

State of Maine
RFP / Proposal Master Score Sheet

Instructions: Complete the Master Score Sheet below providing all of the requested information for each bidder that submitted a proposal in response to the RFP. This document is to be included in the Selection Package submitted to the Division of Procurement Services for review/approval.

SCORESHEET FOR RFP# 201810212: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal									
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		7 Lakes Alliance		Balch Lake Improvement Assoc.		Collin's Pond Improvement Association		Community Lakes Association	
COST:		Cost:	40,000	Cost:	13,000	Cost:	31,622	Cost:	19400
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	22		16		20		20	
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	20		16		14		16	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	10		10		8		8	
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	10		8		9		10	
Section V: Track record	20	17		16		20		17	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	11		13		12		13	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>90</u>		<u>79</u>		<u>83</u>		<u>84</u>	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Friends of The Cobbossee Watershed (Annabessacook Lake)		Friends of The Cobbossee Watershed (Cobbossee Lake)		Friends of The Cobbossee Watershed (Pleasant and Horseshoe Ponds)		Friends of Messolonskee Lake	
COST:		Cost:	26,000	Cost:	10,000	Cost:	30,000	Cost:	36,168
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	21		20		20		18	
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	20		20		18		15	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	10		10		10		10	
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	10		10		10		8	
Section V: Track record	20	20		20		20		14	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	15		13		15		11	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>96</u>		<u>93</u>		<u>93</u>		<u>76</u>	

State of Maine
RFP / Proposal Master Score Sheet

Instructions: Complete the Master Score Sheet below providing all of the requested information for each bidder that submitted a proposal in response to the RFP. This document is to be included in the Selection Package submitted to the Division of Procurement Services for review/approval.

SCORESHEET FOR RFP# 201810212 : Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal									
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Lake Environmental Association- Long Lake		Lake Environmental Association - Sebago Cove		Lake Environmental Association - Sebago Lake		Lake Environmental Association – Songo /Brandy Pond	
COST:		Cost:	\$16,000	Cost:	\$14,764	Cost:	\$8,967	Cost:	\$22,440
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	23		23		22		20	
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	18		17		16		13	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	10		10		10		10	
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	10		8		8		8	
Section V: Track record	20	20		20		20		20	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	12		12		12		12	
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>93</u>		<u>85</u>		<u>88</u>		<u>83</u>	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee		Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council		Little Sebago lake Association		Mid Coast Conservancy	
COST:		Cost:	\$6720	Cost:	\$30,000	Cost:	\$10,000	Cost:	\$2090
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	24		21		22		18	
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	14		20		20		13	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	8		10		10		10	
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	10		8		10		10	
Section V: Track record	20	15		21		20		15	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	14		14		15		11	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>85</u>		<u>94</u>		<u>97</u>		<u>77</u>	

State of Maine
RFP / Proposal Master Score Sheet

Instructions: Complete the Master Score Sheet below providing all of the requested information for each bidder that submitted a proposal in response to the RFP. This document is to be included in the Selection Package submitted to the Division of Procurement Services for review/approval.

SCORESHEET FOR RFP# 201810212 Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal									
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Raymond Waterways Protective Association		Thompson lake Association		Hogan and Whitney Pond Association		Town of Porter Conservation Commission	
COST:		Cost:	\$12,500	Cost:	\$20,000	Cost:	\$9,880	Cost:	1,711
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	22		17		23		19	
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	16		20		12		11	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	10		10		8		7	
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	8		8		10		8	
Section V: Track record	20	17		15		18		13	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	10		11		13		10	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>83</u>		<u>81</u>		<u>84</u>		<u>68</u>	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		West Pond Association		Jordan River Marina and Condo Association					
COST:		Cost:	11,500	Cost:	\$10,752	Cost:			
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	24		18					
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	20		11					
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	8		8					
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	10		8					
Section V: Track record	20	20		17					
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	15		11					
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>97</u>		<u>73</u>					



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Sharon Mann
7 Lakes Alliance
P.O. Box 250
Belgrade Lakes, ME. 04918

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$28,572.00** to the following bidder:

7 Lakes Alliance

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Susan Jackman
Balch Lake Improvement Association
PO Box 0494
East Wakefield, NH 03830

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$9,498.00** to the following bidder:

Balch Lake Improvement Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

March 6, 2019

Donald Porter
Community Lakes Association
PO Box 91
Bryant Pond, ME. 04219

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$10,891.00** to the following bidder:

Community Lakes Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,


Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD O. REID
COMMISSIONER

Rodger Patterson
Collins Pond Improvement Association
92 Emerson Drive
Windham, ME 04062

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$17,869.00** to the following bidder:

Collins Pond Improvement Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Toni Pied
Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed
PO Box 5003
Augusta, ME. 04332-5003

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$21,371.00** to the following bidder:

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed, Annabessacook Lake

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Toni Pied
Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed
PO Box 5003
Augusta, ME. 04332-5003

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$7,798.00** to the following bidder:

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed, Cobbossee Lake

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Toni Pied
Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed
PO Box 5003
Augusta, ME. 04332-5003

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$19,572.00** to the following bidder:

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed, Pleasant Pond/Cobbossee Stream

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REIO
COMMISSIONER

Rachel Whitney
Friends of Messalonskee
P.O. Box 532
Oakland, ME. 04963

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$21,506.00 to the following bidder:

Friends of the Messalonskee

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

March 6, 2019

Richard Auren
Hogan and Whitney Pond Association
296 Bacon Street
Waltham, MA. 02451

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$6,690.00** to the following bidder:

Hogan and Whitney Pond Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

March 6, 2019

Kevin Wood
Jordan River Marina Condo Association
PO Box 720
Raymond, ME. 04071

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$6,400.00** to the following bidder:

Jordan River Marina Condo Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Dave Sanfason
Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council
206 Old Portland Rd
North Waterboro, ME. 04061

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$19,572.00** to the following bidder:

Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Colin Holme
Environmental Association
230 Main Street
Bridgton, ME. 04009

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$9,771.00** to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Long Lake

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,


Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

March 6, 2019

Colin Holme
Environmental Association
230 Main Street
Bridgton, ME. 04009

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$11,089.00 to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Cove

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

March 6, 2019

Colin Holme
Environmental Association
230 Main Street
Bridgton, ME. 04009

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$5,869.00** to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Lake

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette

17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Colin Holme
Environmental Association
230 Main Street
Bridgton, ME. 04009

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$13,323.00** to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Brandy, Songo River & Bayou

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,


Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Diane Caracciolo
Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee
P.O. Box 125
Lovell, ME 04016

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$3,846.00** to the following bidder:

Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Pam Wilkinson
Little Sebago Lake Association
P.O. Box 912
Windham, ME 04602

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$7,798.00 to the following bidder:

Little Sebago Lake Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

March 6, 2019

Addie Halligan
Midcoast Conservancy
P.O. Box 439
Edgecomb, ME. 04556

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$1881.00** to the following bidder:

Mid Coast Conservancy

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Martha Tracy
Town of Porter Conservation Commission
71 Main Street
Porter, ME. 04068

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$1,369.00 to the following bidder:

Town of Porter Conservation Commision

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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.; S M.R.S. § 1825-B

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Neil Jenson
Raymond Waterways Protective Association
PO Box 1243
Raymond, ME. 04071

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$9,048.00** to the following bidder:

Raymond Waterways Protective Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,


Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

March 6, 2019

Alex Bernardy
Thompson Lake Environmental Association
P.O. Box 25
Oxford, ME 04270

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$11,371.00** to the following bidder:

Thompson Lake Environmental Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Dennis Spinney
West Pond Association
26 Tippy Lane
Eliot, ME. 03903

March 6, 2019

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive grant for the removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$9,298.00** to the following bidder:

West Pond Association

Grant applications were reviewed and scored on a competitive basis as outlined in the RFP. Your final grant awarded depended upon the amount of funds requested, DEP staff determination of application score, eligibility of activities and funds available. Eligible activities must relate directly to manual plant control.

The Department will be contacting you soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, 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 RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP 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

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.

Sincerely,

Denise Blanchette
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
denise.l.blanchette@maine.gov

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: 7 Lakes Alliance
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)	22	
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)	20	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section V: Track record (Max: 20 Points)	17	
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	11	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)		90

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	10
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = yes 8 = no with explanation 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	6
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	5
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Arrowhead
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	21
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	21
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	14
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	94

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Arrowhead
DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Arrowhead

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	10
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	6
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Arrowhead

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	8
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)	16	
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)	16	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section V: Track record (Max: 20 Points)	16	
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	13	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)		79

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	3
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	4
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	6
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = yes 8 = no with explanation 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	6
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	5
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Community Lakes Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	20
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	16
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	17
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	13
TOTAL POINTS		84
		(Max: 100 Points)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Community Lakes Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	4
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	4
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Community Lakes Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	8
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	8
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	8
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	6
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	5
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Community Lakes Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	20
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	14
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	9
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)	20
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	12
TOTAL POINTS		83

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	8
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	6
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	8
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	9
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Annabessacook
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max:25 Points)	21
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max:10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	15
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	96

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Annabessacook

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	3
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Annabessacook

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	10
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Annabessacook

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	8
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Cobbossee Lake
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	20
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	20
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)	20
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	13
TOTAL POINTS		93

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Cobbossee Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	3
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	4
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	4
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Cobbossee Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	10
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Cobbossee Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Pleasant/Horseshoe
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	20
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	18
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	15
TOTAL POINTS		93
		(Max: 100 Points)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Pleasant/Horseshoe

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	4
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	4
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Pleasant/Horseshoe

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	8
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Pleasant/Horseshoe

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	8
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)	18	
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)	15	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section V: Track record (Max:20 Points)	14	
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	11	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)		76

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	4
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	2
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	4
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	7
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	8
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = yes 8 = no with explanation 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	5
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	4
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Hogan/Whitney Pond Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	23
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	12
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	18
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	13
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	84

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Hogan/Whitney Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Hogan/Whitney Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	6
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	6
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	6
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Hogan/Whitney Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Jordan River Marine Condo Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	18
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	11
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	8
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)	17
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	11
TOTAL POINTS		73

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Jordan River Marine Condo Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	4
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Jordan River Marine Condo Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	5
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	6
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	8
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	6
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	5
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Jordan River Marine Condo Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Long Lake
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	23
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	18
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max:20 Points)	20
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	12
TOTAL POINTS		93
		(Max: 100 Points)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Long Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	4
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Long Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	8
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = yes 8 = no with explanation 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Long Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Cove
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)	18	
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)	17	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section V: Track record (Max: 20 Points)	20	
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	12	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)		85

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Cove

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	3
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	2
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Cove

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	7
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = yes 8 = no with explanation 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Cove

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Lake
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	22
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	16
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	12
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	88

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	4
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	4
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	6
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

<p>monitoring control projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)	20	
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)	13	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section V: Track record (Max: 20 Points)	20	
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	12	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)		83

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	5
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	8
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	24
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	14
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	15
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	14
TOTAL POINTS		85
		(Max: 100 Points)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	4
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	8
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	6
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	8
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	5
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	5
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee

DATE: 2/28/2019

<p>monitoring control projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Little Sebago Lake Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)	22	
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)	20	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section V: Track record (Max:20 Points)	20	
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	15	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	97	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Little Sebago Lake Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	4
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Little Sebago Lake Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	10
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Little Sebago Lake Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	8
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	18
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	13
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	15
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	11
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	77

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy

DATE: 2/28/2019

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	3
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	3
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	4
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	7

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	6
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	5
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	4
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	6
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)	19	
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)	11	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section V: Track record (Max: 20 Points)	13	
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	10	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	68	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission

DATE: 2/28/2019

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	4
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	4
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	3
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	5
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	6
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	7
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	5
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	4
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects 	4

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	5
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection

NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	22
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max:20 Points)	16
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max:10 Points)	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	17
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	10
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	83

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	2
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	6

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	6
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	5
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	6
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	5
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection

NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
<p>◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)</p>		
◆		
◆		
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	17
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	15
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	11
TOTAL POINTS		
	(Max: 100 Points)	81

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	3
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	3
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	4
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	4
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	10

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	10
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	5
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	4
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	6
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection

NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

BIDDER Withdrew Consideration for Funding

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
<p>◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)</p>		
◆		
◆		
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope (Max: 25 Points)		
Section II. Local Support and Funding (Max: 20 Points)		
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program (Max: 10 Points)		
Section IV: Plant Survey (Max: 10 Points)		
Section V: Track record (Max: 20 Points)		
Section VI: Training and Experience (Max: 15 Points)		
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER: West Pond Association
DATE: 2/28/2019

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is **not** meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Department of Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John McPhedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any . This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		
◆		
◆		
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	24
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	10
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	20
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	15
TOTAL POINTS		
	(Max: 100 Points)	97

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: West Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: West Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<p>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	5
<p>Which priority does the project meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	4
<p>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map • 3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map • 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions. 	5
<p>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project. • 3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done. • 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	5
<p>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. • 3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. • 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	10

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: West Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. • 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. • 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
<p>Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds • 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds • 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds • 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	10
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No 	8
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey 	10
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. • 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	7
<p>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. • 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
<p>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and monitoring control projects • 4 =Has moderate experience • 0 =Has no experience. 	7
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: West Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	8
<p>Does the project team have additional training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods • 5 = The team has some additional training • 0 = The team has no additional training. 	7



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Gerald D. Reid
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive grants program for invasive aquatic plant removal

I, Denise Blanchette accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. 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 that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner. 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 funding decision notices for public distribution.

Denise Blanchette
Signature

2/15/19
Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Gerald D. Reid
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive grants program for invasive aquatic plant removal

I, John McPhedran accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. 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 that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner. 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 funding decision notices for public distribution.

John McPhedran
Signature

February 25, 2019
Date