State of Maine <u>RFP / Proposal Master Score Sheet</u>

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 Purchases for review/approval.

If the Highest Scoring Bidder responded "No" to the question "Are you a Maine Business as defined in this RFP?" on their Proposal Cover Page, the <u>Maine</u> <u>Business Consideration Score Sheet</u> is to be used to determine which Bidder is to be conditionally awarded the contract.

SCORESHEET FOR RF	P# 20171 ⁻	1195 : (Competitive G	ant Pr	ogram to Rem	ove In	vasive Aquatio	Plants	5	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commission		Balch Lake Improvement Association		Belgrade regional Conservation Alliance		Community lake Association		
COST:		Cost:	\$30,000	Cost:	\$10,200	Cost:	\$40000	Cost:	\$19,225	
IDENTIFIED AS A MAINE BUSINESS:		Ye	s X No	Yes 🗆 No X 🗆		Yes X□ No □		Yes 🛛 No X 🗆		
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.									
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25		20		11 22		22	18		
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20		17	9 20		16				
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10		10		10 10		10			
Section IV: Plant Survey	10		8		8 8		8			
Section V: Track record	20		20	13 20		14				
Section VI: Training and Experience	15		15		8	15		10		
TOTAL	<u>100</u>		<u>90</u>		<u>59</u>	<u>95</u>		<u>76</u>		
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Collins Pond Improvement Association		Friends of Cobbossee Watershed Annabessacook		Friends of Cobbossee Watershed Pleasant Pond/ Cobbosee Stream		Friends of Messalonskee		
COST:		Cost:	\$19,010	Cost:	\$30,000	Cost:	\$34,000	Cost:	\$36,168	
IDENTIFIED AS A MAINE BUSINESS:		Ye	s 🗆 No X 🗆	Ye	Yes X 🗆 No 🗀		Yes X□ No □		Yes X 🗌 No 🔲	
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.									
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	(xx)		19	18		20		19		
Section II. Local Support and Funding			15	20		20		18		
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	(xx)		8	10		10		10		
Section IV: Plant Survey			10	8		8		8		
Section V: Track record	(xx)		20	20		20		16		
Section VI: Training and Experience			14		15		15	5 11		
TOTAL	<u>100</u>		<u>86</u>		<u>91</u>	<u>93</u>		<u>82</u>		

State of Maine <u>RFP / Proposal Master Score Sheet</u>

If the Highest Scoring Bidder responded "No" to the question "Are you a Maine Business as defined in this RFP?" on their Proposal Cover Page, the <u>Maine</u> <u>Business Consideration Score Sheet</u> is to be used to determine which Bidder is to be conditionally awarded the contract.

SCORESHEET FOR RF	P# 20171 ⁻	1195 : Competitive	Grant Program to Rem	ove Invasive Aquatio	Plants	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Hogan and Whitney Pond Association	Jordan River Marina and Condo Association	Lakes Environmental Association	Midcoast Conservancy	
COST:		Cost: \$7,900	Cost: \$12,528	Cost: \$25,000	Cost: \$2,335	
IDENTIFIED AS A MAINE BUSINESS:		Yes X 🗆 No 🗆	Yes 🗆 No X 🗆	Yes X□ No □	Yes X 🗆 No 🛛	
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.					
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	21	17	22	20	
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	11	13	20	14	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	8	8	10	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	10	8	8	8	
Section V: Track record	20	15	15 17 20		17	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	13	14	15	14	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>83</u>	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Three Ponds Protective Associatio	on Town of Porter Conservation Commission	Raymond Waterways Protective Association	West Pond Association	
COST:		Cost: \$10,000	Cost: \$4,208	Cost: \$14,000	Cost: \$11,500	
IDENTIFIED AS A MAINE BUSINESS:		Yes □ No X□	Yes □ No X□	Yes □ No X□ Yes □ No X□		
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.					
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25	17	17	23	23	
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20	15	11	17	17	
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10	10	8	10	10	
Section IV: Plant Survey	10	8	8	8	8	
Section V: Track record	20	16	13	17	17	
Section VI: Training and Experience	15	10	9	13	12	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	76	66	88	87	



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$7,275.00** 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,

Jenuse Blonch the **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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



March 1, 2018

Charles Baeder Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance PO Box 250, 137 Main Street Belgrade Lakes, ME. 04918

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$36,158.00** to the following bidder.

Belgrade Regional Conservation 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,

Blanchitz That 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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

Donald Porter Community Lakes Association 17 Birch Ridge Drive Hartford, ME. 04220

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$14,266.00 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.

Donne Bonch Ho

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 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401

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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$15,995.00 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,

ense Hank to

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 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401

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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$28,758.00 to the following bidder.

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed, Pleasant Pond/ Cobbossee Stream

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303



GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$25,158.00 to the following bidder.

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed _ Annabessacook

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

AUGUST'A 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401

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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

Rachel Whitney Friends of Messalonskee 8 Golden Rod Lane Sidney, ME. 04330

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$27,093.00 to the following bidder.

Friends of 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 Lana V

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 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401

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



PAUL R LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$6,385.00** 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,

Onne Blan hitte

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **10,550.00** to the following bidder.

Jordan River Marina and 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,

enn Bucht

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303



PAUL R | FPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$25,158.00 to the following bidder.

Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely enne Black to **Denise Blanchette**

Maine Department of Environmental Protection **17 State House Station** Augusta ME 04333

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

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

,



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

Christian Oren Lakes Environmental Association 230 Main Street Bridgton, ME. 04009

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$33,386.00 to the following bidder.

Lakes Environmental Association

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

lenne Black A

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 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401

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

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

.



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

Garrison Beck Midcoast Conservancy 290 Atlantic Highway Edgecomb, ME. 04556

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$2,102.00** to the following bidder.

Midcoast 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, mer Black

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

AUGUST'A 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401

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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$3,366.00 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.; 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,

Blueluke

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 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401

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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



March 1, 2018

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of <u>\$11,875.00</u> 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,

ime R

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

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

,



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER

March 1, 2018

Wayne Sylvester Three Ponds Protective Association PO Box 1242 Milton, NH 03851

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$3,700.00** to the following bidder.

Three Ponds 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,

mu Blach to

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



PAUL R. LEPAGE GOVERNOR



PAUL MERCER COMMISSIONER

March 1, 2018

Dennis Spinney West Pond Association 235 Bolt Hill Road Eliot, ME. 03903

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201711195. 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 for Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of \$10,775.00 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

AUGUST'A 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017

BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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		
		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 <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the p therefore, not given to a review te 	x		
★			
Maine Busines	ss Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Deinte A	
Numerical Score:		Points A	warded
<u>Numerical Ocore</u> .			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	1
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	ę)
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	3
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	3
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	8	3
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	5	

STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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. 	3
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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. 	1
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	2
 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. 	2
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)
RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	3
 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	6
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	0
 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 	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
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.	
	4
financial accountability.	4
financial accountability. Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	4
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	4
 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. 	4
 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. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had 	4
 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. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 	4
 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. 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 	4
 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. 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. 	
 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. 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 the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control 	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Balch Lake Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	5
 Does the project team have additional training? 7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 5 = The team has some additional training 0 = The team has no additional training. 	3

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance DATE: February 12, 2018

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

Pass/F	ail Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
 (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. Th 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 proposal is to be rejected and,	x	
* *			
Maine Busine	ss Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:		<u>1 01113 / </u>	warucu
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	2
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	5

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	5
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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 #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance DATE: February 12, 2018

	•
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	r 10
 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 	b
 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in 	
scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
• 2= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	10
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 Applicant has 21 40% 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 	10
• $0 = No$	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
Flant Sulvey – Level 2 lequileu	Score (10)
• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum
Deas the applicant demonstrate autoneius aurovience with data management	Score (20)
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, 	
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
• 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.	
moderate success.	
 moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has 	7
 moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	7
 moderate success. 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
 moderate success. 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 projects? 	7

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance DATE: February 12, 2018

• 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	8
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	
species management.	
• 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
• 5 = The team has some additional training	
 0 = The team has no additional training. 	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Community Lakes Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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

Pass/Fa	il Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
 (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to r proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the pr therefore, not given to a review teat 	eview team for evaluation. If a oposal is to be rejected and,	x	
 ★ ★ 			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	8
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	6
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	3
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	4
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	6

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Community Lakes Association DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	3
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Community Lakes Association DATE: February 12, 2018

•	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.	
Dotho	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	
•	0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
CBI- (P	ART II)	Maximum
		Score (10)
•	10 = yes	10
	8 = no with explanation	
	0 = No	
Plant (Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
Fidints	Sulvey – Level z required	Score (10)
•	10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
•	8 = level2	
•	0 = No Survey	
• Track		Maximum
• Track	0 = No Survey	Maximum Score (20)
	0 = No Survey	
Does t	0 = No Survey Record (SEE previous grant reports) he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?	Score (20)
Does t	0 = No Survey Record (SEE previous grant reports) he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
Does t	0 = No Survey Record (SEE previous grant reports) he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management porting?	Score (20)
Does t	0 = No Survey 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	0 = No Survey 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	0 = No Survey 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	0 = No Survey 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	0 = No Survey 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	0 = No Survey 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) 5
Does t and re	0 = No Survey 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) 5
Does t and re	0 = No Survey 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) 5
Does t and re	0 = No Survey 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	Score (20) 5
Does t and re	0 = No Survey 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) 5
Does t and re	0 = No Survey 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	Score (20) 5
Does t and re • • Has th	0 = No Survey 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. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.	Score (20) 5
Does t and re Has th Has th	0 = No Survey 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. 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) 5 5 5
Does t and re • • Has th	0 = No Survey 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. 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 had moderate success. e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control ts?	Score (20) 5 5 5
Does t and re Has th Has th	0 = No Survey 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. 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) 5 5 5

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Community Lakes Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	5
Does the project team have additional training?	5
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
 5 = The team has some additional training 0 = The team has no additional training. 	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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

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 <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the pro- therefore, not given to a review tea 	eview team for evaluation. If a poposal is to be rejected and,	x	
*			
Maine Business	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Points A	warded:
<u>Numerical Score</u> :			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	9
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	5
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	}
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	4
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	6

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	5
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	2
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

	pes the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	9
	= A high level of community support and commitment is represented the proposal.	
	= The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in	
	ope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal.	
	= A low level of commitment and support for the proposal.	
	pject costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of	6
	ceeds the minimum 20% match?	0
	D = Applicant has > 41% matching funds	
	= Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds	
	= Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds	
	= Applicant has less than 20% match	
CBI- (PAR	••	Maximum
CDI- (PAR	1 11)	Score (10)
		50010 (10)
• 10) = yes	8
	= no with explanation	
	= No	
	vey – Level 2 required	Maximum
		Score (10)
• 10) = Greater than Level 2 survey	10
• 8	= level2	
• 0	= No Survey	
	= No Survey ord (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
Track Rec		Maximum Score (20) 7
Track Rec	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7=	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting?	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, eporting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5= re	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, eporting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management,	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 re • 0	applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability.	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5= re • 0= fir	applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and	Score (20)
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 = re • 0 = fir Has the ap	applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and nancial accountability.	Score (20) 7
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 re • 0 fir Has the ap • 6=	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.	Score (20) 7
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 re • 0 fir Has the ap • 6= su	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project	Score (20) 7
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 = re • 0 = fir Has the ap • 6= su	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project access.	Score (20) 7
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 re • 0 fir Has the ap • 6= su • 4	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project access. = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had	Score (20) 7
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 = re • 0 = fir Has the ap • 6= su • 4 = m • 0 =	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project access. = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had oderate success.	Score (20) 7
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 = re • 0 = fir Has the ap • 6= su • 4 = m • 0 = sh	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project ficcess. = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had oderate success. = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has	Score (20) 7
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 = re • 0 = fir Has the ap • 6= su • 4 = m • 0 = sh	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project access. = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had oderate success. = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has has hown little success.	Score (20) 7 6
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 = re • 0 = fir Has the ap • 6= su • 4 = m • 0 = sh Has the ap projects?	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. policant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project access. = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had oderate success. = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has has hown little success.	Score (20) 7 6
Track Reco Does the a and repor • 7= re • 5 fir Has the ap • 6= su • 4 • 6= su • 0 • 5 fir Has the ap projects?	ord (SEE previous grant reports) applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management ting? = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, porting and financial accountability. = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and hancial accountability. poplicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project faccess. = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had oderate success. = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has moven little success. poplicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	Score (20) 7 6

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: February 12, 2018

• 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	7
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	
species management.	
• 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
• 5 = The team has some additional training	
• 0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Annabessacook-DATE: February 12, 2018

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

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 pass/fai	review team for evaluation. If a roposal is to be rejected and,	x	
* *			
Maine Busines	ss Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Dointo A	wordod
Numerical Score:		Points A	warueu
			_
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	8
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8)
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points))
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	

RFP #: 201711195

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Annabessacook-DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	3
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Annabessacook-DATE: February 12, 2018

	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.	
 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
 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
CDI- (PART II)	Score (10)
	50010 (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	7
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.	6
• 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.	
	7
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	-
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?	-

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Annabessacook-DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	8
 Does the project team have additional training? 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 5 = The team has some additional training 0 = The team has no additional training. 	7

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Pleasant Pond Cobbossee Stream DATE: February 12, 2018

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

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 therefore, not given to a review teat 	eview team for evaluation. If a oposal is to be rejected and,	x	
•			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	3
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	3

RFP #: 201711195

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Pleasant Pond Cobbossee Stream DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	4
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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)

RFP #: 201711195

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Pleasant Pond Cobbossee Stream DATE: February 12, 2018

 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
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 	10
• $0 = No$	
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	7
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.	6
 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. 	
	1
	-
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	7
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects?	7
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control	7

RFP #: 201711195

RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbosssee Watershed, Pleasant Pond Cobbossee Stream DATE: February 12, 2018

• 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
• 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully.	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
• 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
• 5 = The team has some additional training	
• 0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee DATE: February 12, 2018

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

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 therefore, not given to a review ter 	eview team for evaluation. If a oposal is to be rejected and,	x	
 ▼ ◆ 			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		I	
		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	9
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	8
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	6
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	1

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	3
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee DATE: February 12, 2018

10
laximum
core (10)
0
laximum core (10)
laximum core (20)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Friends of Messalonskee DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	6
 Does the project team have additional training? 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 5 = The team has some additional training 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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

Pass/Fa	il Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
 ◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This section <u>must</u> be completed by RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.) 		x	
•			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		D i i i	· · ·
Numerical October		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	1
× × ×	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	1
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	2
			,
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
			_
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	5
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	3
× ·	, <i>i</i>		
		-	0
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	ŏ

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	5
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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 #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the preject? 	
the project?	5
 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	6
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	Ū
 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 	10
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	
	Maximum
	Score (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?	Score (20)
 Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting? 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, 	Score (20)
 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)
 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)
 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, reporting and financial accountability. 	Score (20)
 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)
 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and 	Score (20)
 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	Score (20) 5
 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, 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. 	Score (20) 5
 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, 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 	Score (20) 5
 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, 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 success. 	Score (20) 5
 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, 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 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had 	Score (20) 5
 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, 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 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 	Score (20) 5
 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, 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 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) 5
 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, 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 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) 5 5 5 5 5
 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, 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 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 had moderate success. 	Score (20) 5 5 5 5 5
 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, 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 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 had moderate success. 	Score (20) 5 5 5 5 5

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

• 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	7
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	
species management.	
• 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	6
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
 5 = The team has some additional training 	
• 0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Jordan River Marina Condo Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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

Pass/Fa	nil Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
 (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This section <u>must</u> be completed by RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.) 		x	
 ★ ★ 			
Maine Busines	s Consideration	_	
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Points A	warded
<u>Numerical Score</u> :			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	3
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	3
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	4

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Jordan River Marina Condo Association DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	3
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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 #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Jordan River Marina Condo Association DATE: February 12, 2018

• Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	7
• 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	6
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?	0
 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 - voc	8
• 10 = yes	8
• 8 = no with explanation	
$\bullet 0 = No$	Maximum
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Score (10)
• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 	
• 0 = No Survey	Maximum
	Maximum Score (20)
• 0 = No Survey	
• 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 	Score (20)
 0 = No Survey Track Record (SEE previous grant reports) Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting? 	Score (20)
 0 = No Survey 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)
 0 = No Survey 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)
 0 = No Survey 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)
 0 = No Survey 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, reporting and financial accountability. 	Score (20)
 0 = No Survey 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and 	Score (20)
 0 = No Survey 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	Score (20) 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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. 	Score (20) 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 	Score (20) 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 success. 	Score (20) 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had 	Score (20) 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 	Score (20) 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 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
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 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 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 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 6
 0 = No Survey 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, 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 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 6

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Jordan River Marina Condo Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
Does the project team have additional training?	7
 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 5 = The team has some additional training 	
 0 = The team has no additional training. 	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council DATE: February 12, 2018

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

Pass/Fa	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 p therefore, not given to a review to 	review team for evaluation. If a proposal is to be rejected and,	x	
*			
Maine Busine	ss Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			X
		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	D
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	10	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	2)
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	91	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council DATE: February 12, 2018

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1 -4)	Maximum 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. 	5
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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 #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council DATE: February 12, 2018

•		
	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	7
•	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	e 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	PART 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	Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum Score (20)
Does t	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	7
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
•	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	
•	4 – The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had	
•	moderate success.	
•	moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has	
•	moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success.	
	 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 	7
• Has th projec	 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 	7
	 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 	7

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council DATE: February 12, 2018

• 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	8
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	
species management.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
• 5 = The team has some additional training	
• 0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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/Fai	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 re- proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the pre- therefore, not given to a review tea 	eview team for evaluation. If a oposal is to be rejected and,	x	
*			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		<u>Points A</u>	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	2
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	5

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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. 	5
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	4
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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. Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3) 	3 Maximum
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 5)	Score (20)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association DATE: February 12, 2018

•	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	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	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	PART II)	Maximum
•== (·		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	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	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	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)
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)
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) 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.	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 	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.	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 	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 t and re • • Has th	 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. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has 	Score (20) 7
Does t and re • • Has th	 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. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control 	Score (20) 7 6
Does t and re Has th Has th	 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. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control 	Score (20) 7 6
Does t and re Has th Has th	 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. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. e applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control ts? 	Score (20) 7 6

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association DATE: February 12, 2018

• 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	8
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	
species management.	
• 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding	
invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	7
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
 5 = The team has some additional training 	
• 0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: MidCoast Conservancy DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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 te 	eview team for evaluation. If a oposal is to be rejected and,	x	
★			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
Numerical October		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	4
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	4

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: MidCoast Conservancy DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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. 	4
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	5
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	3
 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 #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: MidCoast Conservancy DATE: February 12, 2018

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: MidCoast Conservancy DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
Does the project team have additional training?	7
 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 5 = The team has some additional training 	
 0 = The team has no additional training. 	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission DATE: February 12, 2018

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		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
 ◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This 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 te 	review team for evaluation. If a roposal is to be rejected and,	x	
*			
Maine Busines	ss Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Points A	wordod
Numerical Score:			warueu
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	1
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	3
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	8
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	3
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	ç)
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	6	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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. 	4
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 = Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	2
 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. 	3
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission DATE: February 12, 2018

 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 5 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. 2 = A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 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 6 = Applicant has > 14% matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Roperation and the explanation 0 = No Plant Survey – Level 2 required Maximum Score (10) A locare than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey Track Record (SEE previous grant reports) Maximum Score (20) Does the applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data, reports and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data, reports and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The app	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	
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 > 14% matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 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) Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has a bistory of exemplary data, reports and financial accountability. 4 Has the applicant has a provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 4 Has the applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has not used past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderates success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success.	the project?	5
 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 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = 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 (20) 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey Track Record (SEE previous grant reports) Maximum Score (20) Does 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 a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 4 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has 		
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?610 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds8 = Applicant has > 1.40 % matching funds66 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds86 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds0 = Applicant has less than 20% matchMaximum score (10)CBI- (PART II)Maximum score (10)8• 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No88Plant Survey - Level 2 requiredMaximum score (10)• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey8Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)Maximum score (20)Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data, reports and financial accountability.4• 6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 4 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 0 = The applicant has not used past funds as specified and has had moderate success.0• 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has4		
 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 > 14% matching funds 8 = Applicant has > 14% matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 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) 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data, reports and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 		
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match exceeds the minimum 20% match? 6 10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds 6 0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds 8 0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds 8 0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds 8 8 0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds 8 8 0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds 8 8 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 8 8 0 = No Maximum score (10) 8 Plant Survey - Level 2 required Maximum score (20) 8 0 = No 9 8 9 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 8 8 0 = No Survey 8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 <		
match exceeds the minimum 20% match?Imatching funds10 = Applicant has > 41% matching funds8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds6 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching funds0 = Applicant has 21 - 30% matching fundsMaximum score (10)CBI- (PART II)CBI- (PART II)Maximum score (10)0 = yes88 = no with explanation0 = NoPlant Survey - Level 2 requiredMaximum score (10)10 = Greater than Level 2 survey88 = level20 = No Survey0 = No SurveyScore (20)Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)Maximum score (20)Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?57 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.50 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.4Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.46 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.44 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.00 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has4		6
 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 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey Track Record (SEE previous grant reports) Maximum Score (20) Does 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 a history of exemplary data, reports and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 = 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 		·
 8 = Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds 6 = Applicant has 21 – 30% matching funds 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match CBI- (PART II) 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, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 6 = The applicant has a bistory 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 had moderate success. 		
 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) Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 6 = The applicant has a bistory 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 had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 		
 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match CBI- (PART II) 10 = yes 8 = no with explanation 0 = No Plant Survey – Level 2 required 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey Maximum score (20) 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has a described and to a successful outcome. 6 = The applicant has a 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 had moderate success. 		
CBI- (PART II) Maximum Score (10) • 10 = yes 8 • 8 = no with explanation 8 • 0 = No Maximum Score (10) 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? 5 • 7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 • 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 • 0 = The applicant has growided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 4 • 6 = The applicant has a described and to a successful outcome. 4 • 6 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0		
Score (10)• 10 = yes • 8 = no with explanation • 0 = No8Plant Survey - Level 2 requiredMaximum Score (10)• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey • 8 = level2 • 0 = No Survey8Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)Maximum Score (20)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, reporting and financial accountability.5Has the 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 not used past funds as specified and has had moderate success. • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has4		Maximum
• 10 = yes8• 8 = no with explanation8• 0 = NoMaximum Score (10)Plant Survey - Level 2 requiredMaximum Score (10)• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey8• 8 = level28• 0 = No Survey8Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)Maximum Score (20)Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?5• 7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.4Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. • 6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 4 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.6• 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4		
 8 = no with explanation 8 = no with explanation 0 = No Plant Survey – Level 2 required 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? 7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 6 = 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 		
 8 = no with explanation 0 = No Plant Survey – Level 2 required 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? 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. 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 	• 10 = yes	8
 0 = No Plant Survey – Level 2 required 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey 8 = level2 0 = No Survey 8 a explicit 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 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 		
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? 5 • 7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 • 0 = The applicant has demonstrate competent data management, reporting and financial accountability. 4 • 6 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 4 • 6 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 • 0 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 0 • 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0		
Score (10)• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey8• 8 = level28• 0 = No SurveyMaximum Score (20)Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)Maximum Score (20)Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?5• 7 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.6• 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.4• 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 0 = The applicant has not used past funds as specified and has had moderate success.0• 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has10		Maximum
 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 = 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. 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 (10)
0 = No SurveyMaximum score (20)Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)Maximum score (20)Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?5• 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.6• 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.4Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.4• 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success.5		8
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)Maximum Score (20)Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?5• 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.4Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome. • 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 0 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.0• 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has4	• 8 = level2	
Score (20)Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?5• 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.5• 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data management, reporting and financial accountability.6• 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability.4• 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 0 = The applicant has not used past funds as specified and has had moderate success.0	• 0 = No Survey	
 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. 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 	Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	
 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. 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 	Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management	5
 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. 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 	and reporting?	
 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. 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 		
 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 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 	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 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 		
financial accountability.4Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome.4• 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success.4• 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success.6• 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has6		
 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. 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 	 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and 	
 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 		
 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 		4
 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 	 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project 	
 moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has 	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
• 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has		
	 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had 	
	 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had 	
	 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 	
Has the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control4	 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. 	
projects?	 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	4
 7 =Has extensive experience with management, removal and 	 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 the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control 	4
monitoring control projects	 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 the applicant successfully managed and monitored previous control projects? 7 = Has extensive experience with management, removal and 	4

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Town of Porter Conservation Commission DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	4
 Does the project team have additional training? 7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 5 = The team has some additional training 	5
• 0 = The team has no additional training.	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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 <u>must</u> be completed by RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		x	
 ★ ★ 			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		I	
		Points A	warded
<u>Numerical Score</u> :			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	5
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	}
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	6
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	0

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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. 	3
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	5
 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. 	3
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	3
 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 #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	
the project?	r 5
 10 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. 	I
 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
 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	Maximum
CBI- (PART II)	Score (10)
	30018 (10)
• 10 = yes	10
 8 = no with explanation 	
• $0 = No$	
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Maximum
Flant Sulvey – Level 2 required	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	Score (20) 6
and reporting?	
 and reporting? 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, 	
 and reporting? 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 	
 and reporting? 7= The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 5 = The applicant has demonstrated competent 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, reporting and financial accountability. 	
 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 	
 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. 	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. 	
 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. 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project 	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. 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 	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. 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 	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. 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. 	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. 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 	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. 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
 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. 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 had moderate success. 	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. 6= The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	6
 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. 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 had moderate success. 	6

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	5
 Does the project team have additional training? 7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 5 = The team has some additional training 0 = The team has no additional training. 	5

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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 <u>must</u> be completed by RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.) 		x	
*			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Deista	
Numerical Score:		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	3
· · · ·			
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
		•	•
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	3
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	1	7
			1
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	3
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	8
		0	0

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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. 	5
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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- 	5
 boes 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. Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	5 Maximum

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project? 	7
• 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
• $10 = \text{Applicant has} > 41\%$ 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 	10
• $0 = No$	
	Maximum
Plant Survey – Level 2 required	Score (10)
• 10 = Greater than Level 2 survey	8
• 8 = level2	
• 0 = No Survey	
	Maximum
Track Record (SEE previous grant reports)	Maximum 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)
 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, 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and 	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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 	Score (20) 7
 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, 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. 	Score (20) 7
 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, 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 	Score (20) 7
 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, 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 success. 	Score (20) 7
 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, 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 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 	Score (20) 7
 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, 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 success. 4 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has had 	Score (20) 7
 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, 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 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
 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, reporting and financial accountability. 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports and financial accountability. 0 = 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 4
 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, 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 success. 4 = The applicant has not used past funds as specified and has had moderate success. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has had moderate success. 	Score (20) 7 4
 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, 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 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 4

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 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
 8 = The team has documented extensive experience, and capacity to lead the project successfully. 	
• 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
• 7 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods	
 5 = The team has some additional training 	
 0 = The team has no additional training. 	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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	nil Criteria		
		Pass:	<u>Fail:</u>
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This section <u>must</u> be completed by RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)		x	
+ +			
Maine Busines	s Consideration		
		Yes	No
Did Bidder identify itself as a Maine Business:			Х
		Points A	warded
Numerical Score:			
Section I. Project Purpose and Scope	25 (Max: XX Points)	2	1
Section II. Local Support and Funding	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section III: Courtesy Boat Inspector Program	10 (Max: XX Points)	8	8
Section IV: Plant Survey	10 (Max: XX Points)	1	0
Section V: Track record	20 (Max: XX Points)	2	0
Section VI: Training and Experience	15 (Max: XX Points)	1	5

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

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 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. 	5
 Which priority does the project meet? 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	3
 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
 Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and 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. 	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. 	5
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 5, and Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum Score (20)

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

•		
•	Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project?	7
	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		10
Do the project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work and level of match 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	10
•	10 = yes	10
•	8 = no with explanation	
•	0 = No	B.4
Plants	urvey – 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	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	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	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) 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.	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	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.	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 	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 t and re • • Has th	 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. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has 	Score (20) 7
Does t and re • • Has th	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. 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 4
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. 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and has shown little success. 	Score (20) 7 4
Does t and re • • Has th • Has th	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. 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 4

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE AQUATIC PLANT REMOVAL BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: February 12, 2018

 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 species management. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	7
 Does the project team have additional training? 7 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey methods 	
 5 = The team has some additional training 0 = The team has no additional training. 	

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Balch Lake Improvement Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

OSHA compliance in process. Limited purpose and scope. Does not outline goals and objectives in any real detail. Did mention that they work the areas several times in one season, just no methods outlined. No maps or explanation of conditions. Just made 20% match for requested funds. Limited community support outlined n proposal.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Balch Lake Improvement Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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 in progress. Very brief Purpose and scope. Areas worked multiple times. No map very little explanation of conditions. 20% match.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Community Lakes Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Not Osha compliant. Limited detail in scope and purpose. Not sure they are using their crew for removal work. Will hire NEM for removal work and also use them to assist with barrier removal. Need more clarification on what lake barriers are on and being moved to and what roles are. Not clear how survey work will be done or by whom. Limited map. Limited monitoring outlined beyond 1st year removal. 60% cash match.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Community Lakes Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Not Osha compliant. Purpose to eradicate M.heterophyllum. remove all barriers volunteers do fragging. NEM to help with barrier removal on Christopher. Are map numbers reversed? Would be helpful to add lake name in tables. Application list CBI by volunteers. States entire lake survey completed but does not say how it was done.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

OSHA compliant, applying for new BPR. Clear short and long term goals and objective outlined. Surveying highly detailed, good description of staff roles and work to be done. Transition from past director has a good paper trail to follow. Detailed map of survey areas and work. Hiring NEM for 6 weeks. Greater than 40% cash match. Strong community support and past success outlined.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance DATE: 2/12/2018 EVALUATOR NAME: John McPherdan 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, Goals explicit. Re-staffing. Surveying and removal by BRCA staff is detailed. 6 weeks New England Milfoil. Long term activities for management include adopt a shoreline program. Starting season with full survey of great meadow stream. Field crew funds and director funds check for eligibility.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Excellent detail in purpose and scope. Clearly outlines goals and objectives short and long term. Map provided. No public ramp but working to look at Mill pond and surrounding areas that may be spread risk. Improving community support. 24% cash match.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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 for NEM, not applicable for volunteers. Goals to clear North portion of the lake. Discussion of L. Sebago and controlled nature of Collins. Survey in mill Pond. Dividing large mats into smaller more manageable mats for landowners. No public boat launch.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed - Annabessacook DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Excellent detail in purpose and scope. Detailed survey plans for infestation and beyond to other areas and lakes at risk. Hiring NEM for 6 weeks. Detailed community support and campaign outlined. Good Map provided. Significant CBI coverage during busy hours. Greater than 40% cash match. Some match outlined unsure if anticipated or in hand?

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed - Annabessacook DATE: 2/12/2018 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. Overall great intro for application. Hire NEM. Survey team for Annabessacook and Cobbossee Lake. No clear objective/goal. Included extraneous information to plant removal grant. Application does not clearly connect sites with map. Also, Table 3 does not identify specific areas to be worked. No mention of long term monitoring. Lots of community involvement. All funds for removal by NEM (6 weeks). Survey no indicated though we know it is level 3 from our experience on the lake.
RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed – Pleasant Pond /Cobb Stream DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Excellent detail in purpose and scope. Removal at ramps emphasized Using their own crew OSHA certified new PBR. Lots of community support from dock space service and plant composting. Map provided and linked to table. Greater than 40% cash match.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed – Pleasant Pond /Cobb Stream DATE: 2/12/2018 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, yes. Survey early season and throughout season. States what they will be doing for 2018 could have clearer goals stated. DASH and barriers. Removal at boat access is emphasized. Reasonable estimate of area cleared. Summary of 2017 work limited by the map, but clearly linked on tables 3 and 4. 40 days of removal using own crew. Strong community support list several different partners. Lots of CBI time

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Friends of Messalonskee DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

Plan is limited. It has lots of background but limited goals. Not detailed in how project outcomes will
happen, boat access is listed as a priority. Map provided. OSHA compliant and new PBR. Very large
budget for barriers. Community support letter provided

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Friends of Messalonskee DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

Claim significant reduction in Oakland basin using burlap. Purpose has good background but no specific goals or objectives. Achieved goal of no plants carried out by boats, but do not see documentation of this. Boat access is top priority. Detailed description for area. Sounds promising.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council DATE: 2/12/2018 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 plans and goals outlined in purpose. Project aims to reduce invasive plant spread by working channels and boat launch areas. Significant cash match more than 100% of funds requested. Survey work has been done but not sure of the extent that it has been done beyond minimum needed for removal operations.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Hogan and Whitney Pond Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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. Clear goals. Hiring DASH company to address north end of Hogan. Barriers in deeper areas for 2018. Specific areas to be cleared including for boat access. CBI training for campground. Table 2 says infestation has spread to Whitney. Is this true? Fall survey noted. Entire lake survey planned.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Jordan River Marina Condo Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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 from last year's grant. Goal of eradication and clear outlined that management must happen
for years to achieve goals. Indian point involved. 20% match. Hiring NEM for 14 days. Unclear on how
much survey work has been done. Maps provided but lack detail.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Jordan River Marina Condo Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

Portion of the narrative is not up to date. Goals are to remove all plants found. 14 days of NEM.
Continue indefinitely or until plants are eradicated. Indian Point letter of support. Local business
involved but no larger community involvement. Local team has no additional training.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council DATE: 2/12/2018 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 plans and goals outlined in purpose. Project aims to reduce invasive plant spread by working channels and boat launch areas. Significant cash match more than 100% of funds requested. Survey work has been done but not sure of the extent that it has been done beyond minimum needed for removal operations.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

OSHA certified. Information targets of % measured? Boat ramps to 0% Overall goal 1% infestation. All grant funds requested for divers. Application does not detail level of community involvement. 100% match. Difficult to assess survey level application says level 1 but we know they do more.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Overall detailed summary of removal in all areas to be worked. Specific outline to deal with new area of infestation and clear plans and goals to maintain areas already clear. Survey plan outlined including new areas. Explain role of staff and crew. Team has significant experience and success working infested areas. Greater than 50% cash match. New PBR and OSHA compliant

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

Detailed summary of removal by area. Dates are detailed on tables. Survey crew well described. Significant cash match and community involvement.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

Narrative unclear in who will be doing the work or when. Community support not well demonstrated in application. 25% cash match.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

No OSHA, not required for work. State removal within two weeks of established plants. Does this indicate that they will survey every two weeks? Weekly surveys in Cranberry Cove.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Town of Porter Conservation Commission DATE: 2/12/2018 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 rough plan, few details no long-term planning or goals. Map not clearly linked to strategies. Limited community partners of support 20% match. Limited experience with removal efforts. Does mention survey work up and down stream.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Town of Porter Conservation Commission DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

OSHA compliant. DASH and volunteers working areas DASH cannot get. Mapping with agency staff. Confusing locations on map. No clear public access point.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Concise summary that has some long term and immediate goals. Describe survey and mapping start and end of season. Discuss some of the obstacles to be overcome as they proceed with some areas of work. OSHA compliant new PBR. Strong cash match.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

OSHA in progress. Lots of description and then goal stated. Additional notes provided were helpful. All work done with local crew. Start and end of season mapping.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Plan not complete, does not mention all methods of management happening on the pond. Discusses survey work to be done but not clear on level of volunteer involvement. Map not well linked to plan. Does not describe any long-term goals or plans for the project. Briefly mentions preventing spread to other waterbodies. Will hire contractor for removal work.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

OSHA compliant. Plant survey by volunteers, YCIASP and agencies. No mention of herbicide
treatment. States volunteers to remove plant, not certain where. Brief mention of control to prevent
spread to other lakes. Used DEP/DES map but not clearly linked to table.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: West Pond Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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:

Excellent clear summary and description of work done and to be done. Provides objectives goals and details to who will be doing the work when. Map clearly linked to work plan. Good community support on volunteer DASH. Hiring NEM all funds will be used for divers. Complete survey of the pond done. OSHA compliant new PBR. 41% cash match.

RFP #: 201711195 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants BIDDER NAME: West Pond Association DATE: 2/12/2018 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.

OSHA complaint NEM, not required of volunteer crew. Good purpose and scope. Provides context and hints at objectives, for example states to control but not to eradicate. Map and tables clearly linked. Good clear descriptions. Mentioned volunteers on DASH(45!), surveying, and pulling.

STATE OF MAINE **DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection**



Paul R. LePage Governor

Paul Mercer Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT RFP #: 201711195

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal

I. John McPhedran

accept the

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

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

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

I understand that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disgualified 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

26 february 2018





Paul R. LePage Governor

Paul Mercer Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT RFP #: 201711195

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal

accept the I. Denise Blanchette 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 disgualified 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.

June Blanchette

<u>2/21/18</u> Date

Rev. Sept. 2013