#### 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.

PROPOSAL SUBM	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 SUBM	ITTED BY:	Friends of The Cobbossee Watershed (Annabessacook Lake)		Cobbossee Watershed (Annabessacook		Cobbossee Watershed (Annabessacook		Cobbossee Watershed (Annabessacook		Friends of The Cobbossee Watershed (Cobbossee Lake)		Friends of The Cobbossee Watershed (Pleasant and Horseshoe Ponds)		Friends of Messolonskee La	
						04-	30,000		00.400						
	COST:	Cost:	26,000	Cost:	10,000	Cost:	30,000	Cost:	36,168						
EVALUATION ITEM	COST: POINTS AVAIL.	Cost:	26,000	Cost:	10,000	Cost:	30,000	Cost:	36,168						
	POINTS	Cost:	21	Cost:	20	Cost:	20	Cost:	18						
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	POINTS AVAIL.	Cost:	,	Cost:	·	Cost:	,	Cost:							
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope Section II. Local Support and Funding	POINTS AVAIL.	Cost:	21	Cost:	20	Cost:	20	Cost:	18						
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope Section II. Local Support and Funding Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	POINTS AVAIL. 25 20	Cost:	21 20	Cost:	20 20	COST:	20	Cost:	18 15						
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope Section II. Local Support and Funding Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program Section IV: Plant Survey	POINTS AVAIL. 25 20 10	Cost:	21 20 10	Cost:	20 20 10	Cost:	20 18 10	Cost:	18 15 10						
EVALUATION ITEM  Section I. Project Purpose and Scope Section II. Local Support and Funding Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program Section IV: Plant Survey Section V: Track record Section VI: Training and Experience	POINTS AVAIL. 25 20 10 10	Cost:	21 20 10 10	Cost:	20 20 10 10	Cost:	20 18 10 10	Cost:	18 15 10 8						

#### 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 RFI	# 20161C	)212 : C	competitive Gi	ant Pr	ogram for inva	ISIVE A	quatic Plant R	<u>emova</u>	<u> </u>
PROPOSAL SUBMI	TTED BY:		Environmental ociation- Long Lake	Lake Environmental Association - Sebago Cove			Lake Environmental Association - Sebago Lake		invironmental iation – Songe ly 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 SUBMI	TTED 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	100		<u>85</u>		94		97		77

#### 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.

PROPOSAL SUBMI	PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Raymond Waterways Protective Association		Thompson lake Association		Hogan and Whitney Pond Association		of Porter rvation ission
	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 SUBMI	TTED BY:		West Pond ssociation	a	n 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	100		97		<u>73</u>				





GOVERNOR

March 6, 2019

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

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,

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

ne Blanshitt

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



JANET T. MILLS GOVERNOR



March 6, 2019

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

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,

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





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





March 6, 2019

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

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

Buchit

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





March 6, 2019

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

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,

Lewe Black

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





March 6, 2019

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

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 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

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





March 6, 2019

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

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 <u>\$19,572.00</u> 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

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

Bulula

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





March 6, 2019

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

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

Bulb

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





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 Blanchetté 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

Yanh L

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





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,

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

Black

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





March 6, 2019

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

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 <u>\$19,572.00</u> 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





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 **\$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





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





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 <u>\$5,869.00</u> 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

Unlike

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





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 **\$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





March 6, 2019

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

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





March 6, 2019

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

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





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

Bulle

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





March 6, 2019

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

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 Commission** 

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





March 6, 2019

Neil Jenson Raymond Waterways Protective Association PO Box 1243 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 **\$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



IANET T. MILLS GOVERNOR



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.; 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





March 6, 2019

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

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

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**

<u>Pass:</u> <u>Fa</u>	ail:
eted by on. If a and,	
Points Award	ed:
22	
20	
10	
10	
17	
11	
90	
	eted by on. If a and,  Points Award  22  20  10  17  11

Rev. 2/7/2019

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	5
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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 infectible.	
<ul> <li>vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
<ul> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant</li> </ul>	
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).	
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	4
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
5 = Application defines who, the date(s ) and location(s) and what  resources will be precided throughout the applies some of the project.	
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.	
define resources and when the work will be done.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed.</li> </ul>	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	5
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximur
	Score (20)

Rev. 2/7/2019 2

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for</li> </ul>	
	10
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.	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	10
10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds	
8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds	
• 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds	
0 = Applicant has 21 = 30% match     0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum
	Score (10)
• 10 = yes	10
<ul> <li>8 = no with explanation</li> </ul>	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
Trancourvey Level 2 required	Score (10)
• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	
	Maximum Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?	Score (20)
	Score (20)
and reporting?	Score (20)
<ul><li>and reporting?</li><li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,</li></ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) 6

Rev. 2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	6
Does the project team have additional training?	5
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

Rev. 2/7/2019 4

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Arrowhead DATE: 2/28/2019

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fa	ail Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, <b>if any</b> . This			
RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to			
proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the pa			
therefore, not given to a review te	ann for review.)		
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	1
Continual Local Company and Funding	20 (May: 20 Painta)	2	0
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)		U
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
	( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( (		<u> </u>
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8	3
	20 (14 20 5 : 1 )		_
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	2	1
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	4
<u> </u>			
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	4

Rev.2/7/2019

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)			
<ul> <li>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</li> <li>5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives.</li> <li>3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are</li> </ul>	5			
<ul> <li>vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Which priority does the project meet?</li> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.</li> <li>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).</li> <li>2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	3			
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?  • 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			
<ul> <li>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</li> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.</li> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done.</li> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed.</li> </ul>	5			
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?  • 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)			

Rev.2/7/2019 2

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Arrowhead DATE: 2/28/2019

		1
•	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	10
•	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.	
Do the	2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	10
	project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of exceeds the minimum 20% match?	10
match		
•	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- (P	ART II)	Maximum
		Score (10)
•	10 = yes	10
•	8 = no with explanation	
•	0 = No	
Plant S	Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
•	8 = level2	
_		
•	0 = No Survey	
Track I	0 = No Survey  Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
Track I	•	Maximum Score (20)
	•	-
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.  5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 6
Does to and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.	Score (20) 6
Does to and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 6
Does to and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control is?	Score (20) 6
Does to and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 6

Rev.2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Arrowhead DATE: 2/28/2019

4 =Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	8
Does the project team have additional training?	6
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

Rev.2/7/2019 4

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/Fa	il Criteria		
<u>. 400// 4</u>		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to r proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the pr therefore, not given to a review tea			
<u> </u>			
*			
		Points A	<u>Awarded</u> :
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	1	16
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	1	16
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	1	10
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)		8
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)	1	16
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	1	13
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	79	

Rev. 2/7/2019

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)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	3
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
• 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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	3
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	4
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	<u> </u>
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	3
term outcome?	
• 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximur Score (20)

Rev. 2/7/2019 2

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Balch Lake Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment the project?	for 6
the project?	
<ul> <li>10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represent in the proposal.</li> </ul>	ted
<ul> <li>5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in</li> </ul>	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal	ı.
• 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level or	f <b>10</b>
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	'   '
• 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)
• 10 = yes	10
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
Figure 3 di vey — Level 2 required	Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
O - No Sumou	
• 0 = No Survey	
•	Maximum
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
•	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?  • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?  • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?  • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.  • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?         <ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.         <ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) t 6
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?         <ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.         <ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	Score (20) t 6
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) t 6

Rev. 2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Balch Lake Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	7
Does the project team have additional training?	6
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Community Lakes Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fa	nil Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to a			
proposal fails <b>any</b> of the pass/fail criteria, the pi			
therefore, not given to a review te			
<b>+</b>	,		
+			
		Points A	<u>warded</u> :
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	0
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	6
	40 (14 40 5 : 4 )		
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)		3
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Geodoff IV. Flank Carvey	10 (Max. 10 1 ointo)	•	
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)		
- Control of the cont	20 (Max. 201 0.110)	1	7
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	3
		·	_
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	4

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	4
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
• 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.	_
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	4
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	1
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	4
term outcome?	
• 5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximur Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Community Lakes Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	8
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.	
<ul> <li>2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.</li> </ul>	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	8
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
• 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)
• 10 = yes	8
·	8
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	Maximum
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Score (10)
	40
• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
<ul><li>10 = Greater than Level 2 survey</li><li>8 = level2</li></ul>	10
	10
• 8 = level2	Maximum
<ul><li>8 = level2</li><li>0 = No Survey</li></ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management</li> </ul>	Maximum
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> </ul> Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports) Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting? <ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20) 6
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	Maximum Score (20) 6

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Community Lakes Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	7
Does the project team have additional training?	6
7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Collins Pond Improvement Association

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fa	ail Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. Thi			
RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to			
proposal fails <b>any</b> of the pass/fail criteria, the p			
therefore, not given to a review to	eam for review.)		
<u>*</u>			
•			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:		1 Onto 7	
- Namerical Goorg			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	2	0
J			
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	1	4
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	8	3
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)		9
			^
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)	2	U
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	1	2
7			
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	3

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	5
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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 infectible.	
<ul> <li>vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
• 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant	
infestations with potential for eradication.	
<ul> <li>3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of</li> </ul>	
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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	4
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?	5
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly</li> </ul>	
define resources and when the work will be done.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	3
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximun Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Collins Pond Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

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

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Collins Pond Improvement Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	7
Does the project team have additional training?	5
7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

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**

Pass/Fa	ail Criteria		
		<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, <b>if any</b> . This section <b>must</b> be completed by			
RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to			
proposal fails <b>any</b> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and,			
therefore, not given to a review to	eam for review.)		
<b>+</b>			
+			
		Points A	<u>warded</u> :
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max:25 Points)	2	1
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max:10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	_	_
- Couldn't Hack record	20 (Max. 201 0)	2	0
0 " )" T : :	45 (14 45 D : 1)		
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	5
TOTAL BOINTS	(Many 400 Delete)		^
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	6

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	3
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
• 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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	5
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	-
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	5
term outcome?	
• 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)	Maximur Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Friends of Cobbossee- Annabessacook

DATE: 2/28/2019

	40
<ul> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment fo the project?</li> </ul>	r <b>10</b>
	,
<ul> <li>10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal.</li> </ul>	1
<ul> <li>5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in</li> </ul>	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
• 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
• 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)
• 10 = yes	10
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
	Score (10)
• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	7
and reporting?	
• 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
<ul> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	
reporting and financial accountability.	
0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and	
financial accountability.	
Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	6
success.	
<ul> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	
moderate success.	
<ul> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	
shown little success.	
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	7
projects?	
• 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and	
7 - Has extensive experience with management, removal and	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Friends of Cobbossee- Annabessacook

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 =Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	8
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee-Cobbossee Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

<u>Instructions:</u> 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**

ail Criteria		
an ontona	Pass:	Fail:
is section <u>must</u> be completed by review team for evaluation. If a proposal is to be rejected and, eam for review.)	1 400.	1 4111
	Points A	warded:
	1 011110 7	
(Max: 25 Points)	2	0
(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
(Max: 15 Points)	1	3
(Max: 100 Points)	9	3
	review team for evaluation. If a proposal is to be rejected and, seam for review.)  (Max: 25 Points)  (Max: 20 Points)  (Max: 10 Points)  (Max: 10 Points)  (Max: 20 Points)	S section must be completed by review team for evaluation. If a roposal is to be rejected and, earn for review.)  Points A  (Max: 25 Points)  (Max: 20 Points)  (Max: 10 Points)  1  (Max: 10 Points)  1  (Max: 20 Points)  2  (Max: 20 Points)  2  (Max: 15 Points)  1

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)	Maximur
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	3
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	5
• 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant	
infestations with potential for eradication.	
<ul> <li>3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of</li> </ul>	
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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	4
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	4
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	_
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	4
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximur Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Cobbossee Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

•	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	10
•	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.	
Do the	project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
	exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
•	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- (P	ART II)	Maximum
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· ···· ·· <b>,</b>	Score (10)
•	10 = yes	10
•	8 = no with explanation	
•	0 = No	
Plant 9	Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
		Score (10)
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
•	8 = level2	
_	0 N C	
•	0 = No Survey	
Track I	0 = No Survey  Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.  5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 7
Does to and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 7
Does to and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control ts?	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 7

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Cobbossee Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 =Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	6
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Pleasant/Horseshoe

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fai	I Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This			
RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to re			
proposal fails <b>any</b> of the pass/fail criteria, the pro			
therefore, not given to a review tea	am for review.)		
*			
*			
		Points A	<u>warded:</u>
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	0
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	8
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Outing NV Divit Owner	40 (NA 40 D.: 14)		•
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	2	n
			0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	5
	(	•	<u>-</u>
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	3
	,		

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)
<ul> <li>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</li> <li>5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives.</li> <li>3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>Which priority does the project meet?</li> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.</li> <li>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).</li> <li>2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	3
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?  • 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
<ul> <li>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</li> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.</li> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done.</li> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed.</li> </ul>	4
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?  • 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)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Friends of Cobbossee- Pleasant/Horseshoe

DATE: 2/28/2019

	oes the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for ne project?	8
	• •	
	0 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented the proposal.	
	= The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in	
	cope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
	= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	
Do the pro	oject costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
match exc	ceeds the minimum 20% match?	
• 10	0 = 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- (PAR	T II)	Maximum
		Score (10)
- 1/	0 = vos	10
	0 = yes	10
	= no with explanation	
	= No	D. G
Plant Surv	vey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
• 10	0 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
• 8	= level2	
• 0	= No Survey	
Track Rec	ord ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
Does the	applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	7
and repor	•	,
• 7=	= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
re	eporting and financial accountability.	
• 5	= The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	
re	eporting and financial accountability.	
• 0	= The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and	
fir	nancial accountability.	
Has the ap	pplicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
• 6=	= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	6
SU	uccess.	
• 4	= The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had	
m	oderate success.	
• 0	= The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has	
_	nown little success.	
	10 WIT HELLE SUCCESS.	
sh	pplicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	7
sh		7
sh Has the approjects?		7
• 0 fin Has the ap • 6= su • 4 m	eporting and financial accountability.  = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and nancial accountability.  pplicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project uccess.  = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had noderate success.  = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has	6

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Friends of Cobbossee- Pleasant/Horseshoe

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	8
Does the project team have additional training?	7
7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

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/F	ail Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. The RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the pass/fail criteria, the pass/fail criteria.	review team for evaluation. If a proposal is to be rejected and,		
<b>+</b>			
<b>*</b>			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:		1 Onto 7	
- Tamerous Corre			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	1	8
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	1	5
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	8	3
Section V: Track record	(Max:20 Points)	1	4
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	1	1
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	6

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)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	4
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
Which priority does the project meet?	2
• 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.	
<ul> <li>3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of</li> </ul>	
invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g.,	
managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high	
boat traffic).	
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	5
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
• 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	4
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	3
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
• 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)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Friends of Messalonskee

DATE: 2/28/2019

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	
the project?	7
the project?	
• 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented	
in the proposal.	
<ul> <li>5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in</li> </ul>	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
<ul> <li>2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.</li> </ul>	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	8
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
• 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)
a 10 - vee	10
• 10 = yes	10
• 8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	D.C
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
, , ,	Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	5
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?	
, ,	
and reporting?	
<ul><li>and reporting?</li><li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	4
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	4
<ul> <li>and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	4

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Friends of Messalonskee

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	6
Does the project team have additional training?	5
7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Hogan/Whitney Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

\*

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fa	ail Criteria		
<u>, 444</u>		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. Thi RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the p therefore, not given to a review to	review team for evaluation. If a roposal is to be rejected and,		
<u> </u>			
+			
		Dointo A	worded:
Numerical Score:		Points A	warueu.
Numerical Score.			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	3
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	2
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)		3
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	8
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	3
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	4
	,		

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)
<ul> <li>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</li> <li>5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives.</li> <li>3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>Which priority does the project meet?</li> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.</li> <li>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).</li> <li>2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	3
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?  • 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
<ul> <li>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</li> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.</li> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done.</li> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed.</li> <li>Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>term outcome?</li> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Hogan/Whitney Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

•		
	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	6
•	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.	
	project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	6
	exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
•	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- (P	ART II)	Maximum
CDI- (I	ANT II)	Score (10)
		(20)
•	10 = yes	10
•	8 = no with explanation	
•	0 = No	
Plant 9	Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
- Tune	variety Level 2 required	Score (10)
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
•	8 = level2	
•	0 = No Survey	
Track	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
		Score (20)
Does t	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	
Does t	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?	Score (20)
Does t	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	Score (20)
Does t	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Does t	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.  5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.	Score (20) 6
Does to and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 6
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control ts?	Score (20) 6
Does to and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 6

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Hogan/Whitney Pond Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
<ul> <li>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</li> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	7
Does the project team have additional training?	6
7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Jordan River Marine Condo Association

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fa	nil Criteria		
_		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to a proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the past/fail criteria.	review team for evaluation. If a roposal is to be rejected and,		
<b>*</b>			
+			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	1	8
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	1	1
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)	1	7
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	1	1
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	3

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	4
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
• 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.	_
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	3
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	_
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	3
term outcome?	
• 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)	Maximur
	Score (20

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Jordan River Marine Condo Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

<ul> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal.</li> </ul>	
' '	
5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in  scane A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
2 = A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.      De the proposal and propos	•
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	6
<ul> <li>10 = Applicant has &gt; 41% matching funds</li> </ul>	
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)
• 10 = yes	8
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
	Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	6
and reporting?	
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.  Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
Has the annicant lised hast tilings as described and to a successful outcome	
	_
6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	5
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER:** Jordan River Marine Condo Association

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	6
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Long Lake

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

<u>Instructions:</u> 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**

on must be completed by team for evaluation. If a l is to be rejected and, review.)	Pass: Points A	<u>Fail:</u>
team for evaluation. If a I is to be rejected and,		warded:
	Points A	warded:
	Points A	warded:
	Points A	warded:
	<u>FUITIS A</u>	warueu.
25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	3
20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	8
10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
20 (Max:20 Points)	2	 0
15 (Max: 15 Points)	1:	2
(Max: 100 Points)	9:	3
	20 (Max: 20 Points)  10 (Max: 10 Points)  10 (Max: 10 Points)  20 (Max: 20 Points)  15 (Max: 15 Points)	20 (Max: 20 Points) 10 (Max: 10 Points) 10 (Max: 10 Points) 10 (Max: 10 Points) 20 (Max: 20 Points) 20 (Max: 15 Points) 15 (Max: 15 Points) 15

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	4
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	5
• 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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	4
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	5
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximur Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Long Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	8
the project?	
10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented  in the grantest.	
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.	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	10
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	D.0
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum
	Score (10)
• 10 = yes	10
•	10
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	Maximum
	Maximum Score (20)
• 0 = No Survey	Maximum Score (20)
0 = No Survey  Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>O = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>T= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>O = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>T= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>O = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>T= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>O = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>T= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7 6
<ul> <li>O = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>O = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7 6
<ul> <li>O = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7 6

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Long Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 =Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	6
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	6
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Cove

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fa	il Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to r proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the pr	review team for evaluation. If a		
therefore, not given to a review te			
+			
+			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	1	8
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	1	7
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	8	3
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max:15 Points)	1	2
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	5

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	3
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	2
• 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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	5
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	3
term outcome?	
• 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)	Maximun
	Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Cove

DATE: 2/28/2019

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	7
the project?	
• 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented	
in the proposal.	
<ul> <li>5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in</li> </ul>	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
<ul> <li>2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.</li> </ul>	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
• 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)
• 10 = ves	10
10 ,65	10
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	Maximum
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
• 8 = level2	
<ul><li>8 = level2</li><li>0 = No Survey</li></ul>	Maximum
• 8 = level2	Maximum Score (20)
<ul><li>8 = level2</li><li>0 = No Survey</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> </ul> Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports) Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting? <ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7 6
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>8 = level2</li> <li>0 = No Survey</li> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Cove

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?  • 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	6
<ul> <li>species management.</li> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Does the project team have additional training?</li> <li>7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	6

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Lake

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

\*

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fai	il Criteria		
1 400/1 4		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to reproposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the pretent therefore, not given to a review teather.	eview team for evaluation. If a oposal is to be rejected and,	<u> </u>	
<b>+</b>			
+			
		Points A	<u>warded:</u>
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	2
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	6
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8	3
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	2
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	8

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	4
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	5
• 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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	4
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	4
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximur Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	6
the project?	
<ul> <li>10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
<ul> <li>2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.</li> </ul>	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
<ul> <li>10 = Applicant has &gt; 41% matching funds</li> </ul>	
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)
• 10 = yes	10
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?	7
• 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
<ul> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	
reporting and financial accountability.	
0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and	
financial accountability.	
Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	6
success.	
<ul> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	
moderate success.	
moderate success.	
<ul> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	
0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.  Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	7
<ul> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	7

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Sebago Lake

DATE: 2/28/2019

monitoring control projects	
4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	6
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	6
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/F	ail Criteria		
	-	Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, <b>if any</b> . Th			
RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to			
proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the p			
therefore, not given to a review to	eam for review.)		
<u>*</u>			
•			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:		_	
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	2	0
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	1	3
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	5	3
Godion IV. Flank Galvey	(Max. 101 office)	`	
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)		
Occion v. Hack record	(Max. 201 office)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	1	2
Couldn't it Training and Exponence	(Max. 101 Sille)		_
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	3

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond

DATE: 2/28/2019

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)
<ul> <li>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</li> <li>5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives.</li> <li>3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described.</li> </ul>	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
• 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.	
<ul> <li>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).</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	4
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?	5
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed.</li> </ul>	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	3
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond

DATE: 2/28/2019

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	5
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.	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	8
• 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds	
<ul> <li>8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds</li> <li>6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds</li> </ul>	
0 = Applicant has less than 20% match  CRI (DART II)	Maximum
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
	3core (10)
• 10 = yes	10
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
Figure 3 Level 2 required	Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
0 = No Survey  Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
	Maximum Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?  • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?  • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?  • 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.  • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?         <ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?         <ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project</li> </ul>	Score (20)
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?         <ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.         <ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7
<ul> <li>Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)</li> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?</li> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> <li>Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.</li> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.</li> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.</li> <li>Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control</li> </ul>	Score (20) 7

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association- Songo /Brandy Pond

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?  • 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to	6
<ul> <li>lead the project successfully.</li> <li>5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	6
<ul> <li>7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

<u>Instructions:</u> 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/Fa	ail Criteria		
1.0071		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. Thi RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the p therefore, not given to a review to	review team for evaluation. If a roposal is to be rejected and,		1.3
<b>*</b>			
*			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:		1 Ollito 7	twaraca.
- Namorioar Coord			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	4
	·		
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	4
	40 (14 40 D : 1)		
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	5
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	4
,	,		
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	5

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)	Maximun
	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	4
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	5
• 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.	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	5
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
• 5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	-
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	5
term outcome?	
• 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)	Maximur Score (20)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee

DATE: 2/28/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee

DATE: 2/28/2019

monitoring control projects	
4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	7
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Little Sebago Lake Association** 

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

<u>Instructions:</u> 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 C	<u>riteria</u>		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This see RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revie proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the propo therefore, not given to a review team	ew team for evaluation. If a sal is to be rejected and,		
<b>+</b>			
*		Points A	.warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	2	2
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	(Max:20 Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	7

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)
<ul> <li>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</li> <li>5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives.</li> <li>3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	5
described.	
<ul> <li>Which priority does the project meet?</li> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.</li> <li>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).</li> <li>2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	3
<ul> <li>Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?</li> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> <li>0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.</li> </ul>	5
<ul> <li>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</li> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.</li> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done.</li> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed.</li> </ul>	5
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?  • 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)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Little Sebago Lake Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

•	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	10
•	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.	
	project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
	exceeds the minimum 20% match?	10
match	10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds	
•		
_	8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds	
•	6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds	
CDL /D	0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
CBI- (P	ART II)	Maximum Score (10)
		Score (10)
	10 = yes	10
	8 = no with explanation	10
	0 = No	
Dlant 6		Maximum
Piants	Survey – Level 2 required	Score (10)
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
•	8 = level2	
•	0 = No Survey	
• Track I	•	Maximum
• Track I	0 = No Survey  Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
	•	
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports) he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?	Score (20)
Does t	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.  5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20)
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.	Score (20)
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	Record (SEE previous grant reports)  he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.	Score (20) 7
Does to and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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	Score (20) 7
Does to and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 7
Does t and re	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?  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.  e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.  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.  e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 7

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Little Sebago Lake Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	8
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

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/Fa	il Criteria		
	_	Pass:	<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.)			
+	,		
+			
		Points A	<u>warded</u> :
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	1	8
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	3
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	5
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	1
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	7

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

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)** 

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)		
Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum Score (25)	
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	3	
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?		
• 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.		
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>		
described.		
Which priority does the project meet?	5	
<ul> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant</li> </ul>		
infestations with potential for eradication.		
<ul> <li>3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of</li> </ul>		
invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g.,		
managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic).		
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>		
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	3	
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?		
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>		
• 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.		
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	3	
what resources are needed?		
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what</li> </ul>		
resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.		
<ul> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly</li> </ul>		
define resources and when the work will be done.		
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>		
resources are needed.		
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	4	
term outcome?		
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>		
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)	
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	7	
the project?		

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

•	0 = Has no experience.  ng and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum
•	4 =Has moderate experience	
	monitoring control projects	
•	7 = Has extensive experience with management, removal and	
project		
	e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	6
Hos Hs	shown little success.	6
•	0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has	
	moderate success.	
•	4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had	
	Success.	
•	6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	4
Has the	e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
	financial accountability.	
•	0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and	
	reporting and financial accountability.	
•	5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	
	reporting and financial accountability.	
•	7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
and re	porting?	
	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	5
		Score (20)
Track F	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
•	0 = No Survey	
•	8 = level2	
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
Plant S	Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
•	0 = No	B.4
•	8 = no with explanation	
•	10 = yes	10
		Score (10)
CBI- (P	ART II)	Maximum
•	0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
•	6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds	
•	8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds	
•	10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds	
	exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
Do the	project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	6
•	2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	
	scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
	5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in	
•	in the proposal.	
•	10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Mid Coast Conservancy** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to	6
lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to</li> </ul>	
lead the project successfully.	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive	
species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding</li> </ul>	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

<u>Instructions:</u> 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			
_		Pass:	<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.)			
+	,		
+			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(Max: 25 Points)	1	9
Section II. Local Support and Funding	(Max: 20 Points)	1	1
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(Max: 10 Points)	-	7
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)		3
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)	1	3
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	1	0
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	6	8

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission** 

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

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)
<ul> <li>Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?</li> <li>5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives.</li> <li>3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are vague or infeasible.</li> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described.</li> </ul>	4
<ul> <li>Which priority does the project meet?</li> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.</li> <li>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).</li> <li>2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	3
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority, uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?  • 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
<ul> <li>Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what resources are needed?</li> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s) and location(s) and what resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.</li> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly define resources and when the work will be done.</li> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed.</li> </ul>	4
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?  • 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)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

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

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

4 = Has moderate experience	
0 =Has no experience.	
Training and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	5
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience<sub>τ</sub> and capacity to lead the project successfully.</li> </ul>	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species</li> </ul>	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

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			
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, <b>if any</b> . This			
	<b>RFP Coordinator</b> <u>before</u> proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a		
proposal fails <b>any</b> of the pass/fail criteria, the pro			
therefore, not given to a review tear	n for review.)		
<b>Y</b>			
<b>V</b>			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	2
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max:20 Points)	1	6
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max:10 Points)	8	3
- Control of the control	(mexico : emile)		
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	7
	·		
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	0
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	3

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

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)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	5
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
<ul> <li>5 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are</li> </ul>	
appropriate to achieve the objectives.	
<ul> <li>3 = the project has identified goals and objectives but the methods are</li> </ul>	
vague or infeasible.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	2
<ul> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant</li> </ul>	_
infestations with potential for eradication.	
<ul> <li>3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of</li> </ul>	
invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g.,	
managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high	
boat traffic).	
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	5
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
• 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.	
<ul> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly</li> </ul>	
define resources and when the work will be done.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	5
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?</li> </ul>	6

3

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

Trainin	g and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum
•	0 =Has no experience.	
•	4 = Has moderate experience	
	monitoring control projects	
•	7 = Has extensive experience with management, removal and	
project	s?	
Has the	e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	6
	shown little success.	
•	0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has	
	moderate success.	
•	4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had	
	success.	
1103 (110	6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	5
Has the	e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
•	financial accountability.	
•	0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and	
•	5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.	
_	reporting and financial accountability.	
•	7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
and re	porting?	
	ne applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	6
_		Score (20)
Track F	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
•	0 = No Survey	
•	8 = level2	
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
Plant S	urvey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
Dla 11.0	0 = No	Mavire
•	8 = no with explanation	
•	10 = yes	10
	40	10
		Score (10)
CBI- (P	ART II)	Maximum
•	0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
•	6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds	
•	8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds	
•	10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds	
match	exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
Do the	project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
•	2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	
	scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
•	5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in	
	in the proposal.	
•	10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to	5
lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to</li> </ul>	
lead the project successfully.	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive	
species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding</li> </ul>	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = The team has no additional training.</li> </ul>	

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			
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, <b>if any</b> . This			
RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to			
proposal fails <b>any</b> of the pass/fail criteria, the pr			
therefore, not given to a review te	am for review.)		
<b>Y</b>			
<u> </u>			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	1	7
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	2	0
			_
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)		3
Section IV. Flant Survey	10 (Max. 10 Pollits)		)
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	1	5
- Contain V. Hackingson	20 (Max. 20 ) omto)	•	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	4
-	,	1	1
	(10.000		_
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	1

Rev. 2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

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)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	3
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not</li> </ul>	
described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
• 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).	
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	3
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
• 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	4
what resources are needed?	
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	4
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?</li> </ul>	10

Rev. 2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

DAIL	2/28/2019	
•	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.	
Do the	project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
match	exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
•	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- (P	ART II)	Maximum
	· ···· ·· <b>,</b>	Score (10)
•	10 = yes	10
•	8 = no with explanation	
•	0 = No	
Plant 9	Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
		Score (10)
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
•	8 = level2	
•	0 = No Survey	
Track	Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
		Score (20)
	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	5
and re	porting?	
•	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.	
Has th	e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
•	6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	4
	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.	
Has th	e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	6
projec	ts?	
•	7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and	
	monitoring control projects	
•	4 =Has moderate experience	
•	0 =Has no experience.	
Trainir	ng and Experience (PART III section 5)	Maximum
1 i aii iii	ig and Experience (i Ait in section 5/	IVIGAIIIIGIII

Rev. 2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to	6
lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to</li> </ul>	
lead the project successfully.	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive	
species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding</li> </ul>	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

<u>Instructions:</u> 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			
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, <b>if any</b> . This RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to re	view team for evaluation. If a		
proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the pro			
therefore, not given to a review tea	m for review.)		
<u>*</u>			
•			
		Points A	warded:
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 III. Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(IVIAX. TO FOILIS)		
Section IV: Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)		
0 " 1/ 7 1	(11 00 D 1 1 1 )		
Section V: Track record	(Max: 20 Points)		
Section VI: Training and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)		
	(14 400 5 : : : )		
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)		

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association** 

**DATE: 2/28/2019** 

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
Are the project goals and chiestings alongly stated with appropriate and	Score (25)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
Which priority does the project meet?	
• 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication.	
<ul> <li>3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of</li> </ul>	
invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g.,	
managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high	
boat traffic).	
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
• 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	
what resources are needed?	
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources will be needed throughout the entire scope of the project.	
<ul> <li>3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not clearly</li> </ul>	
define resources and when the work will be done.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	
the project?	

Rev. 2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

DATE: 2/28/2019	1
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.	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
• 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)
• 10 = yes	
8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
	Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	
and reporting?	
<ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,</li> </ul>	
reporting and financial accountability.	
<ul> <li>5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,</li> </ul>	
reporting and financial accountability.	
<ul> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and</li> </ul>	
financial accountability.	
Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	
success.	
<ul> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	
moderate success.	
<ul> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	
shown little success.	
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	
projects?	
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
5 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: Three Pond Protective Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to	
lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to</li> </ul>	
lead the project successfully.	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive	
species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding</li> </ul>	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

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			
		Pass:	<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.)			
+			
+			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: 25 Points)	2	4
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: 10 Points)	8	3
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: 15 Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	7
	, , ,		

Rev. 2/7/2019 1

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: West Pond Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

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)
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	5
effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success?	
• 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.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described.</li> </ul>	
Which priority does the project meet?	4
<ul> <li>5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant</li> </ul>	4
infestations with potential for eradication.	
<ul> <li>3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of</li> </ul>	
invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g.,	
managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic).	
<ul> <li>2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts.</li> </ul>	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, priority,	5
uses affected and plant inventory) and provide a map?	
<ul> <li>5 = Proposed project links two or more specific conditions with map</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = the proposed project lists one condition and map</li> </ul>	
• 0 = the project does not list or describe the current conditions.	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and	5
what resources are needed?	
<ul> <li>5 = Application defines who, the date(s )and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
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.	
<ul> <li>0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what</li> </ul>	
resources are needed.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-	5
term outcome?	
<ul> <li>5 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.</li> </ul>	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
<ul> <li>Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?</li> </ul>	10

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: West Pond Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

DATE: 2/28/2019	
<ul> <li>10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented</li> </ul>	
in the proposal.	
<ul> <li>5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in</li> </ul>	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
<ul> <li>2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.</li> </ul>	
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	10
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	
<ul> <li>10 = Applicant has &gt; 41% matching funds</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>0 = Applicant has less than 20% match</li> </ul>	
CBI- (PART II)	Maximum Score (10)
• 10 = yes	8
• 8 = no with explanation	
• 0 = No	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum Score (10)
• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record ( SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
	Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	7
and reporting?	
<ul> <li>7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,</li> </ul>	
reporting and financial accountability.	
• 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
<ul> <li>0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.</li> </ul>	
Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	
<ul> <li>6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.</li> </ul>	6
<ul> <li>4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had</li> </ul>	
moderate success.	
<ul> <li>0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has</li> </ul>	
shown little success.	
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	7
projects?	
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

Rev. 2/7/2019

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER: West Pond Association** 

DATE: 2/28/2019

	Score (15)
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to	8
lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
<ul> <li>8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to</li> </ul>	
lead the project successfully.	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive	
species management.	
<ul> <li>0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding</li> </ul>	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
<ul> <li>7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 = The team has some additional training</li> </ul>	
0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Sharon Mann, 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

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

individual Evaluator Comments.
Letter of Recommendation from 7 lakes board and members
Level III survey
All new 7 lakes crew. NEM July (10 weeks), 1 week in Belgrade stream (2019 Wings Mill Dam repair)
Strong Community involvement
Renew SUR
Good detail on 2020
Over 100% match
Adequate map

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Sharon Mann, 7 Lakes Alliance

**DATE: 2/15/2019** 

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

<u>Instructions:</u> The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by <u>individual</u> evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is <u>required</u> that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team

consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments.
Strong letter of support from BLA
CBI coverage is 12 hrs/day, 7 days/wk
Surveyed entire shoreline of Great and Long Ponds; 67% of shoreline adopted by residents. Level II
surveys for other Belgrade Lakes
2019 goal: prevent within lake spread and reduce extent of infested area.
7 Lakes DASH crew working alongside NE Milfoil
NE Milfoil for 10 weeks
Comprehensive discussion of surveying and removing, noting overcoming challenges in identifying
milfoil in North Bay – may need to use diver tow.
Concise conclusion of objective.
One week in Belgrade Stream (NE Milfoil)
North Bay 2018: only one plant found.
Installing fragment nets around DASH operations
Significant community support
Most of grant intended for NE Milfoil, some for field crew and even less for program manager.
Over 270% cash match

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Dave Sanfason, Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council

**DATE: 2/15/2019** 

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

individual Evaluator Comments.
Limited narrative on project plan, yet succinct in describing current conditions. Much improved map.
Clear and easy to see plant locations.
Very defined level of progress for example reduced infestation from 70% to 20%
Brown Brook 10% Goal to be moderate infestation by end of 2018
Over 100% match, Strong community support
Use DEP 2007 survey as survey info, could update this
OSC BEI 2007 Survey as Survey into, Social apacite titis

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Dave Sanfason, Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Very brief project goals and scope; claims infestation has already been reduced from 70% to 20%.  Objective for 2019 is 25% reduction in extent of invasive milfoil.  Mapping references past interactive maps.  Significant reduction in Brown Brook and in coves around lake.  Little Ossipee River and L. Ossipee Lake inlets proving difficult to keep in control.  Town funding, LAC and LACC funding too.  Concise but informative summary of objectives for 2020.  More than 120% cash match.
Objective for 2019 is 25% reduction in extent of invasive milfoil.  Mapping references past interactive maps.  Significant reduction in Brown Brook and in coves around lake.  Little Ossipee River and L. Ossipee Lake inlets proving difficult to keep in control.  Town funding, LAC and LACC funding too.  Concise but informative summary of objectives for 2020.
Mapping references past interactive maps. Significant reduction in Brown Brook and in coves around lake. Little Ossipee River and L. Ossipee Lake inlets proving difficult to keep in control. Town funding, LAC and LACC funding too. Concise but informative summary of objectives for 2020.
Significant reduction in Brown Brook and in coves around lake.  Little Ossipee River and L. Ossipee Lake inlets proving difficult to keep in control.  Town funding, LAC and LACC funding too.  Concise but informative summary of objectives for 2020.
Little Ossipee River and L. Ossipee Lake inlets proving difficult to keep in control.  Town funding, LAC and LACC funding too.  Concise but informative summary of objectives for 2020.
Town funding, LAC and LACC funding too. Concise but informative summary of objectives for 2020.
Concise but informative summary of objectives for 2020.
More than 120% cash match.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Susan Jackman, Balch Lake Improvement Association

**DATE: 2/15/2019** 

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

marriada Evaluator Commento.
Question did they buy new coms this year? Stated had them last year, yet budgeted this year.
Some survey work
Light narrative, minimal detail
Adequate map
Good community support. 71% cash match Use Arrowhead divers. One diver needs certification
Use Arrowhead divers. One diver needs certification

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Susan Jackman, Balch Lake Improvement Association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran **EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Brief project goals, lacking detail. New infestation area: Sunset Beach. Little detail provided for project activities. Cash match is 72%. All grant funding proposed for dive time.

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Community Lakes Association, Donnie porter DATE: 2/15/2019
EVALUATOR NAME: Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

individual Evaluator Comments.
Very nice detail on Maps
Good description in project proposal
Not sure what is meant by bracking?
Mentions clearing native plants? on Bryant pond!
Mentions clearing native plants? on Bryant pond! 40% Cash match, adequate community support
Still have barriers to remove.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Community Lakes Association, Donnie porter

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
Goal for Bryant Pond: eradication.
Goal for Shagg: continue to reduce infestation. Predict only searching for plants after 2020.
CBI program!
Brief but complete description of goals for each pond.
CLA started IPP program for area lakes in 2018.
Excellent use of Google Maps
Support from towns, Spruce Mountain Wind.
Cash match: 40.2%
\$2,000 of grant to surface support; \$17,400 to NE Milfoil

### STATE OF MAINE

INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL **BIDDER NAME:** Roger Patterson, Collins Pond Improvement association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette **EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Good description of current conditions and estimate of needed effort to make headway. Hand drawn map, but gets the idea across. DEP survey in 2018, Increase in community contributions. 25% match Good use of second year planning builds off first year hoping for increased hours and less plant. \$14,000 Increased grant request Hiring NEM.

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Rodger Patterson, Collins Pond Improvement association DATE: 2/15/2019
EVALUATOR NAME: John McPhedran
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Environmental Protection

<u>Instructions:</u> The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by <u>individual</u> evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is <u>required</u> that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your

Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:
Letters of support: April 2018 from Windham, July 2018 from Evergreen CU.
Cogent case for proposed approach to managing invasive milfoil.
Narrative posits whether such a dense infestation can be successfully managed with DASH.
Landowners trained in 2017 re making small barriers for shorefront areas.
240 hours NE Milfoil time proposed for 2019; 320 NE Milfoil hours in 2020.
Cash match 25%.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Friends of Cobbossee Watershed Annabessacook

DATE: 2/19/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette **EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Good collaborative group. Mentions outreach and involvement of community. Little lite on long term plans in narrative. Does not discuss goals of the project. Clear description of what is needed to do the project. Good organizational plan to survey before and after to assess work. Al funds for contractor divers doing removal effort Cash match more 100%

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Friends of Cobbossee Watershed – Cobbossee lake

**DATE: 2/19/2019** 

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Almost the same project narrative as other lakes. I would have liked to see more detail on Project goals in the narrative. Mentions education and survey teams. Several community parteners Two species in proposal Hyd mor seems to be a maintenance while Myr spi is rapid response. Funding request is primarily for survey. What is DEP is providing for funds not in grant for rapid response to both species?

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Friends of Cobbossee Watershed - Pleasant/ Horseshoe

DATE: 2/19/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
Good narrative describes survey efforts before and after to assess work and guide management
activities. Working on long term management plan to identify high priority areas an strategy.  Will hire contractor for Pleasant Pond
Some local resources. Busy ramps, High density infestation
80% match

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Friends of Messalonskee

DATE: 2/19/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

ndividual Evaluator Comments:
Burlap funded by community grant in boat launch area
Has stated goals for management, outreach and fundraising
'maintenance mode" Describe Loons cove and Ecles cove as heavy density? Not really maintenance
level if heavy. Wings Mill Dam listed as high priority site, 7 lakes also listed as site. Need to know who
is responsible for this area.
Has letter of support from Music school and Oakland.
4 person crews.
2020 plan limited
Continue to use own budget forms vs ones provided. Difficult to follow when no heading on the
additional pages.
Requesting \$8,000 for barriers in addition to grant funds (that are not reflected in budget). \$3500
(2017) \$8000 (2018)

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Hogan/Whitney

DATE: 2/19/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Good narrative with clear goals and objectives. Hand drawn map, but functional. Hiring NEM and Association members. DEP mapped infestation 2018, will provide to applicant. Raised additional funding in 2018 for South end work. Little bit more community support 28% mach

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Jordan River Marina and Condo Association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
States long term and short term goals in plan with map.
Cuites long term and short term goals in plan with map.
Minimal detail on timeline. 2020 plant same as 2019
•
25% match. Only 20 volunteer hours (2 coordinators 10 hours each). Little community involvement considering 3 organizations.

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Jordan River Marina and Condo Association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
States long term and short term goals in plan with map.
Cuites long term and short term goals in plan with map.
Minimal detail on timeline. 2020 plant same as 2019
•
25% match. Only 20 volunteer hours (2 coordinators 10 hours each). Little community involvement considering 3 organizations.

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Friends of Cobbossee Watershed Annabessacook DATE: 2/19/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran **EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Project summary doesn't clearly state overall project goals. Management strategy notes surveying of 2018 harvest areas and surveying other non-infested areas throughout the season. NE Milfoil for 10 weeks in 2019. Cash match >200%. All grant funding for contractor.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Friends of Cobbossee Watershed - Cobbossee lake

DATE: 2/19/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
Surveying during 2019 all habitat in Cobbossee.
Goal of removal effort for each species not clearly stated.
Collaborative effort with Cobbossee Yacht Club on one species.
Surveying weekly in Eurasian water-milfoil area.
Cash match is 120%.
Most of grant funding going to survey work, necessary for searching for new populations of both
species.

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Friends of Cobbossee Watershed - Pleasant/ Horseshoe **DATE: 2/19/2019 EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran **EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Strong surveying component. Hiring NE Milfoil to work these infestations in 2019. Overall goals not stated in narrative. Cash match is 80%. Most of the funding to contractor.

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Friends of Messalonskee

**DATE: 2/19/2019** 

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Project summary states that they are in "maintenance mode." That may be the case in the areas they have actively managed (except Eccles Cove) but is certainly not the case in the south end of the lake and in Belgrade Stream. Blake Cove burlap (2016) had 6 inches sediment and mature milfoil on top. Grant would pay for \$8000 in barriers (mostly burlap). \$24,258 of \$36,168 grant request is for divers, dive team leader and surface support. Cash match is 39.7%.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Hogan/Whitney

DATE: 2/19/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** No public boat access but there is mention of a boat ramp in the southern cove. I assume this is the private access used by property owners. Would be good to ask Rich to post sign here. Very clear and cogent explanation of three goals. Summary of 2018 notes entirety of section 4 remains heavily infested – is this true or leftover language from previous application? Two weeks of New England Milfoil? Cash match is 28.7%. Most of grant for contractor.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Jordan River Marina and Condo Association

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

### **Individual Evaluator Comments:**

The narrative for this project was not revised for this application. It appears to be the narrative from the 2018 application.
I do not see a map provided with the application.
It appears that very little thought and effort was put into the application.
Cash match is 25%.
Cach materi is 2070.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Long Lake

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Good summary narrative with long and short term goals. Describe less milfoil to be removed still requesting same level of funding. Describe survey efforts to maximize efficiency and measure success. Good map Only 6% of funds for materials not directly related to removal (Air testing, wetsuits, registrations) 50% cash match Loosing coordinator of program, will have new coordinator this season.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Long Lake

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
Excellent summers including regulation approximately approximately product to achieve production
Excellent summary including realistic assessment of continued work needed to achieve eradication.
Map link does not work.  Cash Match 51%.
94% of grant request for captain/divers.
Marinas, boat launching sites and past milfoil areas will be surveyed annually for the foreseeable
future.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Cove

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

### **Individual Evaluator Comments:**

The state of the s
Narrative describes long term and short term goals does not discuss surveying and monitoring to a
great extent, but it is mentioned. Maintenance and prevention mode without increased funding.
Good map
Describe need \$75k and under 30K for 2019 budget
54% match
Only 10 volunteer hours,
Loosing coordinator of program, will have new coordinator this season.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Cove

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
Maintenance and spread prevention mode until significantly more funding becomes available.
Straying from the north to south approach, LEA proposes placing barriers in southern channel leading
to Sebago. Are these barriers likely to get disturbed by boat traffic?
If additional funding available in 2020, perhaps could make more inroads rather than maintaining
status.
91% of grant request for caption or divers
Cash match 55%

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Lake

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Frye island Spot plants remain and goal is to have spot plant remain. Need to remove barriers and harvest Camp Mataponi. Survey for new growth remove any plants Kettle Cove largely free of milfoil, survey to remove spot plants and small patch. All 3 areas described as low density and in Maintenance mode with surveying to keep on top of new infestations. Goal to return to natural conditions by 2020. (observed that cash match for previous projects list the same \$5,000 (Boat motor), 1,000 (harvester Motor, Wetsuits 200) Do these items cost 3X therefore split on other grants?) 96% Cash match 40 volunteer hours

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Lake DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran **EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Narrative concisely summarizes known outlier populations of invasive milfoil in Sebago. All requested grant funds for captain and divers. Cash Match is 96%.

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Songo/Brandy

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Clear narrative discusses full survey on Brandy pond to find any outlying populations of plant. Songo back in shape after extra efforts last season. All plant densities described as low. Describe both infestations as maintenance mode and most very much under control. Good map Continue to see the same match as the 3 other grant requests (5K boat motor, 1K harvester motor ect , all line items consistent with other grant applications) 40% cash match if splitting costs on match with other grants. 18 volunteer hours

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association, Songo/Brandy
DATE: 2/15/2019
EVALUATOR NAME: John McPhedran
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Environmental Protection

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

# Individual Evaluator Comments: All grant funding for captain and divers. Work will require searching over large areas but removing relatively few plants. Desire to do full littoral survey of Brandy Pond in 2019 – by the DASH crew or separate crew? Full survey of Brandy hasn't been done in several years. Cash match is 40.7%

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Lovell invasive Plant Prevention Committee

DATE: 2/20/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

### **Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Some goals stated in narrative. Survey used for management of very small limited number of plants.
5 dives per season. Mostly volunteers. 4 plants 2018
Goal to return to natural conditions
25% cash match
203 volunteer hours plus 84 volunteer diver hours
Requested funds for professional survey. No grant last year

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Lovell invasive Plant Prevention Committee

DATE: 2/20/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

\*

# **Individual Evaluator Comments**:

Very limited CBI; no motorboats allowed.
Not OSHA compliant.
Stated goal: eradication.
No plants found in 2018 post-removal survey by LWRM.
C,D,D signage at ramp.
Cash match 25%.
LIPPC dive team doing work in 2019.
LIPPC dive team doing work in 2019.  Professional plant survey planned for fall 2020.

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** Little Sebago Lake Association

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME Denise Blanchette** 

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Good maps. Nice history of infestation and successes and setbacks. Detail and clear Very detailed clear plan! They discuss survey to direct work, assess efficacy and plan for future work. Focusing in on areas of high use and high spread risk, goal to eradicate. Nice chart of progress over the years by site. Amount removed and costs. Long term experienced crew, good community support. 360 volunteer hours 200% Cash match. All funds for divers

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER NAME: Little Sebago Lake Association
DATE: 2/15/2019
EVALUATOR NAME John McPhedran
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Environmental Protection

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Department's IN F Coordinator of Lead Evaluator for this IN F.
***************************************
Individual Evaluator Comments:
Outstanding project summary.
Logical and easy to follow presentation of 2018 work and current conditions of infested areas, including
grouping of areas with map references and order of priority for removal.
Cash Match 298%.

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL **BIDDER NAME:** Midcoast Conservancy DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME Denise Blanchette EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Narrative brief. Does not discuss long term management does cover first year. Bi-weekly survey and removal- not sure by who. New staff. Adequate map, same one used for last several years. 28% Cash Match

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL **BIDDER NAME:** Midcoast Conservancy DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME John McPhedran EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Project narrative implies surveying will occur every two weeks but this isn't stated explicitly. Narrative references number of years with no plants at each location but doesn't say anything about level 3 survey of the lake to ensure no new populations exist. Also no reference to new MCC staff working with DEP to get up-to-speed on survey and removal procedures. Summary of 2018 removal suggests a barrier remains in Davis Stream; don't believe that's the case. Project Activities for 2019 note that riprap barriers somewhat restrict landowner access to lake. Cash match 28.7%.

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER NAME: Martha Tracy, Town of Porter Conservation Commision DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME:** Denise Blanchette **EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Many maps of various quality- Hand drawn map difficult to read, some of the google type maps are no specific, thought the excel sheet has some description as do some of the google type maps. Overall lots of files nice attempt at detail. Did not mark CBI or public access or explain Did not use all of last year's funding requesting less this year

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

BIDDER NAME: Martha Tracy, Town of Porter Conservation Commision

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME:** John McPhedran

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:
No indication if there is CBI coverage.
Several files of maps sent. Would be preferable to have only most recent maps of area included in
grant application.
Project scope doesn't include goal(s).
Project activities for 2019 do not include areas worked in 2018 which presumably need to be watched
for regrowth.
Appreciate the comment on their experience!
Cash match is 25%.

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL **BIDDER NAME:** Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME Denise Blanchette EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Narrative brief. Does not discuss long term management does cover first year. Narrative clear and concise. Discusses pre-and post surveys to determine work plans and effectiveness of work. Looking to reduce spread potential and mange for uses. List Jordan river maintenance condition by 2021! Good community support 250% Cash match 84 volunteer hours

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL **BIDDER NAME:** Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME John McPhedran EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. Individual Evaluator Comments: OSHA compliance isn't clear, depends on training of new hires. Stated goal is to reduce impact on boat traffic/recreation and prevent fragmentation to limit spread. Well thought-out management approach/timing. Application projects maintenance condition in Upper Jordan River by 2021. Cash match 252%; all match funds from RWPA. \$1,033 of grant to payroll taxes and fees

RFP#: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL **BIDDER NAME:** Thompson Lake Environmental Association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME Denise Blanchette EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Narrative brief. Does not discuss long term management does cover first year. Five-year removal plan. (Not included) for Pine Point. years into plan. Annual diver survey of whole lake? Focusing on launches and marinas. Limited map. Same map annually submitted. Lacks detail or clarity. Sites described with scattered sparse populations listed as low priority while heavily infested site in with limited boat traffic is high priority. 200% cash match 23 volunteer hours

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL **BIDDER NAME:** Thompson Lake Environmental Association DATE: 2/15/2019 **EVALUATOR NAME John McPhedran EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** OSHA compliant. Goal doesn't explain what is meant by "manage." Two years into five-year plan to manage the 10 acres at Pine Point. Narrative states that 5 of the 10 acres already managed. \$300K of \$500K five-year plan has been pledged/raised. Primary technique benthic barriers with DASH along shore, between docks. Narrative notes that divers do annual complete underwater survey of the lake. That would be a major undertaking. Further text states the divers concentrate on boat access sites, marinas, boating channels and docks. In Summary of 2018 removal, difficult to tell which year being discussed. 1.7 acres of plastic barrier in Pine Point will be moved twice in 2019 requiring 100 hours. Under Project Activities for 2019, Map 1 site 1 noted to have 10-acres heavy infestation but narrative noted that 5 of the 10 acres is already managed. Application projects that Pine Point will be down to 1-2-acres dense milfoil by end of 2020. Plan for 2020 is clear and complete. Cash Match 240%

RFP#: 201810212

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL

**BIDDER NAME:** West Pond Association

**DATE: 2/15/2019** 

**EVALUATOR NAME Denise Blanchette** 

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Standard hand labeled site map and additional map of survey and removal tracks. Descriptive narrative with clear plan and goals for near eradication. Surveys to determine efficacy and to monitor new growth. Surveyed fall and Spring. Will hire NEM 3 weeks. Strong volunteer base. Do some late season harvesting and surveys. 80% Cash match 1560 volunteer hours!

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL
BIDDER NAME: West Pond Association

DATE: 2/15/2019

**EVALUATOR NAME John McPhedran** 

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Department of Environmental Protection Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP. **Individual Evaluator Comments:** Complies with OSHA. Concise narrative. Start date May 6<sup>th</sup> with contractor. 47 lake association volunteers trained to work on DASH boat. Cash match 80.1% Applicant very experienced managing curly leaf pondweed.

# 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, <u>Denise Blanchette</u> accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of <u>Maine Department of Environmental Protection</u>. 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.

Dense Blanch Ho

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 McPhedra 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.

Signature

February 25, 2019