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 Procurement Services for review/approval.

SCORESHEET FC	R RFP# 2	2018102	212: Competitive	e Grant I	Program for Inva	sive Aqu	atic Plant Remov	/al	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Community Lakes Association Shagg Pond		Community Lakes Association Christopher		7 Lakes Alliance		Friends of Messalonskee	
	COST:		(\$14,704)	Cost: (\$7470)		Cost: (\$55,000)		Cost:	(\$38,314)
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives	(45)		(31) (36) (38)		(40)				
Plant Survey	(10)		(10)		(10)		(10)		(10)
Local Resources and Match	(20)		(11)		(6)		(18)		(15)
Track Record/Experience/Training	(25)		(20)		(20)	(19)			(19)
TOTAL	<u>100</u>		<u>(72)</u>		<u>(72)</u>		<u>(85)</u>		<u>(84)</u>
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Lovel Invasive Plant Prevention Commission		West Pond Association		Raymond Waterways Protective Association		Thompson Lakes Environmental Association	
COST:			(\$3,920)	Cost:	(\$15,000)	Cost:	(\$12,000)	Cost:	(\$20,000)
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives	(45)		(40)		(42)		(40)		(32)
Plant Survey	(10)		(10)		(10)		(10)		(8)
Local Resources and Match	(20)		(12)		(20)		(17)		(14)
Track Record/Experience/Training	(25)		(23)		(25)		(22)		(17)
TOTAL	<u>100</u>		<u>(85)</u>		<u>(97)</u>		<u>(89)</u>		<u>(72)</u>

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 Procurement Services for review/approval.

SCORESHEET FOR RFP# 201810212: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal										
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:			Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commission		Jordan River Marina Condo Association		Hogan and Whitney Pond		Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed. Pleasant/Horseshoe/Cobb. Stream	
COST:		Cost: (\$40,000)		Cost:	Cost: (\$8,818)		Cost: (\$9,160)		(\$20,000)	
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.							 		
Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives	(45)		(40)		(34)		(41)		(32)	
Plant Survey	(10)	<u> </u>	(7)	<u> </u>	(10)	<u> </u>	(6)	+	(10)	
Local Resources and Match	(20)	 	(20)	+	(6)	<u> </u>	(12)	+	(16)	
Track Record/Experience/Training	(25)	<u> </u>	(24)	<u>+</u>	(15)		(19)		(23)	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>		<u>(91)</u>	1	(65)		<u>(78)</u>		<u>(81)</u>	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Lake		C W	Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Annabessacook Lake		Collins Pond Improvement Association		Balch Lake Improvement Committee	
	COST:	Cost:	(\$8,000)	Cost:	(\$24,000)	Cost:	(\$27236.00)	Cost:	(\$13,000)	
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.									
Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives	(45)		(36)		(35)		(40)		(30)	
Plant Survey	(10)	<u> </u>	(10)	<u> </u>	(10)	(10)		<u> </u>	(10)	
Local Resources and Match	(20)	 	(18)	<u> </u>	(20)		(10)		(18)	
Track Record/Experience/Training	(25)	<u>+</u>	(23)	(22)		<u>+</u>	(25)		(20)	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>(87)</u>			<u>(87)</u>		<u>(85)</u>		(78)	

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 Procurement Services for review/approval.

SCORESHEET FOR RFP# 201810212: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal									
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY: COST:		Lakes Environmental Association Sebago Lake		Lakes Environmental Association Sebago Cove		Lakes Environmental Association Long Lake		Lakes Environmental Association Songo Brandy	
		Cost: (\$9,540)		Cost: (\$12,400)		Cost: (\$9,840)		Cost:	Cost: (\$15,900)
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives	(45)	(35)		(37)		(43)		(38)	
Plant Survey	(10)		(8)		(8)		(8)		(10)
Local Resources and Match	(20)		(15)		(15)		(18)	(15)	
Track Record/Experience/Training	(25)	(25)		(23)		(23)		(23)	
TOTAL	<u>100</u>		<u>(83)</u>		<u>(83)</u>		<u>(92)</u>		<u>(86)</u>
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Three Ponds Protective Association		Little Sebago lake Association					
COST:		Cost:	(\$10,000)	Cost:	(\$15,000)				
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives	(45)		(36)		(41)				
Plant Survey	(10)		(10)		(6)				
Local Resources and Match	(20)		(14)		(20)				
Track Record/Experience/Training	(25)		(15)		(25)				
TOTAL	<u>100</u>		<u>(75)</u>		<u>(92)</u>				





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of <u>\$37,125.00</u> to the following bidder:

7 Lakes Alliance

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303



GERALD D. REID COMMISSIONER

March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$10,275.00** 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,

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



GERALD D. REID

March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$_4,648.00_** to the following bidder:

Community Lakes Association for Bryant(Christopher) Pond

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303



GERALD D. REID COMMISSIONER

March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$11,159.00** to the following bidder:

Community Lakes Association for Shagg Pond

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$_22,437.00_** to the following bidder:

Collins Pond Improvement Association

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **§ 19,525.00** to the following bidder:

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed, Annabessacook Lake

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$_5,525.00** to the following bidder:

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed, Cobbossee Lake

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **§15,925.00** to the following bidder:

Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed, Pleasant Pond/Cobbossee Stream

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303



GERALD D. REID COMMISSIONER

March 18, 2020

Danielle Boutin Friends of Messalonskee P.O. Box 532 Oakland, ME. 04963

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **<u>\$28,576.00</u>** to the following bidder:

Friends of the Messalonskee

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of <u>\$6,627.00</u> to the following bidder:

Hogan and Whitney Pond Association

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **<u>\$5,861.00</u>** to the following bidder:

Jordan River Marina Condo Association

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$35,925.00** to the following bidder:

Lake Arrowhead Conservation Council

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **<u>\$7,765.00</u>** to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Long Lake

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of <u>\$9,705.00</u> to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Cove

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$_6,988.00_** to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Sebago Lake

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$12,235.00** to the following bidder:

Lakes Environmental Association, Brandy, Songo River & Bayou

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of <u>\$ 3,920.00</u> to the following bidder:

Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

STATE OF MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$12,175.00** to the following bidder:

Little Sebago Lake Association

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303 PRESQUE ISLE 1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769 (207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

STATE OF MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of <u>\$ 9,325.00</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,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303 PRESQUE ISLE 1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769 (207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

STATE OF MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS GOVERNOR



March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of <u>\$13,925.00</u> to the following bidder:

Thompson Lake Environmental Association

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303 PRESQUE ISLE 1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769 (207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

STATE OF MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION





March 18, 2020

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

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

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **<u>\$7,425.00</u>** to the following bidder.

Milton 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,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303 PRESQUE ISLE 1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769 (207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

STATE OF MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION





March 18, 2020

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

Subject: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201810212. Competitive Grant For The Removal of Invasive Aquatic plants.

This letter is regarding the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for **Competitive Grant for the Removal of Invasive Aquatic Plants**. The Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award in the amount of **\$12,925.00** to the following bidder:

West Pond Association

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

AUGUSTA 17 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017 (207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826 BANGOR 106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6 BANGOR, MAINE 04401 (207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584 PORTLAND 312 CANCO ROAD PORTLAND, MAINE 04103 (207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303 PRESQUE ISLE 1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769 (207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance DATE: 2/12/2020 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 <u>required</u> that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives Descriptive narrative on history of infestation and methods used. Did not list low density/high spread areas as highest priority for removal. Reducing weeks worked by contractor from 10-7
- II. Plant Survey Adopt a shoreline, survey most areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Strong financial match and community support
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Project since 2012 this is the 3rd year for this manager. Crew is new each year.
 - Has LSM training late last season, but most crew will not return

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: BLIMP DATE: 2/12/2020 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

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

consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives

 Narrative lacks detail yet lists general responsibilities. Hand drawn map. Significant reduction in infestation after NH herbicide treatment.
- II. Plant Survey
 - At least level 2 survey, no public access.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Has some resources. New coordinator and recent new members of local support.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - New coordinator (her second season), new field person last season, 2 of 3 hired divers more than 4 years' experience.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training late last season, and NH invasive removal training

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: CLA- Bryant Pond (Lake Christopher) DATE: 2/12/2020 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 <u>required</u> that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Narrative lacks detail yet lists general responsibilities. Map is adequate but does not really show areas worked, shows areas of infestation.
- II. Plant Survey
 - At least level 2 survey, no public access.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Has some resources. 16% cash match. Coordinator 3+ years. Limited volunteers listed.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - New coordinator (her second season), new field person last season, 2 of 3 hired divers more than 4 years' experience.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: CLA- Shagg Pond DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Methods vague. Goal of eradication, limited plan on getting there. No motorized boats, less risk of spread. 80% decrease in infestation but no real description of how this is measured. Map and narrative are no linkable (Do not know what areas on the map where described in the narrative because the map is not labeled.) Monitoring limited to removal.
- II. Plant Survey
 - At least level 2 survey, no public access.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Has some resources. 30% cash match. Coordinator 3+ years. Limited volunteers listed.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator now working for a removal contractor.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Collins Pond DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
- Good clear description of the effort and the challenges. Clear outline on progress and building off previous years progress. Hand drawn map but connected sites through the narrative and table. No ramp, limits spread risk. Clear idea of what it would take to get the infestation to a managed level.
- II. Plant Survey
 - At least level 2 survey, no public access.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Has some resources. 25% cash match. Use local divers and boats for follow up after the contactor. volunteers do some barriers and frag gathering.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator been with the organization many years. Hirer local contractor. Increasing efforts.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. More than 5 years.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: FOCW Cobbossee Stream_Horseshoe_Pleasant Lake DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Description of infestation lacks detail. 10-13% of boat inspections. High traffic dense infestation. NEM contracted 6 weeks. Priority on launches and boat traffic areas, working up stream down. Seasonal team to do barriers in Horseshoe, plus training property owners.
- II. Plant Survey
 - Does annual survey of areas to work and additional areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Has significant partners and resources. More than 100% match. Coordinator has worked for 10+ years with invasive aquatic species in Maine
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator been with the organization many years. Increasing efforts.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Has significant survey and plant training experience.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Friends Of Messalonskee DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- *I.* Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Very detailed description of the work previously done and plans for the upcoming season. Each area worked described individually in detail. Prioritizing areas of potential spread within and outside of the lake.
- II. Plant Survey
 - Does annual survey of areas to work and additional areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - 36% match. Has partners and resources. Good description of recruitment strategies and outreach to sustain the program over time. More than 100% match. Coordinator has worked for 10+ years with invasive aquatic species in Maine. Lead diver has extensive experience with the group.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator is beginning 3rd season. Increasing efforts.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Has significant survey and plant training experience.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: FOCW Cobbossee Lake DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Description of infestation lacks detail. Mentions efforts in 2019 and plan to build off this work. Testing new management strategies for EPFB but does not describe them.
- II. Plant Survey
 - Does annual full lake survey
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Has significant partners and resources. More than 100% match. Coordinator has worked for 10+ years with invasive aquatic species in Maine
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator been with the organization many years. Increasing efforts.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Has significant survey and plant training experience.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: FOCW Annabessacook Lake DATE: 2/12/2020 EVALUATOR NAME: Denise Blanchette EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Environmental Protection

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by <u>individual</u> evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Clear description of infestation and areas worked and methods. Mentions efforts in 2019 and plan to build off this work. 10 weeks hiring contractor. Describes plan for 2021
- II. Plant Survey
 - Does annual full lake survey
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Has significant partners and resources. More than 100% match. Coordinator has worked for 10+ years with invasive aquatic species in Maine
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator been with the organization many years. Hirer local contractor. Increasing efforts.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Has significant survey and plant training experience..

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: West Pond Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives

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

Descriptive narrative that clearly defines areas worked in 2019 and areas to be worked in 2020. Has systematic approach to infestation, only carry in ramp, that limit spread issues. Hire New England Milfoil and have volunteer crew follow up

- II. Plant Survey Greater than Level 2 survey
- III. Local Resources and match Good financial support from local resources, Excellent volunteer contributions. Home grown group that has been operating for many years and also hire professional group for brunt of the work.
- *IV.* Track Record and Training Completes reports on time with attention to detail.
- V. Training and Experience

Coordinators and lead diver have been with the program since the beginning. They are working on sustainability. Have detailed data on work done since beginning of the program.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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:

I. Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives

Limited description of work done in 2019 and plans to build off in 2020. Does have maps that link to work done previous year. Transition year from herbicide treatment (managed by DEP) to management by group. Describes anticipated volunteer effort to survey and assist professional contractors.

- II. Plant Survey Greater than Level 2 survey
- *III.* Local Resources and match Financial support from local resources, and businesses. Hiring NEM 5 weeks.
- *IV.* Track Record and Training Completes reports on time with attention to detail.
- V. Training and Experience

Coordinators been with the program since the beginning (5 years) However herbicide has been the primary means of treatment and managed by the state. This will be TTPA's first year managing the Maine infestation manually.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Thompson Lake environmental Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Prioritize pine point cove, that has limited traffic, but dense infestation. Uncertain about the extent of infestation several different acreage and areas listed in report. Adequate maps.
- II. Plant Survey
 - Does annual survey of areas to work and some additional areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Strong financial and organizational support, limited volunteer support from residents. Only 2 volunteers
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Lead divers has 4+ years' experience, most of the crew has less than 2 years' experience.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

I. Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives

Descriptive narrative that clearly defines areas worked and level of infestation.

- II. Plant Survey Greater than Level 2 survey
- III. Local Resources and match Financial support from local resources, and businesses. Limited volunteer contributions. Home grown group that has been operating for many years. Current coordinator been there for 3+ years. Dive crew has one returning member. Run and maintain their own DASH
- *IV.* Track Record and Training Completes reports on time with attention to detail.
 - Training and Experience Coordinators been with the program since the beginning been managing the field operations 3+ years.

V.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Little Sebago lake Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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:

I. Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives

Descriptive narrative that clearly defines areas worked in 2019 and areas to be worked in 2020. Looking to do a full lake survey to better define areas with invasive plants. Prioritizes high risk areas.

- II. Plant Survey Greater than Level 2 survey
- *III.* Local Resources and match Strong financial support from local resources, good volunteer contributions. Home grown group that has been operating for many years and also trained other groups on setting up.
- *IV.* Track Record and Training Completes reports on time with attention to detail.
- V. Training and Experience

Coordinators and lead diver have been with the program since the beginning. They are working on sustainability and have other divers that have been on for 5+ years. Have detailed data on work done since beginning of the program.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Lovell Invasive Plant Prevention Committee (Cushman Pond) DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives Descriptive narrative on history of infestation and methods used. Did describe some risk of spread and efforts to prevent.
- II. Plant Survey
 - Most areas of the pond surveyed by diver multiple times.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - 25% Match. More than 10+ years dive team
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Reports done as expected. 3rd year for this manager. Divers have 10+ years
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LEA_ Songo Brandy DATE: 2/12/2020 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:

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Prioritize spread areas. Good maps. Links last year's work to this coming season objective. Making progress after flare of cleared areas in Brandy. Songo looking better needs more work some large patches.
- II. Plant Survey

V.

- Does annual survey of areas to work and some additional areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Strong financial and organizational support, limited volunteer support from residents.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator is beginning 2nd season. Increasing efforts.
 - Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Lead divers have 4+ years' experience, most of the crew has 2+ years or better experience.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LEA_ Sebago Lake DATE: 2/12/2020 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:

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Prioritize spread areas. Good maps. Links last year's work to this coming season objective. Adding new area to work.
- II. Plant Survey

V.

- Does annual survey of areas to work and some additional areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Strong financial and organizational support, limited volunteer support from local residents.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator is beginning 2nd season. Increasing efforts.
 - Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Lead divers have 4+ years' experience, most of the crew has 2+ years or better experience.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LEA_ Sebago Cove DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - Prioritize spread areas. Good maps. Describes positive success last season and building
 off this, after having some setbacks the previous year.
- II. Plant Survey
 - Does annual survey of areas to work and some additional areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Strong financial and organizational support, sporadic support from local residents.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator is beginning 2nd season. Increasing efforts.
- V. Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training. Lead divers have 4+ years' experience, most of the crew has 2+ years or better experience.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Lakes Environmental Association_ Long Lake DATE: 2/12/2020 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:

I. Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives

Descriptive narrative that clearly defines areas worked in 2019 and areas to be worked in 2020. Prioritizes high risk areas and continued survey.

II. Plant SurveyGreater than Level 2 surveyIII. Local Resources and match

Strong financial support from local resources, smaller volunteer contirbutions.

- *IV.* Track Record and Training New field coordinator, completes paperwork as expected.
- V. Training and Experience Two lead divers with more than 4 years' experience. Overall organization has several years' experience. Self-run DASH and dive crews.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commision DATE: 2/12/2020 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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives

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

Descriptive narrative that clearly defines areas worked in 2019 and areas to be worked in 2020. Identifies high risk areas of spread and means to manage. Adequate map. Clear estimate on how much they would like to reduce the infestation in 2020 after work in 2019.

- II. Plant Survey Greater than Level 2 survey
- *III.* Local Resources and match Strong financial support from local resources, good volunteer contributions. Home grown group that has been operating for many years and trained other groups on setting up.

IV. Track Record and Training

Completes reports on time.Crew has extensive training on invasive plant management, operations,

V. Training and Experience

Coordinators and lead divers have been with the program since the beginning. They are a home-grown group that has a demonstrated capacity to be sustainable and productive. They are working on sustainability and have other divers that have been on for 5+ years.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Jordan River Marian and Condo Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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:

I. Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives

9 dives, localized area restricted to owners of slips and campground

- II. Plant Survey Level 2 survey
- *III. Local Resources and match limited Local collaborators.*
- *IV.* Track Record and Training New coordinator, completes paperwork as expected.
- V. Training and Experience Hire New England Milfoil, little volunteer involvement..

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Hogan Pond DATE: 2/12/2020 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:

- I. Project Purpose and Scope Goals and Objectives
 - No public access, one campground, connected to Whitney Pond. Prioritize spread prevention to adjacent lake. Poor map. Describes positive success last season and building off this. Hire NEM contractor. Locals do follow up.
- II. Plant Survey

V.

- Does annual survey of areas to work and some additional areas.
- III. Local Resources and match
 - Limited community resources.
- IV. Track Record and Training
 - Completed reports as expected. Coordinator is beginning 5th season. Increasing efforts.
 - Training and Experience
 - Has LSM training and diver training.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Summary details potential for in-lake spread
- Summary statement of eradication v. management
- Goal to cover 2 acres with bottom barrier
- II. Local Support and Funding
 - Coordinating efforts with FOM
- III. Plant Survey
 - Details new plant survey method started in 2019
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record
 - Volunteers will be trained to remove plants

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: West Pond Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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 (REP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for

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.

- Project Purpose and Scope
 Clear description of approach to managing CLP
- II. Local Support and Funding
 - Strong lake association support and participation
- III. Plant Survey
- *IV.* Training, Experience and Track Record
 - Detailed description of project development since 2005

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Thompson Lake Environmental Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
 - Description of infestation a little confusing regarding area removed
 - Moving from reclamation to maintenance
 - Goal: manage remaining 2 acres and reduce annual management to 5-6 weeks
- II. Local Support and Funding
 - Raised \$300K of \$500K fundraising goal
- III. Plant Survey
 - Divers will spend 20-25 hours surveying high risk areas
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record
RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Raymond Waterways Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Concise and clear goal in project summary
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - Proposal specifies start and end of season surveys and mapping
 - Plant density description is a bit unclear
- *IV.* Training, Experience and Track Record
 - Current coordinator has multiple years' experience

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Volunteers to remove N. minor
- Not explicit about proposed use of DEP funds; strategy and timeline explains more
- II. Local Support and Funding
 - May hire YCIASP to assist with training and surveying

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

- III. Plant Survey
 - Survey by TPPA
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Little Sebago DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Most removal after July 4; starting with Mumford and Beaver coves
- II. Local Support and Funding
- \$23K annually from LSLA membership, \$13K from towns
- III. Plant Survey
 - Monthly plant surveys by LSLA at boat ramp
 - Concerned that there may be other areas of infestation
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LIPPC DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope • Little information on the map
- II. Local Support and Funding
- Long term local involvement for more than 20 years
- III. Plant Survey
- *IV.* Training, Experience and Track Record
 - Local and experienced divers involved over the years

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LEA Songo River and Brandy Pond DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- 2020 goal: address dense regrowth in back coves over last 2 years (Songo River)
- Using small barriers and DASH
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - Surveying remainder of Songo River in 2020
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LEA Sebago Lake DATE: 2/12/2020 EVALUATOR NAME: John McPhedran EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Environmental Protection

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by <u>individual</u> evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is <u>required</u> that each individual evaluator make notes for

each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Expanding work to Northwest River in 2020
- Frye Island invasive milfoil "virtually eliminated"
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LEA Sebago Cove DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Goal: maintain reduced invasive milfoil and prevent spread via fragmentation
- Sites are not ordered by priority for 2020 but are for 2021
- *II.* Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - Will visit priority sites at least twice during the season
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LEA Long Lake DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- 2020: remove remaining invasive milfoil with hand-pulling
- Goal: functional eradication
- *II.* Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - Will survey after removal to assess need for additional removal; also surveying potential habitat with sea sleds
- *IV.* Training, Experience and Track Record
 - Training not specified

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: JRMCA DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Brief summary of project
- Hiring NEM
- Goal of maintenance control after three more years
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Hogan and Whitney Ponds Association DATE: 2/12/2020 EVALUATOR NAME: John McPhedran EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Environmental Protection

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by <u>individual</u> evaluators for this Paguest for Proposals (PEP) proposal. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for

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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Highest priority is to keep invasive milfoil out of Whitney
- Goal of overall effort: reduce to maintenance level of annual removal and eliminate need for grant funding
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Friends of Messalonskee DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Cross-training CBIs and DASH crew
- Goals listed
- II. Local Support and Funding
 - Collaborating with Colby, Quarry Rd Recreation Area
- III. Plant Survey
 - Detailed description of infestation by area
 - Surveying Messalonskee Stream in 2020
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record
 - Recent success with use of burlap for barriers

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: FOCW-Pleasant, Cobbossee Stream, Horseshoe DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Maps and interface with site listings should be clearer
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - 2019 survey from outlet of Cobbossee to Horseshoe Pd
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: FOCW-Cobbossee DATE: 2/12/2020 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 <u>required</u> that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Testing EFB management strategies little detail in scope
- Map doesn't identify sites on management plan
- *II.* Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - 2-person survey team
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: FOCW-Annabessacook DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- If no herbicide treatment, DASH will be primary method
- Project scope lacked some detail, e.g., no reference to SUR
- II. Local Support and Funding
 - FOCW does considerable work in local schools
- III. Plant Survey
 - 2-person plant survey team; full survey in June
 - Areas of concern identified
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Includes description of uses affected by infestation
- Good overall purpose statement
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - Clear description of status of infestation
 - Map could be improved
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: CLA – Shagg Pond DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- States that invasive milfoil can be eradicated from the pond
- Claims milfoil reduced to date by 80%
- Lacks detail on timing and order of work
- II. Local Support and Funding
- III. Plant Survey
 - Uses Google My Maps to show survey/removal results
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: CLA – Bryant Pond DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Shifting focus from Pump House cove to outlet cove
- Application states close to eradication
- Doesn't state contractor for removing barriers in outlet
- II. Local Support and Funding
- Just made 20% match threshold
- III. Plant Survey
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: BLIMP DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Working mid-May through mid-October
- Sites not ordered by priority
- *II.* Local Support and Funding
 - Description of match generally describes sources of funding.
- III. Plant Survey
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER NAME: LACC DATE: 2/12/2020 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.

- I. Project Purpose and Scope
- Goal: remove 25% of remaining invasive milfoil
- Removal at boat access sites a priority
- II. Local Support and Funding
 - Significant local resources; long-term local support
- III. Plant Survey
 - Survey method is unclear
- IV. Training, Experience and Track Record

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : 7 lakes Alliance DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all a all a sto be rejected and,	N/A	
◆			
•			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	8
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	8
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	1	9
		1	
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	5

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : 7 lakes Alliance DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder 7 Lakes Date 2/13/20 Total Score

85

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	9
 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. 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	5

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : 7 lakes Alliance DATE: 2/14/2020

	•
• 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 proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	5
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off 	
 8 – There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built of previous years. 	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	7
long-term outcome?	
• 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
• 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum (10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
years	
• 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	18
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e. does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
articulated and consistent over time.	
 articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : 7 lakes Alliance DATE: 2/14/2020

 of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or less) community support and involvement. 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data management and reporting?	4
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, 	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	6
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	n
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consister	nt
quality work.	
• 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	4
• 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : 7 lakes Alliance DATE: 2/14/2020

•	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	1
	year	l

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail (Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This set RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revie proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all all all all all all all all all	N/A	
◆			
▼			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	4	2
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	7

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder WEST

Total Score 00)	97	Scoring for	Plant Control Gra	ants (Maxim
,	se and Scope (Part	III- Section 1)		Maximum (45)
effective meth • 10 = th metho • 6 = the metho • 2 = The	nods to address the ne project has clearly ds are appropriate t e project has identifi ds are vague or infe	ves clearly stated, with issue with a high likeli y stated goals and objective to achieve the objective ied goals and objective easible. goals and objectives a	hood of success? ectives and ves. es, but the	10
 5 = First plant i 3 = Second for the second plant i 	nfestations with pot cond priority is giver sive aquatic plants v h (e.g., managing in areas with high boa	o projects addressing i tential for eradication. n to projects aimed at within and between w wasive plants near boa	reducing spread aterbodies at access points	4
Does the appl priority, uses 5 = Pro map 3 = the	icant clearly define t affected and plant ir pposed project links e proposed project li	the current conditions nventory) and provide two or more specific of ists one condition and st or describe the curr	i (plant density, a map? conditions with map	3
launches, trav • 5 = Yes • 3 = Pri	el channels, recreat s, the project prioriti	izes all high risk spread high risk area, but not	d areas first	5
and what resc • 5 = Ap	ources are needed? plication defines wh ces will be needed t	who will do the work, no, the date (s)and loc throughout the entire	ation(s) and what	5

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: 2/14/2020

• 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 proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	8
there a likelihood of success?	
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years. 	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	7
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
	(10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
• 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3	
years	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	20
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
articulated and consistent over time.	
 articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: 2/14/2020

	of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
	less) community support and involvement.	
٠	6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
	commitment and support for the proposal.	
•		
	Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE p	revious grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does t	he applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
mana	gement and reporting?	
•	5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
	reporting and financial accountability.	
•	3 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data	
	management, reporting and financial accountability.	
٠	0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports	
	and financial accountability.	
	e applicant used past funds as described and to a successful	5
outco		
•	5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
	project success.	
٠	3 = 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.	
	ng and Experience	
	he project team have the collective experience, education and	10
capaci	ty to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
•	10 = The team has documented extensive experience and	
	capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
	3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
	homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
	quality work.	
•	6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding	
	invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
	managing operations. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects	
<u> </u>	regarding invasive species	
Doest	he project team have additional training?	5
•	5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
	methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: West Pond Association DATE: 2/14/2020

•	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: T\ fYY`DcbXg`DfchYW]j Y`Association DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail (<u>Criteria</u>		
		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This so RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all all all all all all all all all	N/A	
+ +			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	7
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	4
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	5

Bidder TTPA

Total Score 75 Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)

Rev. 1/3/2020

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: H\ fYY`DcbXg`DfchYW]j Y`5 ggcVJUjcb` DATE: 2/14/2020

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	7
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: H\ fYY`DcbXg`DfchYWjj Y`5 ggcVjUjcb` DATE: 2/14/2020

Describe proposed project work build off the province work required	7
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	/
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off 	
previous years.	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
	-
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	5
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project. 	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
• 5 – Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Deep the project have a recent survey to define the infectation of	(10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last 	
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
• 6 – The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 5 years	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table	Maximum
3)	(20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	14
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
• 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is	
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
articulated and consistent over time.	
• 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused	
in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level	
of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or less) community support and involvement.	
of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: H\ fYY`DcbXg`DfchYWjj Y`5 ggcVjUrjcb` DATE: 2/14/2020

• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	3
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 	
 3 = 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	3
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	6
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	3
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 vears' 	
 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years' manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted. 	
 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years' manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted. 0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Three Ponds Protective Association DATE: 2/14/2020

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Assoiation DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This so RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi- proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all is to be rejected and,	N/A	
+ +			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	2
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	8	3
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	4
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	1	7
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	2

Bidder TLEA

Total Score

72

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Assolation DATE: 2/14/2020

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	7
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	4
RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Assolation DATE: 2/14/2020

Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	6
• 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years.	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance. 	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	5
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. Limited surveys. 	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum (10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	8
• 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last	
year	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table	Maximum
3)	(20)
3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	(20)
*	
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%?	
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level 	
 Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or 	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Assolation DATE: 2/14/2020

• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	3
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	3
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	7
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	4
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years' 	
manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
 manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted. 0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Thompson Lake Environmental Assoiation DATE: 2/14/2020

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protection Association DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all a all a sto be rejected and,	N/A	
★			
T			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	4	0
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	7
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	2
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	9

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protection Association DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder RWPA

Total Score 89 Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100) **Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)** Maximum (45) Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and 10 effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and • methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. Which priority does the project meet? 3 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, 5 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. Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat 5 launches, travel channels, recreation areas) • 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first • 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where 4 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.

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protection Association DATE: 2/14/2020

	1
• 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 proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	6
there a likelihood of success?	
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years. 	
• 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	7
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
• 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
• 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last	
year	
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	Maximum
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table)	Maximum (20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for 	(20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	(20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	(20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	(20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	(20)
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(20)

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protection Association DATE: 2/14/2020

of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 	
 3 = 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	4
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	8
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
• 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Raymond Waterways Protection Association DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Little Sebago lake Association DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all a lis to be rejected and,	N/A	
★			
T		<u> </u>	
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	4	1
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	(6
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	2

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Little Sebago lake Association DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder LSLA

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	
And the president scale and chiestings clearly stated, with engagementicity and	(45) 9
Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and	9
 effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and 	
 If a project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 	
 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the 	
methods are vague or infeasible.	
 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are 	
not described.	
Which priority does the project meet?	3
 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive 	
plant infestations with potential for eradication.	
• 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread	
of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies	
through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points	
and in areas with high boat traffic).	
 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. 	
Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density,	5
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.	
Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat	
launches, travel channels, recreation areas)	
 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 	
 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 	
 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	
Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where	5
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.	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Little Sebago lake Association DATE: 2/14/2020

• 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and	
what resources are needed.	8
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	0
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off 	
previous years.	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	6
long-term outcome?	
• 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
• 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	Maximum
Plant Survey	(10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	6
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last 	
year	
• 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3	
years	
•	
• 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	Maximum
• 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the	Maximum (20)
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 	
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level 	(20)
 O = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	(20)

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Little Sebago lake Association DATE: 2/14/2020

e 6 - Applicant has 20,20 % matching funds. A low lovel of	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
• 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	10
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
• 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Little Sebago lake Association DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lovel Invasive Plant Prevention Committee DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail (Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This so RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revip proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all a lis to be rejected and,	N/A	
◆			
▼			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	4	0
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	2
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	3
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	5

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lovel Invasive Plant Prevention Committee DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder LIPPIC

Total Score Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100)	85
Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	10
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where 	4
 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. 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lovel Invasive Plant Prevention Committee DATE: 2/14/2020

	1
• 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 proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	7
there a likelihood of success?	
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years. 	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance.	
• 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off	
previous work.	
·	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	7
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	(10) 10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last 	10
 IO – The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
years	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table	Maximum
3)	(20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	12
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e. does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	1
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
· · · · · · · ·	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lovel Invasive Plant Prevention Committee DATE: 2/14/2020

of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	4
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 	
 3 = 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	4
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	10
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lovel Invasive Plant Prevention Committee DATE: 2/14/2020

• 3	= The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
m	anual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
• 0	= The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
ye	ear	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Songo Brandy DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
ection must be completed by ew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, ere are no pass/fail criteria in	N/A	
	Points A	warded:
(Max: 45 Points)	3	8
(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
(Max: 20 Points)	1	5
(Max: 25 Points)	2	3
(Max: 100 Points)	8	6
	ection <u>must</u> be completed by ew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, ere are no pass/fail criteria in (Max: 45 Points) (Max: 10 Points) (Max: 20 Points) (Max: 25 Points)	Pass: ection must be completed by ew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, ere are no pass/fail criteria in N/A ere are no pass/fail criteria in Points A (Max: 45 Points) 3 (Max: 10 Points) 1 (Max: 20 Points) 1 (Max: 25 Points) 2

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Songo Brandy DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder LEA Songo

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	10
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	4

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Songo Brandy DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	6
• 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off	
 previous years. 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced but returned because of refocus or lack of continued 	
 maintenance. 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	5
 Iong-term outcome? 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
• 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
	15
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%?	
 the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
 the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	
 the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	
 the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	
 the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Songo Brandy DATE: 2/14/2020

• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	8
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years' 	
manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Songo Brandy DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
section must be completed by iew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, here are no pass/fail criteria in	N/A	
	Points A	warded:
(Max: 45 Points)	3	5
(Max: 10 Points)	8	3
(Max: 20 Points)	1	5
(Max: 25 Points)	2	5
(Max: 100 Points)	8	2
	ection <u>must</u> be completed by iew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, here are no pass/fail criteria in (Max: 45 Points) (Max: 10 Points) (Max: 20 Points) (Max: 25 Points)	Pass: section must be completed by iew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, here are no pass/fail criteria in Points A (Max: 45 Points) (Max: 10 Points) (Max: 20 Points) (Max: 25 Points)

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder LEA Songo

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	8
 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. 	5
 Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	5

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	4
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off 	
previous years.	
• 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	6
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project. 	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	8
• 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last	
 • 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
years	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	15
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time.	
 articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	
 articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level 	
 articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	NA
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum (25)
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(23)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, 	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	10
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
• 10 – The team has documented extensive experience and	
 The team has documented extensive experience and capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work.	
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience 	
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is contracted. 	
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience 	
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is contracted. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species 	
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is contracted. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	5
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is contracted. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species Does the project team have additional training? 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	5
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is contracted. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species Does the project team have additional training? 	5
 capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is contracted. 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species Does the project team have additional training? 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	5

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Cove DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This so RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revip proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all a lis to be rejected and,	N/A	
★			
T			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	7
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	8	3
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	5
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	3
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	3

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Cove DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder LEA Songo

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	8
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	5

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Cove DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	6
• 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off	
previous years.	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced but returned because of refocus or lack of continued 	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	5
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
• 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	8
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
years	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table	Maximum
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	(20)
•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	(20) 15
3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%?	
 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	
 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	
 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	
 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	
 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Cove DATE: 2/14/2020

• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• $0 = 0$ = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART in section 4)	()
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
• 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	9
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	4
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years' 	
manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Sebago Cove DATE: 2/14/2020

•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Long Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
section must be completed by iew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, here are no pass/fail criteria in	N/A	
	Points A	warded:
(Max: 45 Points)	4	3
(Max: 10 Points)	8	3
(Max: 20 Points)	1	8
(Max: 25 Points)	2	3
(Max: 100 Points)	9	•
	ection <u>must</u> be completed by iew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, here are no pass/fail criteria in (Max: 45 Points) (Max: 10 Points) (Max: 20 Points) (Max: 25 Points)	Pass: ection must be completed by iew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, here are no pass/fail criteria in N/A Points A Points A (Max: 45 Points) 4 (Max: 10 Points) 8 (Max: 20 Points) 1 (Max: 25 Points) 2

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Long Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	10
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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 	5

project.

3 = Application defines the work and who will do it but does not

clearly define resources and when the work will be done.

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Long Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

	Γ
 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	8
there a likelihood of success?	
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off provious years 	
 previous years. 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	6
long-term outcome?	
• 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. Limited surveys. 	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Thank our vey	(10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	8
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last 	
year	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
 • 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	18
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
• 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is	
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
articulated and consistent over time.	
• 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused	
in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level	
of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or less) community support and involvement.	
iessi community sunnort and involvement	1
RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Long Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
• 3 = 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	4
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	10
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	4
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
	1
 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years' 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lakes Environmental Association _ Long Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all all all all all all all all all	N/A	
★			
•			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	4	0
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)		7
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	4
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	9	_

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder LACC

Total Score	91	Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score	
100)			
Destant Destant			

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	10
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where and what recovered areas are needed?	4 5
 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. 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

• 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 proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	8
there a likelihood of success?	
• 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years.	
• 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
	ļ
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	5
 Iong-term outcome? 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	7
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
• 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3	
years	
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	Maximum
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for 	
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(20)

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 	,
 3 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data 	
management, reporting and financial accountability.	
 0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, report 	:s
and financial accountability.	
Has the applicant used past funds as described and to a successful outcome?	5
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
project success.	
• 3 = The applicant has used some past funds as specified and has	s
had moderate success.	
• 0 = The applicant has not used past grant funds as specified and	t
has shown little success.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	10
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more the	an
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consiste	ent
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regardin 	g
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	4
• 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Lake Arrowhead Conservation Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Jordan River marina Condo Asociation DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all all all all all all all all all	N/A	
 ★ ★ 			
		1	
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	4
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	(6
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	1	5
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	6	5

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Jordan River marina Condo Asociation DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder JRMCA

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	8
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	5

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Jordan River marina Condo Asociation DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	7
there a likelihood of success?	
• 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off	
previous years.	
• 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
• 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	5
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Thank Survey	(10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
• 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last	
year	
• 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3	
years	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	6
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e. does cash	-
match exceed the required 20%?	
 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
articulated and consistent over time.	
• 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused	
• 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level	
• 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Jordan River marina Condo Asociation DATE: 2/14/2020

• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
	_
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
• 3 = 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	4
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	5
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	1
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
• 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Jordan River marina Condo Asociation DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine Department of environmental Protection NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John Mcphedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail (Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This so RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to reviproposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all a lis to be rejected and,	N/A	
+ +			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	4	1
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	(6
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	2
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	1	9
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	8

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder Hogan

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	10
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	5

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	6
there a likelihood of success?	
• 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off	
previous years.	
• 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities'	7
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	6
• 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last	
year	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
years	
• 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the	
last 4 years	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	12
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
	1
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time.	
 funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	
 funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level 	
 funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, articulated and consistent over time. 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

•	6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
•	commitment and support for the proposal.	
•	0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track	Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
	previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
(3LL þ	nevious grant reports (PART in section 4)	()
	the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	4
IIIaIIa	gement and reporting?	
•	5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability.	
•	3 = The applicant has demonstrated competent data	
•	management, reporting and financial accountability.	
•	0 = The applicant has provided insufficient or tardy data, reports	
Ū	and financial accountability.	
	ne applicant used past funds as described and to a successful	4
outco		
•	5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
	project success.	
•	3 = 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.	
	ng and Experience	_
	the project team have the collective experience, education and	7
capac	ity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
•	10 = The team has documented extensive experience and	
	capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
	3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
	homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
-	quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding	
•	invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
	managing operations. The team is contracted.	
-		
•	0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects	
• Doest	0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species	Δ
Doest	0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species the project team have additional training?	4
• Doest	0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species the project team have additional training? 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	4
Does 1	0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species the project team have additional training?	4

1

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

• 0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
year	

Scoring for Plant Control Grants- Final.docx

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Hogan and Whitney Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Messalonskee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine Department of environmental Protection NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John Mcphedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail (Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This set RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revie proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all all a sto be rejected and,	N/A	
◆			
<u>•</u>			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	4	0
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	5
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	1	9
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	4

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Messalonskee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder FOM

Date 2/14/20

Total Score Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100) 84 Maximum Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1) (45) Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and 10 effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. • 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. Which priority does the project meet? 2 • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. • 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, 5 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas)

- 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first • 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all
- 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas.
- Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where 5 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.

RFP #: 201810212
RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal
BIDDER: Friends of the Messalonskee Lake
DATE: 2/14/2020

• 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'	7
long-term outcome?	
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	6
there a likelihood of success?	
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off 	
previous years.	
• 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
• 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off	
• 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	Maximum
• 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off	Maximum (10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey 	(10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 	(10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last 	(10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	(10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	(10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	(10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	(10)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	(10) 10
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	(10) 10 Maximum
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Messalonskee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or less) community support and involvement. 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
 of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or less) community support and involvement. 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
 less) community support and involvement. 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of commitment and support for the proposal. 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• $0 = 0$ = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	4
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	3
outcome?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	8
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
quality work.	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than 3 years' experience managing operations. The team is homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent quality work. 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Messalonskee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

•	5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
	methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
•	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	vear	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Stream_Pleasant Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine Department of environmental Protection NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John Mcphedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all is to be rejected and,	N/A	
+ +			
•		1	
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	2
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	6
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	3
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	4

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Stream_Pleasant Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder FOCW_CStream/Pleasant Date 2/14/20

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	(45) 7
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	4

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Stream_Pleasant Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

• 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 proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	5
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years. 	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance. 	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
• Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	5
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum (10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	Maximum (20)
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for	16
the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	
match exceed the required 20%?	
• 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is	
represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
articulated and consistent over time.	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Stream_Pleasant Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or 	
less) community support and involvement.	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
• 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	8
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Stream_Pleasant Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	
• 3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
• 0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
vear	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine Department of environmental Protection NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Denise Blanchette NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Denise Blanchette, John Mcphedran

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria			
		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (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. If there are no pass/fail criteria in your RFP, delete this section.)		N/A	
◆ ▲			
•			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	6
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	8
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	3
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	7

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder FOCW_Cobbossee

Date 2/14/20 Total Score 87 Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100) Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1) Maximum (45) Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and 8 effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and • methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. Which priority does the project meet? 4 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, 2 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. Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat 5 launches, travel channels, recreation areas) • 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first • 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all • 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where 5 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.

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	Maximum (20) 18
last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	(20)
last 4 years	
/	
 year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last 	10
Plant Survey	Maximum (10)
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project. 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. Limited surveys. 0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
• Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	6
 previous years. 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance. 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
 Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success? 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off 	6
what resources are needed.	

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

	-
of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, reporting and financial accountability. 	
 3 = 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?	5
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	8
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
• 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Cobbossee Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Annabessacook Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail (Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (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. If there are no pass/fail criteria in your RFP, delete this section.)		N/A	
★			
<u> </u>			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	5
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	2	0
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	2
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	7

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Annabessacook Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder FOCW_Anna

Date 2/14/20

Total Score 87 Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100) **Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)** Maximum (45) Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and 8 effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and • methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. Which priority does the project meet? 2 • 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, 5 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. Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat 5 launches, travel channels, recreation areas) • 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first • 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all • 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where 4 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

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Annabessacook Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

 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 proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	6
there a likelihood of success?	-
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years. 	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
•	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	5
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum (10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	
 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	
Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table	Maximum (20)
3)	
Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash	20
match exceed the required 20%?	
 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	
• 20 = A fight level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching	
funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated,	
articulated and consistent over time.	
מו נוכטומנכט מווט כטוואוצנרוג טעפו נוווופ.	
RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Annabessacook Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

• 12 = The work group is limited to a few partners narrowly focused in scope. Applicant has 31-40 % matching funds. A moderate level of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
• 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	7
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
• 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
	1

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER: Friends of the Cobbossee Watershed_ Annabessacook Lake DATE: 2/14/2020

• 5 =The team has extensive t	
methods. Manual harvesting	g experience greater than 3 years
 3 = The team has some addi 	tional training. Less than 3 years'
manual harvesting experien	ce. The team is contracted.
• 0 = The team has no addition	nal training. The team is in their first
vear	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all a lis to be rejected and,	N/A	
+			
•		1	
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
		4	0
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)		
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	0
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	25	i
		Ť	
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	8	5

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder Collins

Date 2/14/20

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100) 85

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	10
 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. 	5
 Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	5

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is	7
there a likelihood of success?	
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years. 	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced 	
but returned because of refocus or lack of continued	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
•	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome? 6	6
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
	(10)
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last 	(10)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	(10)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	(10)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	(10)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	(10)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table)	(10)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years 	(10) 10 Maximum
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3)	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e., does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/14/2020

of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	5
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	5
outcome?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and 	
project success.	
 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	10
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
• 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
• 5 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Collins Pond Improvement Association DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Shagg Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail	Criteria		
		Pass:	Fail:
♦ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This s RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revi proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all all all all all all all all all	N/A	
 ★ ★ 			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	1
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	1
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	2	0
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	2

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Shagg Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder CLA_Shagg

Date 2/14/20 Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100) 72 Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1) Maximum (45) Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and 7 effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and • methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. • 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. Which priority does the project meet? 4 5 = First priority is given to projects addressing incipient invasive plant infestations with potential for eradication. 3 = Second priority is given to projects aimed at reducing spread of invasive aquatic plants within and between waterbodies through (e.g., managing invasive plants near boat access points and in areas with high boat traffic). • 2 =Third priority is awarded to ongoing maintenance efforts. Does the applicant clearly define the current conditions (plant density, 4 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. Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat 3 launches, travel channels, recreation areas) • 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first • 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all • 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. Does the applicant clearly define who will do the work, when and where 4 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.

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Shagg Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	5
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off previous years. 	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced but returned because of refocus or lack of continued maintenance. 	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off previous work. 	
• Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	4
 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly 	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. 	
Limited surveys.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
Plant Survey	Maximum
Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?	10
 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 	
-	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 	
 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	
years	
 • 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	Maximum (20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 	
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(20)
 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	(20)

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Shagg Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
• 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	3
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, 	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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	4
outcome?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	8
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Shagg Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

•	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
•	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Christopher Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
ection must be completed by ew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, ere are no pass/fail criteria in	N/A	
	<u> </u>	
	Points A	warded:
(Max: 45 Points)	3	6
(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
(Max: 20 Points)	(6
(Max: 25 Points)	2	0
(Max: 100 Points)	7	2
	ection <u>must</u> be completed by ew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, ere are no pass/fail criteria in (Max: 45 Points) (Max: 10 Points) (Max: 20 Points) (Max: 25 Points)	Pass: ection must be completed by ew team for evaluation. If a al is to be rejected and, ere are no pass/fail criteria in N/A ere are no pass/fail criteria in Points A (Max: 45 Points) 3 (Max: 10 Points) 1 (Max: 20 Points) 6 (Max: 25 Points) 2

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Christopher Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder CLA Christopher

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	7
 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
 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. 	
 Does the project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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 an advantage. 	4

clearly define resources and when the work will be done.

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Christopher Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Christopher Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	3
management and reporting?	
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management,	
reporting and financial accountability.	
• 3 = 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	4
outcome?	4
• 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and	
project success.	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	9
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	4
 5 =The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey 	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Community Lakes Association _ Christopher Pond DATE: 2/14/2020

•	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
٠	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Balch Lake Improvement Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

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 Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

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

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria			
		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This set RFP Coordinator <u>before</u> proposals are given to revie proposal fails <u>any</u> of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal therefore, not given to a review team for review. If the your RFP, delete this section.)	ew team for evaluation. If a all all all all all all all all all	N/A	
★			
T			
		Points A	warded:
Numerical Score:			
Project Purpose and Scope - Goals and Objectives	(Max: 45 Points)	3	0
Plant Survey	(Max: 10 Points)	1	0
Local Resources and Match	(Max: 20 Points)	1	8
Track record/Experience/Training	(Max: 25 Points)	20	
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	7	8

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Balch Lake Improvement Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

Bidder Blimp

Date 2/14/20

Scoring for Plant Control Grants (Maximum Score 100) 78

Project Purpose and Scope (Part III- Section 1)	Maximum (45)
 Are the project goals and objectives clearly stated, with appropriate and effective methods to address the issue with a high likelihood of success? 10 = the project has clearly stated goals and objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. 6 = the project has identified goals and objectives, but the methods are vague or infeasible. 2 = The project lacks clear goals and objectives and methods are not described. 	6
 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 project place high priority on areas of high risk spread? (boat launches, travel channels, recreation areas) 5 = Yes, the project prioritizes all high risk spread areas first 3 = Prioritizes at least one high risk area, but not all 0 = Does not prioritize high risk areas. 	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. 	3

RFP #: 201810212

RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Balch Lake Improvement Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

 0 = Application does not define who, date(s) and location(s) and what resources are needed. 	
Does the proposed project work build off the previous year's results? Is there a likelihood of success?	5
 8 = There is demonstrated likelihood of success and has built off 	
previous years.	
 5 = There has been some success (infestation has been reduced but returned because of refocus or lack of continued 	
maintenance.	
 2 = Progress has been limited, the work does not build off 	
previous work.	
•	
Does the project include a strategy for monitoring the control activities' long-term outcome?	5
• 7 = Monitoring beyond the project's end date is clearly	
articulated. Surveys done annually beginning and end of project.	
 5 = Limited monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. Limited surveys. 	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date.	
0 = No monitoring is planned beyond the plan end date. Plant Survey	Maximum
Plant Survey	(10)
Plant SurveyDoes the project have a recent survey to define the infestations?• 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last	(10)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	(10)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the 	(10)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 	(10)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for 	(10) 10 Maximum
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)
 Plant Survey Does the project have a recent survey to define the infestations? 10 = The project has completed beyond a level 2 survey in the last year 6 = The project has a level 2 survey completed within the last 3 years 0 = The project has not completed a least a level two survey in the last 4 years Local Resources (required 20% match) (Part III, Section 2, Part IV, Table 3) Does the applicant demonstrate community support or commitment for the project and do project costs provide exceptional value, i.e, does cash match exceed the required 20%? 20 = A high level of community support and commitment is represented in the proposal. Cash (applicant has > 41% matching funds), volunteer and community involvement is demonstrated, 	(10) 10 Maximum (20)

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Balch Lake Improvement Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

of support and commitment to the proposal. Recent (1 year or	
less) community support and involvement.	
 6 = Applicant has 20-30 % matching funds. A low level of 	
commitment and support for the proposal.	
 0 = 0 = Applicant has less than 20% match 	
Track Record / Training and Experience	Maximum
(SEE previous grant reports) (PART III section 4)	(25)
Does the applicant demonstrate extensive experience with data	3
management and reporting?	
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary data management, 	
reporting and financial accountability.	
 3 = 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?	4
 5 = The applicant has a history of exemplary accountability and project success. 	
• 3 = 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.	
Training and Experience	
Does the project team have the collective experience, education and	8
capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?	
 10 = The team has documented extensive experience and 	
capacity to lead the project successfully. The team has more than	
3 years' experience managing operations. The team is	
homegrown and can trouble shoot issues and maintain consistent	
quality work.	
 6 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding 	
invasive species management. Less than 3 years' experience	
managing operations. The team is contracted.	
 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects 	
regarding invasive species	
Does the project team have additional training?	5
• 5 = The team has extensive training, SCUBA, Plant ID, Survey	
methods. Manual harvesting experience greater than 3 years	

RFP #: 201810212 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal BIDDER : Balch Lake Improvement Commission DATE: 2/14/2020

٠	3 = The team has some additional training. Less than 3 years'	
	manual harvesting experience. The team is contracted.	
٠	0 = The team has no additional training. The team is in their first	
	year	



Janet T. Mills Governor STATE OF MAINE DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

> Gerald D. Reid Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT RFP #: 201810210 RFP TITLE: Competitive Grant Program for Invasive Aquatic Plant Removal

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

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

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

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

I agreeto 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.

Blanchette, Denise L Digitally signed by Blanchette, Denise L Date: 2020.03.23 08:37:20 -04'00'

Signature

Date

Rev. 7/15/2019



Janet T. Mills Governor STATE OF MAINE DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

> Gerald D. Reid Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT RFP #: 201810210 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 disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agreeto 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.

ohn McPhedran

Signature

3/23/2020 Date

Rev. 7/15/2019