA Coordinator: Tom Schmeelk

Names of Evaluators: Tom Schmeelk, Hillary Peterson, Marleen LaJoie, Brittany Schappach

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Eligibility	X	
•		
•		
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	5
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	15
Section IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	12
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	0
Section VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	7
Section VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	5
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>44</u>

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I

Preliminary Information

Section I. Eligibility

Evaluation Team Comments: Municipality within eligible area

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Budget

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. A complete and itemized budget that is clear and realistic.	25	5

Evaluation Team Comments: Details are missing from the budget section

EVALUATION OF SECTION III

Goals

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Realistic, clearly stated project goals, objectives timeline, and deliverables (quantifiable when possible).	25	15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Timeline details-not a great time for identification of populations that would be problematic in spring 24, and therefore for treatments.

Goals realistic, hit the minimum requirements

EVALUATION OF SECTION IV

Impact

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec IV. Evidence that the proposed project will provide an impact regarding browntail moth exposure mitigation through appropriate use of physical controls, pesticide treatments, cultural controls, education, or a combination of the former.	20	12

Evaluation Team Comments:

Timeline issue, but benefits stated and clear

EVALUATION OF SECTION V

Community Engagement

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Demonstration that the project will foster additional community engagement in browntail moth mitigation.	15	0

Evaluation Team Comments:

Opportunity is there, since the applications would be at the school, but not addressed at all in the application

EVALUATION OF SECTION VI

Integrated Pest Management

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VI. Adherence to the principles of integrated pest management .	10	7

Evaluation Team Comments:

Monitor, prune, treat all part of approach, IPM coordinator part of team, timing is an issue

EVALUATION OF SECTION VII

Coordinators

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Sec VII. Clear identification of who will coordinate the work, their qualifications, and the qualifications of those who will conduct work where applicable.	5	5

Evaluation Team Comments:

Key team members for school property involved, underlying high score

Individual Notes

STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Belgrade

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: short and detail lacking overview

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: implants different from injections?

Activities: in the contract it mentions 228 trees, all hosts?

Project Timeline: “within 30 days” life cycle considerations

Expected outcomes: Confusion w/ lifestages and treatment

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative: Thorough break down and narrative, liked pamphlet idea

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Belgrade
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Activities/Project timeline
 - 2 season chemicals cannot be applied within 30 days of grant award; injections/implants would ideally need to be applied in early spring so that products will be effective at killing early instars (before they become late instars or moths). Most irritation and defoliation would happen already by the time award money is disbursed.
- Expected outcomes
 - 100% eradication of browntail would be wonderful, but it is not possible.
 - Moths are very strong fliers and may be brought into the town via wind, hitchhiking etc.
- Chemical treatments
 - Are these areas where treatments occurring in high traffic areas?
 - Acct #797.12 missing chemical used

RFP #: 202303052
RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant
BIDDER NAME: Belgrade
DATE: 5/21/23
EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: Good though treatment timeline not appropriate

Activities: community engagement and education good with preparing an informational brochure for residents, using licensed professionals is good

Project Timeline: timeline not in line with how to effectively treat/control browntail moth, some activities should be in winter/early spring, misunderstanding of lifecycle

Expected outcomes: timeline of activities not realistic with proper treatment, educational brochure is good, good public areas mentioned

Project Team: licensed operator provided, team listed but qualification of team members was not provided

Budget & Narrative: Good narrative, more could have been explained on the contracted services

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Belgrade

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: No discussion of education efforts beyond an educational brochure, want to kill moths – not a life stage to target, 228 trees to inject – want to ensure only injections on host trees, not all chemicals included (missing on one page from contracted company)

Project Timeline: Within 30 days of having the award, does not take life cycle into account.

Expected outcomes:

Want to 100% eradicate BTM – not a realistic goal

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative:

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: CMBG

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: Thorough and detailed, IPM oriented w/ signage good

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: very realistic goals

Activities:

Project Timeline: Sound timeline, October 2024 will be too late for funding period

Expected outcomes: clearly stated outcomes

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative:

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202303052

RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT

BIDDER NAME: Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens

DATE: 5/19/2023

EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Overview of project
 - Question for RFA Coordinator – bidder requests pruning dead branches from BTM defoliation when these trees likely died from other causes (BTM contributed to stress, not tree death itself) ... do we mind that funds would be used for this?
- Activities
 - Define ISA assessment and threshold for management interventions
- Expected outcomes
 - Draft of guest and staff surveys that measure BTM reduction
- Budget
 - Materials
 - Associated fees/licenses for aerial lift usage?
 - Is web removal in larger/taller trees the appropriate management strategy or will tree injections be considered?
 - Educational materials
 - What materials will be produced?

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Coastal Maine Botanical Garden DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: Good, achievable, but could have more details of when certain activities will happen

Activities: community engagement and education is good with so many public visitors Project

Timeline: could have more timeline details for treatment of trees

Expected outcomes: timeline details of activities not included, site heavily used by the public so there could be timing challenges, good opportunity for public education

Project Team: licensed operator provided, team listed

Budget & Narrative: Good budget details, narrative could use more details on timeline and education

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Coastal Maine Botanical Gardens

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: Excellent application will reach a lot of people.

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals:

Activities: Mechanical removal and education to a LOT of people!

Project Timeline:

Expected outcomes:

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative:

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Morrill

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: ovide treatments of btm are not a thing, good use of education

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: Sept treatment?? Ovide?? Understanding of lifecycle. Good outreach

Activities:

Project Timeline: oct too early for viewing webs

Expected outcomes:

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative:

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Morrill
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Project goals
 - I'm not sure I agree with the timing of the injection sprays in August – treatments done in early Spring that are effective by late May are ideal for targeting BTM and are most appropriate for trees
 - Include quotes from contractor including pesticide product that will be used
 - Would be nice to see trees in high-traffic areas that will be treated

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Town of Morrill

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: Good details, but timeline of activities not appropriate, flyer distribution good, many community locations, good details on public education

Activities: education well planned, should have more details on how to evaluate events,

Project Timeline: education activities well planned with community meetings and flyers posted at several town buildings, good plan to treat heavily used public areas, timeline not appropriate though it mentions they will follow recommendations of licensed professionals

Expected outcomes: timeline of activities not accurate, good plan for use of professional help, good plan for public education

Project Team: licensed professional identified, team listed

Budget & Narrative: Good budget details, good narrative details

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Morrill

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Pass

Project Goals: September treatment; ovicide does not make sense. Timing not realistic of some activities.

Activities: How do they advertise to actually get people to the events?

Project Timeline: Lack of understanding of the biology (ovicide, timing). Do include multiple methods.

Expected outcomes: Like the education at monthly community event; appropriate timing of treatments off; missing "treat areas with this type of public activity"

Project Team: There is no listed applicator license, but people were also not told to include them.

Budget & Narrative:

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Orono

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: Great overview, very thorough

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals:

Activities: Good use for signage, August injection?

Project Timeline: Good timeline w/ monitoring

Expected outcomes: excellent outcomes

Budget & Narrative: complete and detailed narrative

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Orono
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Love the use of monitoring website to determine highest infestation areas of BTM.
- Budget
 - Include justification for trees receiving both acephate + emamectin benzoate treatments... Is the acephate injection timing in August 2023 aimed to target early instar caterpillars?
 - Acephate is most effective during spring when tree is actively growing and taking up nutrients

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Town of Orono

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: Good, clearly stated details, good education and monitoring, good map provided of infected areas, timing of initial treatment not good

Activities: well planned, good outline of specific trees to treat, good education plan Project Timeline: well planned activities. timeline not appropriate

Expected outcomes: data driven, education through actions, timeline of activities not accurate, good plan for public education

Project Team: licensed professional identified, team listed with details of roles and qualifications

Budget & Narrative: Good narrative, clear budget details

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Orono

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Pass

Project Goals: Data driven; timing slightly off (if you inject in August, you won't know you are injecting the right trees).

Activities: Like that they tag the trees with educational information and will continue programs.

Project Timeline: Some issues with timing.

Expected outcomes:

Project Team: Very detailed!

Budget & Narrative:

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Plymouth

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: Very short overview

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals:

Activities: Approved pesticides

Project Timeline: Too soon for funding, shoot for next spring

Expected outcomes:

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative: ME extension BTM fund???

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Plymouth
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Project timeline
 - Bidder refers to using Mectinite in June 2023 – this timing is not the most effective for treatment of BTM. Spring 2024 when trees can be treated and product effective before late May would be most appropriate.
- Expected outcomes
 - BTM is good at travelling (larval stages can go unnoticed and moths are strong fliers) – 100% eradication is not realistic
- Budget
 - Contract
 - Would like to see quotes from contractor and locations of trees to be treated
 - Other
 - I'm not familiar with the ME Extension BTM Fund – is this referring to UMO browntail research?

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Town of Plymouth

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: timing not good, unrealistic goals, not accurate in removing browntail moth, good education plan with town meeting to inform the public

Activities: good target of sites, not enough details of advertisements for public meetings, timing not good

Project Timeline: well planned activities. timeline not appropriate

Expected outcomes: data driven, education through actions, timeline of activities not accurate, good plan for public education

Project Team: licensed professional identified, team listed with details of roles and qualifications

Budget & Narrative: some confusion, no supporting budget details

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Plymouth

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Pass

Project Goals: 100% eradication; unrealistic goals; target date is incorrect; primary concern is human health. Project is bare minimum without any exceptional goals.

Activities: They don't say how they will get people to the public meeting. Missing understanding of biology and how treatments are expected to work.

Project Timeline:

Expected outcomes:

Budget & Narrative: Unsure about the donation to extension, the way it was written was somewhat unclear with grammatical errors; no supporting documents.

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Pownal

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals:

Activities: Good use of education + partnership w/ Bradbury, should record ed workshops

Project Timeline: Clipping parties should be completed by April not May, Sept application seems strange, education should not occur in June, understanding of lifecycle?

Expected outcomes: Interesting metrics

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative: Good use for pole pruners, narrative doesn't describe costs

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Pownal
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Project goals
 - I'm not sure I agree with the timing of the injection sprays in September – treatments done in early Spring that are effective by late May are ideal for targeting BTM and are most appropriate for trees
 - Include quotes from contractor including pesticide product that will be used
 - Would be nice to see trees in high-traffic areas that will be treated
 - Winter web clipping parties need to be done before caterpillars emerge in March/April. May will be too late to clip webs.
- Budget
 - Love the idea of purchasing pruning poles to be lent out to the public and coloring pages for children to identify BTM.
 - Very cool idea to have funds available for reimbursement to homeowners
 - Will there be requirements or limitations for homeowners (e.g. # of trees treated, #webs removed, companies recruited for services?), or set \$ amounts per individual who submits a reimbursement request?

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Town of Pownal

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: timing not good, not accurate in removing browntail moth, good education plan good partnership with Bradbury State Park, local school, and other local agencies

Activities: not enough details on activities, timing not good

Project Timeline: activities and approaches good, timeline not appropriate

Expected outcomes: timeline of activities not accurate, good plan for public education

Project Team: agencies listed, no details on specific people and roles

Budget & Narrative: some confusion, could be more clear, good purchase of prune poles and coloring pages

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Pownal

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Pass

Project Goals:

Activities: Excellent plans here for community engagement including adults and kids. Like the coloring pages and pruning poles.

Project Timeline: Timeline of clipping and application are off. Interesting metrics (where do these percentages come from?). If they can't identify the life cycle, how will 75% of kids??

Expected outcomes:

Budget & Narrative: Some areas lack clarity.

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Smithfield

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: Somewhat lofty goals

Activities: Heavy focus on cemeteries, impact?

Project Timeline: No clear timeline or regard for lifecycle

Expected outcomes:

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative: No budget breakdown

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Smithfield
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Project timeline
 - I do not agree with this project timeline to treat trees within 2 days of approval of grant funding
 - Treatments done in early Spring that are effective by late May are ideal for targeting BTM and are most appropriate for trees
- Expected outcomes
 - 100% eradication of BTM caterpillars is not realistic – BTM caterpillars are great at traveling to new areas and adult moths are very strong fliers.
 - Mosquito Banditos contracted applicator only has 7A and 7E categories – not 3A

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Town of Smithfield

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: good, no clear timeline for activities, not accurate in removing browntail moth, no education plan

Activities: not clear with activity details, timing not clear

Project Timeline: activities and approaches not clear, timeline not appropriate

Expected outcomes: timeline of activities not clear or understood, no plan for public education

Project Team: licensed professional listed, team listed, more details on specific roles of team members

Budget & Narrative: some confusion, conflicting numbers on 1st page and budget information

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Smithfield

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: Kill all BTM is not realistic. Cemeteries might not be the most useful area to protect public health (although the town might know that folks go there as a park). Life cycle not considered.

Eligible: Pass – if budget is fixed.

Project Goals: Goals are too lofty (kill all BTM), timeline is not realistic.

Activities:

Project Timeline:

Expected outcomes:

Budget & Narrative: Budget is incomplete.

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Tremont

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: Not much detail overall, Reimbursement to landowners is acceptable

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals:

Activities: Very short description

Project Timeline: Not clear

Expected outcomes: Good section including education but how will they accomplish?

Project Team:

Budget & Narrative:

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Tremont
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Missing copy of non-profit status/business license in submission documents
- Very cool idea to have funds available for reimbursement to homeowners
 - Will there be requirements or limitations for homeowners (e.g. # of trees treated, #webs removed, companies recruited for services?), or set \$ amounts per individual who submits a reimbursement request?
- Educational materials
 - What will be provided to the public – brochures? Flyers?
 - How will it be provided – via mail? Advertised downtown or in public areas?
- Budget
 - Materials
 - Would like to see a more fleshed out budget to include what supplies/equipment are going to be purchased and descriptions of how they will aid BTM mitigation
 - Labor
 - Do public works employees hold the correct pesticide applicator licenses?

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Town of Tremont

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: education part good, no timeline for activities, not enough details on what will be achieved or how, project addresses community areas

Activities: timing of activities not clear, not clear with activity details or how residents get support and what residential reimbursements can be included

Project Timeline: no detailed timeline, activities and approaches not clear

Expected outcomes: timeline of activities not clear or understood, mailers for public education

Project Team: team listed with roles

Budget & Narrative: simple, straightforward

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Tremont

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Pass

Project Goals: Unsure how they will actually do the education.

Activities: Reimbursement program is nice to see, mailers, this will encourage people to look.

Project Timeline: Missing a lot of details.

Expected outcomes:

Budget & Narrative: Simple, but all there.

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Veazie

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Schmeelk

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview: Dimethyl Acetyl Phosphomidothicate?

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: Attainable and clear goals

Activities: Good to have IPM plan included

Project Timeline: Fall application window not optimal

Expected outcomes:

Budget & Narrative: No breakdown or descriptive narrative.

RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: BROWNTAIL MOTH MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT
BIDDER NAME: Town of Veazie
DATE: 5/19/2023
EVALUATOR NAME: Brittany Schappach
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Eligibility
 - Missing non-profit documents
- Budget
 - Treatment areas seem very reasonable... would like to see tree injection quotes from "Ground Renovators"
 - Is this contractor also responsible for winter web removal?
 - If not, labor costs/arborist contract needs to be added to budget costs

RFP #: 202303052

RFP TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant

BIDDER NAME: Town of Veazie

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Marleen Lajoie

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Yes

Project Goals: timeline for activities not good, good plan for how trees will be treated, project addresses school community but no public education

Activities: timing of activities not good, activity details or how residents get support

Project Timeline: timeline not good, good activities with trees identified for pruning, injections, and monitoring

Expected outcomes: timeline of activities not good, public education not addressed

Project Team: team listed with specific roles of team members

Budget & Narrative: not itemized or complete, missing details

RFA # 202303052

RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant

BIDDER NAME: Veazie

DATE: 5/21/23

EVALUATOR NAME: Hillary Peterson

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record application review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Applications (RFA) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each application that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFA Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFA.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Overview:

Eligible: Pass

Project Goals: Not doing any education – opportunity is there but not addressed.

Project Timeline: Not detailed and confusing.

Project Team: Gave a good list.

Budget & Narrative: Not itemized.



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA # 202303052
RFA TITLE: Browntail moth mitigation assistance grant.**

I, Hillary Peterson accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Applications (RFA) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted an application to this RFA.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose applications I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any application submitted in response to this RFA nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Applications presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hillary Peterson'.

5/21/2023



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION, AND FORESTRY**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant**

I, Brittany Schappach accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Applications (RFA) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted an application to this RFA.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose applications I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any application submitted in response to this RFA nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Applications presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.



Signature

5/19/2023

Date



Janet T. Mills
Governor

**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION, AND FORESTRY**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant**

I, Thomas Schmeelk accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Applications (RFA) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a application to this RFA.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose applications I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any application submitted in response to this RFA nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Applications presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Tom Schmeelk', written over a horizontal line.

Signature

5/19/2023

Date



Janet T. Mills
Governor

**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSERVATION, AND FORESTRY**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA #: 202303052
RFA TITLE: Browntail Moth Mitigation Assistance Grant**

I, Marleen Lajoie accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signature

Marleen Lajoie

Date:

5-19-23