

State of Maine
Master Score Sheet

RFA# 202312241								
Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priority Grants								
Bidder Name:		Millinocket	Milo	Norway	Otisfield	Stonington + Deer Isle	Waterville	Whitneyville
Proposed Cost:		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$200,000	\$29,009	\$78,477.62
Scoring Sections	Points Available							
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	Pass / Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	25	18	n/a	25	25	17	19	20
Criteria 3: Feasibility	20	15	n/a	20	20	19	18	18
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	15	9	n/a	15	15	11	10	10
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	15	7	n/a	15	15	9	10	10
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	25	18	n/a	23	20	20	20	20
TOTAL	100	67	n/a	98	95	76	77	78

From: [Kruлик, Ashley](#)
To: [Amber Wheaton](#)
Cc: [Zorn, Casey](#)
Subject: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA# 202312241 Notice of Conditional Awards
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 1:38:00 PM
Attachments: [ANL_EEPG_Millinocket.pdf](#)

Hello Amber,

Thank you for your application to the Community Resilience Partnership's Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA. The attached Conditional Award Notification Letter for RFA #202312241 lists the communities selected to receive awards. These awards will remain conditional, pending review from the US Department of Energy and execution of a service contract with GOPIF.

If you received a conditional award, we will follow-up with more information very shortly.

Thank you,
Ashley

Ashley Kruлик | Community Resilience Partnership Program Manager
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
Burton Cross Building, 3rd Floor, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Ashley.Kruлик@maine.gov | 207-816-2717 | www.maine.gov/future
Ask me about the [Community Resilience Partnership](#).

From: [Kruлик, Ashley](#)
To: [Town Manager](#)
Cc: [Zorn, Casey](#)
Subject: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA# 202312241 Notice of Conditional Awards
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 1:40:00 PM
Attachments: [ANL_EEPG_Milo.pdf](#)

Hello Robert,

Thank you for your application to the Community Resilience Partnership's Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA. The attached Conditional Award Notification Letter for RFA #202312241 lists the communities selected to receive awards. These awards will remain conditional, pending review from the US Department of Energy and execution of a service contract with GOPIF.

If you received a conditional award, we will follow-up with more information very shortly.

Thank you,
Ashley

Ashley Kruлик | Community Resilience Partnership Program Manager
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
Burton Cross Building, 3rd Floor, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Ashley.Kruлик@maine.gov | 207-816-2717 | www.maine.gov/future
Ask me about the [Community Resilience Partnership](#).

From: [Kruklik, Ashley](#)
To: jwilson@norwaymaine.com
Cc: [Zorn, Casey](#)
Subject: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA# 202312241 Notice of Conditional Awards
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 1:41:00 PM
Attachments: [ANL_EEPG_Norway.pdf](#)

Hello Jeff,

Thank you for your application to the Community Resilience Partnership's Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA. The attached Conditional Award Notification Letter for RFA #202312241 lists the communities selected to receive awards. These awards will remain conditional, pending review from the US Department of Energy and execution of a service contract with GOPIF.

If you received a conditional award, we will follow-up with more information very shortly.

Thank you,
Ashley

Ashley Kruklik | Community Resilience Partnership Program Manager
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
Burton Cross Building, 3rd Floor, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Ashley.Kruklik@maine.gov | 207-816-2717 | www.maine.gov/future
Ask me about the [Community Resilience Partnership](#).

From: [Kruklik, Ashley](#)
To: admin@otisfieldme.gov
Cc: [Zorn, Casey](#)
Subject: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA# 202312241 Notice of Conditional Awards
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 1:42:00 PM
Attachments: [ANL_EEPG_Otisfield.pdf](#)

Hello Julie,

Thank you for your application to the Community Resilience Partnership's Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA. The attached Conditional Award Notification Letter for RFA #202312241 lists the communities selected to receive awards. These awards will remain conditional, pending review from the US Department of Energy and execution of a service contract with GOPIF.

If you received a conditional award, we will follow-up with more information very shortly.

Thank you,
Ashley

Ashley Kruklik | Community Resilience Partnership Program Manager
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
Burton Cross Building, 3rd Floor, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Ashley.Kruklik@maine.gov | 207-816-2717 | www.maine.gov/future
Ask me about the [Community Resilience Partnership](#).

From: [Kruлик, Ashley](#)
To: [Linda Nelson](#)
Cc: [Zorn, Casey](#)
Subject: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA# 202312241 Notice of Conditional Awards
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 1:43:00 PM
Attachments: [ANL_EEPG_Stonington_DeerIsle.pdf](#)

Hello Linda,

Thank you for your application to the Community Resilience Partnership's Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA. The attached Conditional Award Notification Letter for RFA #202312241 lists the communities selected to receive awards. These awards will remain conditional, pending review from the US Department of Energy and execution of a service contract with GOPIF.

If you received a conditional award, we will follow-up with more information very shortly.

Thank you,
Ashley

Ashley Kruлик | Community Resilience Partnership Program Manager
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
Burton Cross Building, 3rd Floor, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Ashley.Kruлик@maine.gov | 207-816-2717 | www.maine.gov/future
Ask me about the [Community Resilience Partnership](#).

From: [Kruлик, Ashley](#)
To: [Michael Hall](#)
Cc: [Zorn, Casey](#)
Subject: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA# 202312241 Notice of Conditional Awards
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 1:44:00 PM
Attachments: [ANL_EEPG_Waterville.pdf](#)

Hello Michael,

Thank you for your application to the Community Resilience Partnership's Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA. The attached Conditional Award Notification Letter for RFA #202312241 lists the communities selected to receive awards. These awards will remain conditional, pending review from the US Department of Energy and execution of a service contract with GOPIF.

If you received a conditional award, we will follow-up with more information very shortly.

Thank you,
Ashley

Ashley Kruлик | Community Resilience Partnership Program Manager
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
Burton Cross Building, 3rd Floor, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Ashley.Kruлик@maine.gov | 207-816-2717 | www.maine.gov/future
Ask me about the [Community Resilience Partnership](#).

From: [Kruлик, Ashley](#)
To: [James Jutras](#)
Cc: [Zorn, Casey](#)
Subject: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA# 202312241 Notice of Conditional Awards
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 1:45:00 PM
Attachments: [ANL_EEPG_Whitneyville.pdf](#)

Hello James,

Thank you for your application to the Community Resilience Partnership's Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant RFA. The attached Conditional Award Notification Letter for RFA #202312241 lists the communities selected to receive awards. These awards will remain conditional, pending review from the US Department of Energy and execution of a service contract with GOPIF.

If you received a conditional award, we will follow-up with more information very shortly.

Thank you,
Ashley

Ashley Kruлик | Community Resilience Partnership Program Manager
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
Burton Cross Building, 3rd Floor, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Ashley.Kruлик@maine.gov | 207-816-2717 | www.maine.gov/future
Ask me about the [Community Resilience Partnership](#).



**STATE OF MAINE
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF POLICY
INNOVATION AND THE FUTURE**

**Hannah Pingree
Director**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

CONDITIONAL AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER

April 3, 2024

Amber Wheaton
Town of Millinocket
197 Penobscot Ave.
Millinocket, ME 04462

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Awards under RFA #202312241 Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

Dear Ms. Wheaton:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future for the Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional awards to the following applicants:

1. Town of Millinocket
2. Town of Norway
3. Town of Otisfield
4. Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
5. City of Waterville
6. Town of Whitneyville

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'H' followed by a 'P' and a horizontal line extending to the right.

Hannah Pingree
Director, Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

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
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF POLICY
INNOVATION AND THE FUTURE**

**Hannah Pingree
Director**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

CONDITIONAL AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER

April 3, 2024

Robert Cannery
Town of Milo
6 Pleasant Street
Milo, ME 04463

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Awards under RFA #202312241 Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

Dear Mr. Cannery:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future for the Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional awards to the following applicants:

1. Town of Millinocket
2. Town of Norway
3. Town of Otisfield
4. Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
5. City of Waterville
6. Town of Whitneyville

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'H' and 'P' followed by a horizontal line.

Hannah Pingree
Director, Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

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
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF POLICY
INNOVATION AND THE FUTURE**

**Hannah Pingree
Director**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

CONDITIONAL AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER

April 3, 2024

Jeff Wilson
Town of Norway
19 Danforth Street
Norway, ME 04268

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Awards under RFA #202312241 Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

Dear Mr. Wilson:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future for the Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional awards to the following applicants:

1. Town of Millinocket
2. Town of Norway
3. Town of Otisfield
4. Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
5. City of Waterville
6. Town of Whitneyville

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'H' and 'P' followed by a horizontal line.

Hannah Pingree
Director, Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

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
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF POLICY
INNOVATION AND THE FUTURE**

**Hannah Pingree
Director**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

CONDITIONAL AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER

April 3, 2024

Julie Ward
Town of Otisfield
403 State Route 121
Otisfield, ME 04270-6274

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Awards under RFA #202312241 Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

Dear Ms. Ward:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future for the Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional awards to the following applicants:

1. Town of Millinocket
2. Town of Norway
3. Town of Otisfield
4. Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
5. City of Waterville
6. Town of Whitneyville

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'H' and 'P' followed by a horizontal line.

Hannah Pingree
Director, Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

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
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF POLICY
INNOVATION AND THE FUTURE**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Hannah Pingree
Director**

CONDITIONAL AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER

April 3, 2024

Linda Nelson
Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
32 Main Street PO Box 9
Stonington, ME 04681

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Awards under RFA #202312241 Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

Dear Ms. Nelson:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future for the Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional awards to the following applicants:

1. Town of Millinocket
2. Town of Norway
3. Town of Otisfield
4. Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
5. City of Waterville
6. Town of Whitneyville

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'H' and 'P' followed by a horizontal line.

Hannah Pingree
Director, Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

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
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF POLICY
INNOVATION AND THE FUTURE**

**Hannah Pingree
Director**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

CONDITIONAL AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER

April 3, 2024

Michael Hall
City of Waterville
1 Common Road
Waterville, ME 04901

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Awards under RFA #202312241 Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

Dear Mr. Hall:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future for the Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional awards to the following applicants:

1. Town of Millinocket
2. Town of Norway
3. Town of Otisfield
4. Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
5. City of Waterville
6. Town of Whitneyville

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'H' and 'P' followed by a horizontal line.

Hannah Pingree
Director, Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

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
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF POLICY
INNOVATION AND THE FUTURE**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Hannah Pingree
Director**

CONDITIONAL AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER

April 3, 2024

James Jutras
Town of Whitneyville
7 Ames Way
Machias, ME 04654

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Awards under RFA #202312241 Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

Dear Mr. Jutras:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future for the Community Resilience Partnership Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional awards to the following applicants:

1. Town of Millinocket
2. Town of Norway
3. Town of Otisfield
4. Towns of Stonington and Deer Isle
5. City of Waterville
6. Town of Whitneyville

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'H' and 'P' followed by a horizontal line.

Hannah Pingree
Director, Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

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
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Millinocket
DATE: 3/15/24

DEPARTMENT NAME: Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Ashley Krulik
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Brian Ambrette, Ashley Krulik, Claire Swingle

SUMMARY PAGE

		Points Awarded:
Numerical Score:		
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	Pass
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	(Max: 25 points)	18
Criteria 3: Feasibility	(Max: 20 Points)	15
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	(Max: 15 Points)	9
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(Max: 15 Points)	7
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	18
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	67

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Millinocket
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 1 –Applicant Information and Eligibility**

Total Points Available: Pass/Fail **Score:** Pass

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Dr. Sharon Klein/UMaine
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: No
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 4
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Medium
- SVI (low, med, high): High

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 2 – Scope of Work**

Total Points Available: 25 **Score:** 18

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: New Windows for the Millinocket Municipal Building

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Task 1: Replace 59 windows in Town Hall with high efficiency Fibrex windows
 - Would benefit from additional task detail

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

APPLICANT: Millinocket

DATE: 3/15/24

- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat
 - Limited detail about installation process and project management; would benefit from additional detail about vendor selection, compliance, etc.

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
 - No ground disturbance
 - Yes, historically significant.
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Built in 1935
 - Yes, historic preservation, Davis-Bacon, Build America Buy America

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - 12 months
 - Would benefit from more detail on how meeting Federal requirements will impact timeline
 - A more detailed timeline would be helpful

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Cited resident surveys that stated weatherizing municipal building was a resident priority
 - Already installed heat pumps and LED lighting throughout the first floor

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Millinocket
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 3 – Feasibility**

Total Points Available: 20 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Partially described
 - Expect to see building heating loss go from 30-60% to 10%
 - Improved comfort for staff and visitors

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Community Initiatives Director will lead project management
 - Contractor, once selected, will complete the installation
 - Treasurer will be responsible for tracking budget and payment

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Millinocket
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 4 – Administrative Process**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Amber Wheaton, Community Initiatives Director
- Is the community’s approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described
 - Would benefit from more information on proposed process to meet reporting and federal requirements

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Partially described
 - Town is currently tracking invoices for the change in cost of heating oil to see the change in cost of heat pumps
 - Will continue to track after installation of new windows
 - Would benefit from also tracking electric cost
 - Would benefit from description of how cost savings will be captured/repurposed

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Millinocket
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - Project will be discussed at Town Council meetings throughout the process
 - No specific outreach planned to inform public of these upgrades/discussions
 - Missed opportunity to do more education around energy efficiency
 - Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally
 - Discussed town having high social vulnerability overall and avg. income of \$42k
 - Would benefit from mechanism to determine how this will save taxpayer money/repurpose funds

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally
 - Energy cost savings will be used to further upgrade the municipal building's energy efficiency
 - Would benefit from a specific plan or decision making process

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally discussed
 - States that it will save taxpayer dollars

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Millinocket
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 18

- Budget Narrative & Worksheet – 20 points
- Use of Efficiency Maine rebates – up to 2 points
- Use of federal “direct pay” tax credit – up to 3 points

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Includes a rough estimate from vendor
 - Town is seeking funds from the Mackenzie Foundation to raise the remaining \$82,502 needed to complete the project

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) n/a
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Yes – if they receive grant from Mackenzie Foundation

- Other notes
 - Received \$65,057.00 discount in estimate quote

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Milo
DATE: 3/15/24

DEPARTMENT NAME: Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Ashley Krulik
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Brian Ambrette, Ashley Krulik, Claire Swingle

SUMMARY PAGE

		Points Awarded:
Numerical Score:		
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	Fail
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	(Max: 25 points)	0
Criteria 3: Feasibility	(Max: 20 Points)	0
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	(Max: 15 Points)	0
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(Max: 15 Points)	0
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	0
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	0

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Milo
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 1 –Applicant Information and Eligibility**

Total Points Available: Pass/Fail **Score:** __Fail__

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): **No**
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Rep. Chad Perkins
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: No
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 4
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): High

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Norway
DATE: 3/15/24

DEPARTMENT NAME: Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Ashley Krulik
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Brian Ambrette, Ashley Krulik, Claire Swingle

SUMMARY PAGE

		Points Awarded:
Numerical Score:		
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	Pass
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	(Max: 25 points)	25
Criteria 3: Feasibility	(Max: 20 Points)	20
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	(Max: 15 Points)	15
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(Max: 15 Points)	15
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	23
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	98

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Norway
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 1 –Applicant Information and Eligibility**

Total Points Available: Pass/Fail Score: Pass

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: n/a
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: Yes
 - Vendor for earlier CAG will be selected before the start of this project
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Medium
- SVI (low, med, high): Medium

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 2 – Scope of Work**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 25

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Rooftop Solar at the Norway Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Task 1 Vendor bid via MMA and selection

STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

APPLICANT: Norway

DATE: 3/15/24

- Bidders will be asked to justify ability to meet federal requirements
- Task 2 Install 38.54kW solar on town office roof
 - Learn from police building solar project underway
- Task 3 Administrative tasks
 - Project management, reporting, cost savings fund, federal tax credits
- Task 4 Community Engagement
 - Two public meetings hosted by Climate Committee – one for uses of cost savings, second for general education on town's clean energy and resilience goals.
- Deliverables:
 - Rooftop solar array with 80-94 panels that will produce 45,000kWh to 50,000kWh annually;
 - New designated fund for energy efficiency and climate resilience projects;
 - Education and public engagement about Norway's solar projects
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Likely
 - Well-designed project with clear objectives

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - None of the above
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Davis-Bacon, Build America Buy America

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Town office was built in 1988
 - Will not trigger any special federal requirements
 - Engineering assessment has confirmed that the roof is in suitable condition
 - Outside of historic district and 100 year flood zone

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - 24 months
 - Accounting for past experience with vendor availability and supply chain timelines
 - Provided a timeline for each task

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Town Office and fire station consume 90,000 kWh annually
 - Adding rooftop solar will allow the Town to exit a community solar project, creating space for local businesses to participate
 - Rooftop solar will be more financially beneficial to the town than community solar
 - Highly visible
 - Not clear how/if community input determined the project as a priority

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Norway
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 3 – Feasibility**

Total Points Available: 20 Score: 20

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Detailed and reasonable with measurable results
 - 45,000-50,000 kWh of solar production per year
 - Expected to save \$4,250 to \$4,722 annually

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Town Manager will lead project management
 - CEBE will assist with federal rule compliance and reporting
 - Deputy Treasurer will set up designated fund for cost savings and transfer savings into that fund
 - Norway Climate Committee and CEBE will plan and facilitate public engagement in collaboration with the town manager
 - Selected vendor will be comfortable with federal compliance

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Norway
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 4 – Administrative Process**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Town manager with CEBE
- Is the community’s approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Detailed and reasonable

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Norway
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Well-designed
 - Town public meetings
 - Planned and facilitated by the climate committee
 - Print and social media outreach
 - Town Zoom broadcast

- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Well-designed
 - Town vulnerability assessment identified vulnerable/disadvantaged groups - households and individuals experiencing low incomes, older adults, youth, individuals with disabilities or other health vulnerabilities, and renters or mobile home residents
 - Will work with local service organizations and faith groups to increase participation

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Norway CAP will identify uses of savings with public input

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - As part of the CAP in development, the climate committee with develop an approach for equitable distribution of resilience projects which will inform the use of cost savings

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Norway
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 23

- Budget Narrative & Worksheet – 20 points
- Use of Efficiency Maine rebates – up to 2 points
- Use of federal “direct pay” tax credit – up to 3 points

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Costs were based on an average of 3 vendor estimates
 - Provided one vendor estimate
 - Includes administrative support costs for CEBE

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) Yes
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Town funds and tax credits

- Other notes
 - Well-designed application

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Otisfield
DATE: 3/15/24

DEPARTMENT NAME: Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Ashley Krulik
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Brian Ambrette, Ashley Krulik, Claire Swingle

SUMMARY PAGE

		Points Awarded:
Numerical Score:		
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	Pass
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	(Max: 25 points)	25
Criteria 3: Feasibility	(Max: 20 Points)	20
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	(Max: 15 Points)	15
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(Max: 15 Points)	15
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	20
TOTAL POINTS		95

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Otisfield
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 1 –Applicant Information and Eligibility**

Total Points Available: Pass/Fail **Score:** Pass

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: n/a
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): low

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 2 – Scope of Work**

Total Points Available: 25 **Score:** 25

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Transitioning to Renewable Energy with Rooftop Solar at the Otisfield Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Task 1 – Select contractor – bidders will be asked to provide experience with Federal requirements

STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

APPLICANT: Otisfield

DATE: 3/15/24

- Task 2 – Install rooftop solar array - ~90 panels, 39.9 kW system to produce 44,280 kWh annually, American made system
 - Task 3 – Establish energy fund to capture the cost savings generated by the array and utilize those savings for future energy efficiency and renewable energy projects; savings will be transferred to a dedicated fund annually and used at the discretion of the selectboard for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects
 - Task 4 – Community energy fair will be hosted by the resilience committee with an emphasis on resources for renters, mobile homeowners, and low income households
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Likely

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes, historic preservation, Davis-Bacon, Buy America Build America

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Otisfield Town Office rooftop
 - Built in 1931, not on National Register of Historic Places but will work with Maine Historic Preservation Commission to follow requirements

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - 24 months
 - Expect completion in 13 months
 - Account for community energy fair within 24 months

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Cited recent energy sustainability assessment
 - Town's first renewable energy project
 - Town leased EV and installed heat pumps – increasing electric load
 - Project is highly visible

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Otisfield
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 3 – Feasibility**

Total Points Available: 20 Score: 20

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Over 50% expected reduction in energy consumption

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Select board will be responsible for bidding and contractor selection, as well as supervising the completion of each task
 - Administrative Assistant will assist select board with contractor coordination; set up energy fund and transfer monthly savings; lead reporting and federal rule compliance with CEBE assistance
 - Resilience Committee with lead community engagement and assist with reporting
 - CEBE will support grant administration, overseeing federal rule compliance, setting up a process for tracking cost savings, and supporting the Resilience Committee in organizing the energy fair.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Otisfield
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 4 – Administrative Process**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Administrative Assistant with support from Resilience Committee and CEBE
- Is the community’s approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Otisfield will track cost savings and transfer into new energy efficiency fund at the end of each fiscal year
 - Mentions monthly transfer in project management section

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Otisfield
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Robust and well-designed
 - Hosting a community energy fair – targeting renters, mobile home residents, and low income households
 - Specific outreach strategies planned - town wide mailing, signage, digital outreach, partner businesses/organizations
 - Public input on uses of the energy fund
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Local outreach
 - Identified most vulnerable/disadvantaged groups as renters, mobile home residents, and low income households

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Use of funds to be informed by priorities within the Sustainable Energy Assessment and recommendations from Resilience Committee
 - Savings will be transferred to a special fund annually
 - Potential use as match for future grant opportunities, or small efficiency projects

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Cost savings and community energy fair will expand available resources to the community
 - Energy fair will help community members navigate topics that are often confusing by have economic and climate benefits

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Otisfield
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

- Budget Narrative & Worksheet – 20 points
- Use of Efficiency Maine rebates – up to 2 points
- Use of federal “direct pay” tax credit – up to 3 points

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Looked at similar projects across the region to estimate cost

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) No
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) No

- Other notes
 - This project will qualify for direct pay tax credits

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Stonington and Deer Isle
DATE: 3/15/24

DEPARTMENT NAME: Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Ashley Krulik
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Brian Ambrette, Ashley Krulik, Claire Swingle

SUMMARY PAGE

		Points Awarded:
Numerical Score:		
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	Pass
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	(Max: 25 points)	17
Criteria 3: Feasibility	(Max: 20 Points)	19
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	(Max: 15 Points)	11
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(Max: 15 Points)	9
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	20
TOTAL POINTS		76

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Stonington and Deer Isle
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 1 –Applicant Information and Eligibility**

Total Points Available: Pass/Fail Score: Pass

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Kathleen Billings, Stonington Town Manager
 - Deer Isle Selectboard
 - Sen. Nicole Grohoski
 - Rep. Holly Eaton
 - Hancock County Emergency Management Agency
 - Island Institute
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable:
 - Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements:
 - Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
 - Multi-community
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Small
- SVI (low, med, high): High

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 2 – Scope of Work**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 17

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: The Stonington-Deer Isle Energy Efficiency Pilot Project

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

APPLICANT: Stonington and Deer Isle

DATE: 3/15/24

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Task 1: Purchase and install at two sites, one in each municipality, solar energy systems of 60 kWh
 - Task 2: Purchase and install battery storage systems of less than 1,000 kWh capacity to work in conjunction with their respective photovoltaic (PV) energy system.
 - Would benefit from detail on specific tasks such as vendor selection, community engagement, and energy savings tracking
 - Installations are at two different sites – one in each town

- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - None of the above
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - Yes
 - Further description of the Stonington site will be needed by DOE
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes, NEPA, Davis-Bacon, Buy America Build America

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - NEPA review of the Stonington site

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described
 - 24 months
 - 18 months for installation

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Two towns are on an island that is vulnerable to sea level rise and coastal storms
 - Unreliable electric grid is a challenge for beneficial electrification goals
 - The projects will demonstrate the benefits of energy resilience to residents and businesses
 - Both towns are receiving technical assistance from the ETIPP program and the Island Institute
 - Would serve as a pilot project in each town, providing proof of concept toward the goals of the larger U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Transitions Initiative Partnership

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Stonington and Deer Isle
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 3 – Feasibility**

Total Points Available: 20 Score: 19

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - The anticipated outcomes for this pilot project are as follows:
 - reduced oil consumption
 - reduced energy costs
 - proof of concept of PV + battery microgrid system to achieve better reliability and resilience through frequent power outages
 - public support for energy efficiency measures
 - all calculations courtesy the Lawrence Berkeley and National Renewable Energy Labs as part of the towns' collaborative ETIPP project
 - Estimated reduced energy consumption, Deer Isle Town Office: 45,670kWh/year (calculation by Lawrence Berkeley National Lab), with reduced oil consumption by an estimated 50%. In 2023 the Town Office consumed 1,960 gallons of heating oil; estimated reduction is 980 gallons/year.
 - For both towns, estimate a cost savings of \$320/year per kW of array capacity
 - 30kWh batteries will power buildings for 12 hours during outage

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Town Mangers Kathleen Billings and Jim Fisher will serve as project managers
 - Other Town staff will support
 - Specific roles and responsibilities not included
 - Allen Kratz to serve as a subcontractor –
 - Would benefit from more detail on what his role will entail and a letter of support
 - Multiple project partners, would benefit from more detail on what their roles will entail

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Stonington and Deer Isle
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 4 – Administrative Process**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 11

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Stonington will administer the grant, including reporting and compliance
 - Stonington has experience with federal grants
 - MOU between towns – copy of MOU should be provided to GOPIF
- Is the community’s approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Would benefit from specific detail on who will be developing and submitting the reports and ensuring the Federal requirements are met
 - MOU may provide more detail
 - Will the vendors be familiar with the federal requirements?

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Minimally described
 - Subcontract the documentation of energy cost savings, but the fee is not identified in the budget and the subcontractor has not been identified
 - Would benefit from more detail on the timeframe and mechanisms to capture cost savings

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Stonington and Deer Isle
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - List extensive prior energy resilience activities and grants
 - Otherwise minimally considered for this project
 - Would benefit from more attention to community engagement activities planned for this project

- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - General resiliency benefits to the community
 - Would benefit from consideration of how specific vulnerable groups will participate in the benefits

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Stonington will transfer cost savings into a new account to support affordable, energy efficiency housing
 - Dedicated account for the savings
 - Deer Isle will direct cost savings to support local non-profit organizations that support low-moderate income families

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Stonington would benefit from more detail on how cost savings will be spent on housing goals
 - Deer Isle project is highly visible
 - Town already displays energy savings resources for residents
 - Identified low income and elderly residents as the most vulnerable

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Stonington and Deer Isle
DATE: 3/15/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

- Budget Narrative & Worksheet – 20 points
- Use of Efficiency Maine rebates – up to 2 points
- Use of federal “direct pay” tax credit – up to 3 points

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal

- Total request: \$200,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Budget narrative would benefit from more information on how installation and equipment costs were estimated
 - Attached PVWatts analysis provides detail on how size of arrays and batteries were determined
 - It is mentioned in the Project Management section that Stonington will contribute \$5k in in-kind costs, but budget worksheet only includes \$2500
 - Would benefit from more detail on how budget for subcontracting energy efficiency tracking is factored into the budget

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - Yes – battery storage incentive
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - Yes
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Deer Isle plans to make additional energy efficiency improvements as part of this project – new insulation and windows

- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Waterville
DATE: 3/18/24

DEPARTMENT NAME: Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Ashley Krulik
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Brian Ambrette, Ashley Krulik, Claire Swingle

SUMMARY PAGE

		Points Awarded:
Numerical Score:		
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	Pass
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	(Max: 25 points)	19
Criteria 3: Feasibility	(Max: 20 Points)	18
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	(Max: 15 Points)	10
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(Max: 15 Points)	10
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	20
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	77

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Waterville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 1 – Applicant Information and Eligibility**

Total Points Available: Pass/Fail Score: Pass

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Rep. Bruce White
 - Mayor Michael Morris
 - Chief of Police William Bonney
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: No
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Large
- SVI (low, med, high): high

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 2 – Scope of Work**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 19

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Retrofitting For Our Future

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in building

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

APPLICANT: Waterville

DATE: 3/18/24

- Upgrade to LED lighting in two buildings
 - 108 fixtures in the police building, 78 fixture in City Hall
- Would benefit from clearly defined tasks around administration and community engagement

- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat likely

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - Yes, all of the above for City Hall
 - None of the above for the Police building
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes – Historic Preservation for City Hall
 - No for Police Building

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Yes, Davis-Bacon, Build America Buy America, Historic Preservation

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - 12 months
 - Expectation is to finish in 6 months
 - Basic timeline was provided

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable
 - Longstanding goal of City Hall and Waterville Police Department to be more eco-friendly, save staff time spent changing lightbulbs, and lead by example in highly visited buildings

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Waterville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 3 – Feasibility**

Total Points Available: 20 Score: 18

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Reasonable
 - Reducing electrical costs
 - Increasing comfort for occupants
 - Setting an example for the community

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Reasonable
 - Community Development Specialist to oversee City Hall project and Police Chief to oversee Police Department work
 - Will work with an Efficiency Maine approved contractor

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Waterville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 4 – Administrative Process**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 10

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Community Development Specialist
- Is the community’s approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described
 - Would benefit from more detail on whether the CDS is familiar with the reporting and federal requirements and understands the work involved

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Reasonable
 - Estimate \$4900/year in savings
 - Compare future energy bills to past bills
 - Would benefit from more detail on how they are going to capture/retain the savings
 - Cannot use EMT rebate as energy cost savings

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Waterville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 10

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - No planned community participation activities
 - Are planning to do a press release with updates on their website and social media
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Will put savings into a fund to support EV charging infrastructure in the community
 - Would benefit from an estimate of how many charging stations, how frequently the fund would allow installations, etc.

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - More comfortable buildings for occupants and visitors
 - Would reduce costs and save taxpayer money
 - Reinvestment back into the community

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Waterville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

- Budget Narrative & Worksheet – 20 points
- Use of Efficiency Maine rebates – up to 2 points
- Use of federal “direct pay” tax credit – up to 3 points

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal

- Total request: \$40,300
 - Will need to subtract Efficiency Maine rebate, so the requested total would be \$29,009
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
 - Yes, but needs amending

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - Included but needs to be subtracted from the funds requested
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) n/a
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) n/a

- Other notes
 - Project management cost share/in-kind time not included

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/18/24

DEPARTMENT NAME: Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and the Future
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Ashley Krulik
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Brian Ambrette, Ashley Krulik, Claire Swingle

SUMMARY PAGE

		Points Awarded:
Numerical Score:		
Criteria 1: Applicant Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	Pass
Criteria 2: Project Scope of Work	(Max: 25 points)	20
Criteria 3: Feasibility	(Max: 20 Points)	18
Criteria 4: Administrative Process	(Max: 15 Points)	10
Criteria 5: Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(Max: 15 Points)	10
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	20
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	78

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 1 –Applicant Information and Eligibility**

Total Points Available: Pass/Fail **Score:** Pass

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Whitneyville Town Clerk
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: n/a
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): high

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 2 – Scope of Work**

Total Points Available: 25 **Score:** 20

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Whitneyville, Maine Hillgrove Community Hall and Town Clerk office Energy Retrofits

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Task 1: Replacing all 13 windows and 2 exterior doors with Energy Star, energy efficient products from Renewal by Andersen.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

APPLICANT: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/18/24

- Task 2: Convert to energy efficient lighting in the Clerk's office and elsewhere with Efficiency Maine Incentives
- Task3: Convert 22 existing light fixtures in the Community Hall to energy efficient LED's (not qualified for Efficiency Maine Incentives)
 - Would benefit from more information on why these fixtures aren't eligible for EMT rebates.
- Task 4: Install 2 heat pumps to fuel switch from oil to electric as the prime heating method. One heat pump to be installed in the Clerk's office, one in Hillgrove Hall

- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes – Historic Preservation

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Davis-Bacon, Buy American Build America, Historic Preservation
 - Applicant states that they do not believe that NEPA or HP requirements will be applicable to this project.

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described.
 - 24 months
 - Accounts for any potential supply change delays
 - Basic timeline
 - Would benefit from detailed timing for each task

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Identifies energy saving projects were prioritized during CRP enrollment process
 - Specifically, community hall upgrades received the greatest number of votes in a community survey
 - Community Hall could serve as an emergency heating and cooling center
 - Currently closed in January due to the cost of heating
 - Heat pumps and LED lighting will reduce costs and reliance on fossil fuel

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 3 – Feasibility**

Total Points Available: 20 Score: 18

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Partially described
 - Town will consider opening community hall in January as a result of the new heating system
 - Reduced fuel oil savings estimated to be \$4000 annually
 - \$386 estimated annual savings per attached spreadsheet for the LED lighting
 - Would benefit from a mechanism to track/measure energy consumption and savings.

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Partially described
 - Nate Pennell of Whitneyville will be the coordinating point of contact and will manage the projects with limited support from SCEC
 - Contractors have been selected and will lead installation

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 4 – Administrative Process**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 10

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Whitneyville (Nate Pennell?), with limited support by Sunrise County Economic Council (SCEC)
 - Lead point of contact was not identified
- Is the community’s approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Would benefit from determining lead point of contact for grant administration and including more detail on whether grant administrator has an understanding of the reporting and Federal requirements, and a plan for how those requirements will be met.

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Reasonable
 - SCEC will develop a spreadsheet for tracking fuel cost and consumption pre and post installation

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits**

Total Points Available: 15 Score: 10

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - Project was prioritized based on community input
 - Information about the project will be posted at the library and clerks office and updates will be made at town meetings

- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally – most vulnerable/disadvantaged groups were not identified
 - Mentions keeping Community Hall open in January to benefit most vulnerable population

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Savings will be used to reduce annual town budget and result in tax savings or tax stability that will benefit most vulnerable populations
 - Also discussing using savings toward supplementing local assistance funds for people in need of emergency heating assistance or other assistance
 - Does not specify how funds will be collected or how a decision will be made on how to disburse funds

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Stabilization of taxes through reduction of operating costs is important for all community members within an overall vulnerable community
 - How will be savings be passed along to taxpayers? Reduction in mil rate, etc?
 - Year-round heating/cooling shelter will benefit most vulnerable community members

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
APPLICANT: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/18/24

**EVALUATION OF
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

- Budget Narrative & Worksheet – 20 points
- Use of Efficiency Maine rebates – up to 2 points
- Use of federal “direct pay” tax credit – up to 3 points

Evaluation Team Comments:

Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal

- Total request: \$78,477.62
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable
 - Vendor quotes provided for each task
 - Would benefit from more cost details (including estimates and rebates) in the budget narrative

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - Yes for the Clerk’s office
 - Community Hall does not qualify for EMT incentives
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) n/a
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) No

- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Millinocket
DATE: 3/14/2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - UMaine, Sharon Klein
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: n/a
- Acceptance of federal requirements: yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? no
- Community Type: municipality
- CRP Region(s): 4
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): medium
- SVI (low, med, high): high

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: New Windows for the Millinocket Municipal Building

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Replace 59 windows in the Town Hall with energy efficient windows
 - Would benefit from list of tasks
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat
 - Very basic information provided in scope of work
 - Would benefit from additional detail, e.g. vendor selection process, federal compliance

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
 - Historically significant
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - no

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Davis-Bacon, historic preservation

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Municipal building built in 1935
 - Will trigger historic preservation requirements

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - 12 months
 - More detailed timeline of tasks would be helpful

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Community workshop/surveys prioritized weatherization of public buildings
 - Town previously installed heat pumps and upgraded lighting to LED in the same building

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Reduction in heat loss to 10% from 30-60%. Probably relevant to windows only, not entire building envelope.
 - More comfort for occupants and visitors
 - Savings on heating oil
 - Would benefit from more specific energy or cost savings estimates

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Community Initiatives Director will oversee project management
 - Treasurer and CID will administer budget and invoices
 - Will select a contractor to perform the installation

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Community Initiatives Director
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Partially described
 - Currently tracking this winter's heating oil costs (with heat pumps installed) to compare to next winter with new windows
 - Should be tracking electricity costs too
 - Missing description of how cost savings will be retained. Dedicated account? Monthly/annual transfers?

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - Project to be discussed at town council meetings.
 - Missed opportunity to do more education, displays, etc. of full energy savings in the building from heat pumps, LEDs, and weatherization.
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimal engagement and participation
 - town seeks ways to save taxpayers money

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Cost savings will be used for further unspecified energy efficiency improvements
 - Does not describe how savings will be captured, for how many years, etc.

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally
 - Saving taxpayers money – does not describe how (e.g. reduction in mill rate?)

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request:
 - \$100,000

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Vendor estimate provided.
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Other funds – \$82K from philanthropy is requested
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Millinocket
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Dr. Sharon Klein/UMaine
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: No
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 4
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Medium
- SVI (low, med, high): High

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: New Windows for the Millinocket Municipal Building

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Task 1: Replace 59 windows in Town Hall with high efficiency Fibrex windows
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat
 - High efficiency windows will reduce energy costs
 - Limited detail about installation process and project management

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - more than 50 years old
 - historically significant
- Will the project cause ground disturbance? No

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes – Historic Preservation

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Built in 1935

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described.
 - 12 months

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable –
 - weatherizing municipal buildings is a top priority for residents per community surveys
 - Already installed heat pumps and LED lighting throughout the first floor

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Detailed and reasonable with measurable results
 - Expect to see building heating loss go from 30-60% to 10%
 - Project is anticipated to reduce the use of heating oil
 - Low-e windows are designed to keep buildings warmer in the winter and cooler in the summer
 - Block 84% of UV rays

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Community Initiatives Director will lead project management
 - Contractor will complete all the work
 - Treasurer will be responsible for tracking budget and payment

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Amber Wheaton, Community Initiatives Director
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described
 - Would benefit from more information on how reporting and federal requirements will be met

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Partially described
 - Currently tracking heating oil usage and will compare 2023/2024 usage with 2024/2025 usage to understand reduced need
 - Would benefit from description of how cost savings will be captured/repurposed

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Minimally considered
 - Project will be discussed at Town Council meetings throughout the process
 - Held community workshop in 2022 where residents prioritized making the municipal building more energy efficient
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally
 - Millinocket ranks high on the social vulnerability index – this project will save all taxpayers money
 - Would benefit from mechanism to determine how this will save taxpayer money/repurpose funds

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Energy cost savings will be used to further upgrade the municipal building's energy efficiency
 - Will there be taxpayer savings as well?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally
 - Will save taxpayer dollars
 - Making upgrades to a public building

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - No

- Other notes
 - Seeking funds from the Mackenzie Foundation to raise the remaining \$82,502 needed to complete the project
 - Received \$65,057.00 discount from contractor

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Millinocket
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: Yes, Dr. Sharon Klein
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: N/A
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? no
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 4
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Medium
- SVI (low, med, high): High

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: New Windows for the Millinocket Municipal Building

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*): energy efficiency

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. 59 Fibrex windows with high performance low-e4 glass in Millinocket Town Hall building, partially described
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*] somewhat, basic information provided,

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*] Yes
- Will the project cause ground disturbance? No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*] Yes

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements? Historic preservation and Davis Bacon

Project Timeline

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. 12 months, timeline with more detail would be helpful

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Reasonably detailed and reasonable, cites resident surveys conducted in August 2022 that prioritize weatherizing buildings, as well as other work already done within the Municipal Building

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*] partially described; There are not specific methodology described, but the applicant describes the Town expecting to have heat loss reduced from 30-60% to 10% and improved comfort for employees and visitors

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Community Initiatives Director (identified as Amber Wheaton) responsible for project management and Treasurer responsible for keeping project on budget. Seems reasonable.

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements? Amber Wheaton, CID
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? Minimally described [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Yes, the Town is tracking invoices for heating oil to track change after installing heat pumps and will continue to do so to track changes once new windows are installed. Partially – would benefit from also tracking electric costs. Not a plan for redeploying funds.

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Millinocket

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*]. Moderately expected – regular Town Council Meetings will keep public updated on process; could do more outreach
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Minimally discuss specific vulnerable or disadvantaged groups but discusses town overall having high social vulnerability and average household income of \$42,000.

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Minimally. States that energy cost savings will be used to further upgrade the municipal buildings but doesn't detail specific plan or decision making process.

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Minimally detailed– saving overall taxpayer dollars.

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Partially described and includes a quote from Renewal by Andersen but that quote is not itemized, and it's not clear that other quotes were obtained. The Town is also seeking funds from the Mackenzie Foundation, but it is not clear how likely those are to be obtained or the timeline.
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal "direct pay" option for tax credits? (yes, no) N/A
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) Yes if grant from Mackenzie Foundation is received
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Norway
DATE: 3/14/2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: none
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable:
 - yes, good standing
 - vendor for earlier grant will be selected before start date of this project
- Acceptance of federal requirements: yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? no
- Community Type: municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): medium
- SVI (low, med, high): medium

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Rooftop Solar at the Norway Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Task 1 Vendor bid via MMA and selection
 - Bidders will be asked to justify ability to meet federal requirements
 - Task 2 Install 38.54kW solar on town office roof
 - Learn from police building solar project underway
 - Task 3 Administrative tasks
 - Project management, reporting, cost savings fund, federal tax credits
 - Task 4 Community Engagement
 - Two public meetings hosted by Climate Committee – one for uses of cost savings, second for general education on town’s clean energy and resilience goals.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant’s final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Likely

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Well-designed project with clear objectives

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - none
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - no
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Davis Bacon, BABA

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Town office building built in 1988
 - No federal requirements triggered

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - 24 months due to past experience with contractor availability and supply chain
 - Timeline provided for each task

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Town office and fire station consume 90,000kWh annually
 - Rooftop solar will allow town to exit a community solar project, freeing space for businesses to participate
 - Rooftop solar will be more financially beneficial to the town than community solar
 - Highly visible

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - 45,000-50,000kWh of solar production per year
 - Expected to save town approximately \$4500/year

Project Management

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Town manager – project management, vendor selection, reporting/compliance with CEBE as needed
 - Selected vendor to be comfortable with federal compliance
 - Deputy Treasurer – designated fund establishment and monthly transfers of savings
 - Climate Committee – public meeting planning and facilitation with CEBE

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Town manager with CEBE
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - reasonable

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - detailed and reasonable

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - well-designed
 - two public meetings planned and facilitated by Climate Committee
 - Print and social media.
 - Town Zoom broadcast
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Vulnerability Assessment identified vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. Will work with local social service organizations and faith groups for turn out.

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Norway Climate Action Plan to identify uses of savings, with public input

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- As part of climate action plan in development, Climate Committee will develop approach to equitable distribution of resilience projects (not yet complete). Will inform use of cost savings.

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request:
 - \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Costs based on average of 3 vendor estimates. One estimate provided.
 - Includes admin support costs for CEBE
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - yes
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Town funds/tax credits
- Other notes
 - Very well-designed application

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Norway
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: n/a
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Medium
- SVI (low, med, high): Medium

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Rooftop Solar at the Norway Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Task 1: Put project out to bid and contract solar installer – must be familiar with federal requirements
 - Task 2: Install 80-94 panel solar array
 - Task 3: Manage administrative requirements of the project
 - Task 4: Community engagement – determine how to reinvest the cost savings
 - Deliverables:
 - Rooftop solar array with 80-94 panels that will produce 45,000kWh to 50,000kWh annually;
 - New designated fund for energy efficiency and climate resilience projects;
 - Education and public engagement about Norway’s solar projects.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant’s final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Likely
 - Tasks and deliverables are well researched and comprehensive

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - None of the above
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - No

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Norway Town Office rooftop - standing seam metal facing nearly due south at a 6/12 pitch
 - Outside of historic district and 100 year flood zone
 - Site will not trigger Federal requirements

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - 24 months (ideally 12 months but anticipating unknown delays)

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - In 2023, the town office and fire station complex consumed 90,761 kWh of electricity
 - Solar has been identified as a key element of Norway's climate resilience strategy
 - This project will result in substantial cost savings for Norway which will be leveraged to further improve the town's climate resilience through its new designated fund
 - By installing new solar for the Town to use, businesses will be able to access the solar farm on the landfill to offset their usage

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]

- Detailed and reasonable with measurable results
 - Produce 45,000kWh to 50,000kWh annually
 - Expected to save \$4,250 to \$4,722 annually

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Town Manager will lead project management
 - CEBE will assist with federal rule compliance and reporting
 - Deputy Treasurer with set up designated fund for cost savings and transfer savings into that fund
 - Norway Climate Committee and CEBE will plan and facilitate public engagement in collaboration with the town manager

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Town Manager and CEBE
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Savings will be tracked monthly and transferred to a separate fund

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Robust and well-designed
 - Two public meetings
 - Discuss how to repurpose cost savings
 - Renewable energy educational event
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*].
 - Yes and well-designed

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Identified vulnerable/disadvantaged groups – households and individuals experiencing low incomes, older adults, youth, individuals with disabilities or other health vulnerabilities, and renters or mobile home residents
- Leverage existing relationships from CAP process
- Press release, website announcements, social media, flyers, public access tv

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Cost savings will go toward the implementation of priorities identified in Norway's climate action plan

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Norway's climate committee will develop an approach to assess the equitable distribution of benefits of resilience projects
 - This will be used to determine how to implement the cost savings

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Referenced 3 vendor estimates
 - Include hourly breakdown for CEBE roles

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) Yes
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Town funds and tax credits

- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Norway
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: No
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Medium
- SVI (low, med, high): Medium

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Rooftop Solar at the Norway Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*): Clean energy

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*] Likely, well-designed project with clear objectives. Project deliverables include the rooftop solar array of 80-94 panels that will produce around 45,000kWh to 50,000kWh annually; a new designated fund for energy efficiency and climate resilience projects; and education and public engagement about Norway's solar projects.

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*] No
- Will the project cause ground disturbance? No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*] No

Site Description

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements? Davis Bacon; engineering assessment has confirmed roof is in suitable condition for installation of solar panels

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. 24 months, detailed and reasonable, accounting for supply chain issues.

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Demonstrates benefits of the project allowing other businesses to join in community solar, though not how community input determined the project is a priority.

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*] Detailed and reasonable with measurable results – kWh produced and cost savings

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable. Town manager will lead with assistance from Center for an Ecology-Based Economy as needed.

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. *detailed and reasonable*

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Yes detailed and reasonable. Energy cost savings will be determined by assessing the kilowatt hours produced each month and what that offsets based on the rate Norway pays per kilowatt hour (kWh produced x \$/kWh). That amount will then be transferred from the general fund on a monthly basis to a designated fund for energy efficiency and resiliency projects.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Norway

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*]. Robust and well-designed, including soliciting input on how the funds saved should be directed, planned and facilitated public meetings.
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Yes and well-designed, including identifying specific populations and outreach strategies (local faith groups, organizations)

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Yes and well-designed

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Yes and well-designed, opening space on the solar farm, generating savings to funnel into future projects, and assessing the equitable distribution of benefits as part of the CAP in development.

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Yes, detailed and reasonable, with several cost estimates solicited and budget break-downs by task
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) Yes
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) Yes in the form of tax credits
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Otisfield
DATE: 3/14/2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: none
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: in good standing
- Acceptance of federal requirements: yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? no
- Community Type: municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): low

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Transitioning to Renewable Energy with Rooftop Solar at the Otisfield Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Task 1 - Select contractor
 - Bidding requirements include federal compliance
 - Task 2 - Install rooftop solar array
 - 36.9kW solar on town office roof
 - Task 3 - Establish energy fund
 - Savings transferred to fund annually
 - Used at discretion of selectboard for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects
 - Task 4 - Community energy fair
 - Hosted by Resilience Committee
 - Emphasis on resources for renters, mobile homes, low-income households
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - likely

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
 - Not listed on register
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - no
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Maybe
 - will cooperate with Maine Historic Preservation and purchase American-made panels

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Old school, built in 1931 with several additions. Became town office in 1990
 - May trigger historic preservation
 - DBA, BABA compliance required

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - 24 months
 - Detailed timeline for 13 months

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Energy Sustainability Assessment identified solar as priority
 - Town office already has heat pumps
 - Town leases an EV for code enforcement
 - Highly visible

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Will generate 44,000kWh and offset >50% of municipal electricity consumption. Town office consumes 12,000kWh, total municipal use is 85,000kWh. Expected to increase with heat pumps.
 - reasonable

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Select board – vendor selection, supervision
 - Administrative Assistant – contractor coordination, energy fund, monthly (? - other parts of application say annually) savings transfers, reporting and compliance
 - Contractor – solar installation
 - Resilience Committee – energy fair
 - CEBE – admin support, energy fair support

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Administrative assistant, with Committee and CEBE support
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - reasonable

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - CEBE will be contracted to develop a process for tracking cost savings
 - Cost savings will be transferred into the newly established energy fund at the end of each fiscal year.

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - community energy fair will be the primary community engagement activity
 - information about how to save money and improve comfort through energy efficiency upgrades and renewable energy
 - Townwide mailing, signage, social, local businesses and orgs
 - Input on uses of energy fund
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Priority community members include renters, mobile home residents, and households experiencing low incomes

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - informed by priorities in Sustainable Energy Assessment and by recommendations Resilience Committee

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Potential uses include match for future grants and small efficiency upgrades

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Cost savings for future projects, special consideration given to those that improve community-wide resilience
 - Fair will help community members navigate topics that are often confusing but have tangible economic and climate benefits

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request:
 - \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Estimates based on a quote, not included. Comparable to other projects in the region
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - no
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - no
- Other notes
 - Solid proposal, curious why no use of tax credits

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Otisfield
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: n/a
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): low

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Transitioning to Renewable Energy with Rooftop Solar at the Otisfield Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Task 1 – Select contractor – bidders will be asked to provide experience with Federal requirements
 - Task 2 – Install rooftop solar array - ~90 panels, 39.9 kW system to produce 44,280 kWh annually, American made system
 - Task 3 – Establish energy fund to capture the cost savings generated by the array and utilize those savings for future energy efficiency and renewable energy projects
 - Task 4 – Community energy fair
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Likely
 - Scope of work is well thought out and provides necessary information to support the deliverables

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Otisfield Town Office rooftop
 - Built in 1931, not on National Register of Historic Places

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - 24 months
 - Provided a detailed schedule for each step of the project

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Recent energy audit identified installing solar as a priority to stabilize energy costs and reduce emissions
 - Town leased EV and installed heat pumps – increasing electric load
 - First solar project in the community will be an important and visible educational opportunity

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - 44,280 kWh annually
 - Otisfield will offset over 50 percent of its current electricity consumption

Project Management

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Select board will be responsible for bidding and contractor selection, as well as supervising the completion of each task
 - Administrative Assistant will assist select board with contractor coordination; set up energy fund and transfer monthly savings; lead reporting and federal rule compliance with CEBE assistance
 - Resilience Committee with lead community engagement and assist with reporting
 - CEBE will support grant administration, overseeing federal rule compliance, setting up a process for tracking cost savings, and supporting the Resilience Committee in organizing the energy fair.

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Administrative Assistant with support from Resilience Committee and CEBE
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Otisfield will track cost savings and transfer into new energy efficiency fund at the end of each fiscal year
 - Mentions monthly transfer in project management section

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Robust and well-designed
 - Community energy fair – targeting renters, mobile home residents, and low income households
 - Promote via a town wide mailing, signage, digital outreach, partner businesses/organizations
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Identified renters, mobile home residents, and low income households
 - Various outreach strategies to get residents to attend energy fair

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Establishing energy efficiency fund with cost savings
 - Use as match for future grant opportunities, or small efficiency projects
 - Use of funds will be informed by the priorities presented in the Otisfield Sustainable Energy Assessment, by recommendations of the Otisfield Resilience Committee, and public input

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Cost savings will fund future projects
 - Energy fair will engage community members to learn more about energy efficiency and renewable energy
 - Would benefit from more information on how this project will benefit vulnerable/disadvantaged groups

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Cost estimates were based on similar projects in the region

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) n/a
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) No
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) No

- Other notes
 - This project will qualify for direct pay tax credits

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Otisfield
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: No
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Small
- SVI (low, med, high): Low

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Transitioning to Renewable Energy with Rooftop Solar at the Otisfield Town Office

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*): clean energy

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. 90 panels, 36.9kW system; detailed and reasonable
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*] Likely

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*] Yes
- Will the project cause ground disturbance? No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*] Yes

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements? Davis Bacon, BABA

Project Timeline

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable, 24 months, expect completion of array in 13 months

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable, citing recent Energy Sustainability Assessment and noted that it would be town's first renewable energy project, highly visible

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*] Detailed and reasonable, expected kWh/cost and reduction (over 50 percent) of current electricity consumption

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable, Otisfield select board, resilience committee, town staff, and Center for Ecology-Based Economy.

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements? Otisfield's Administrative Assistance
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*] Detailed and reasonable, annually transfer of funds to a dedicated fund

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*]. Robust and well-designed including hosting a community energy fair, outreach strategies

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Otisfield

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Yes and well-designed with local outreach and identification of priority community members.

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Yes and well-designed, with use of funds to be informed by priorities in the Sustainable Energy Assessment and recommendations of the Resilience Committee; savings transferred to fund annually. Identify potential uses.

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Yes and well-designed; cost savings plus fair to expand knowledge of resources;

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$100,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Yes detailed and reasonable

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) No
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) No

- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Stonington
DATE: 3/14/2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Stonington
 - Deer Isle
 - Sen. Grohoski, Rep. Eaton
 - Hancock Co EMA
 - Island Institute
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements: yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? Multi-community
- Community Type: municipality
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): high

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: The Stonington-Deer Isle Energy Efficiency Pilot Project

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Would benefit from detail on specific tasks such as vendor selection process, community engagement, energy savings tracking.
 - Install solar + storage at two sites, one in each town
 - Deer Isle town office building
 - Business Incubation Center in Stonington
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat, would benefit from more detail

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - no
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - At Stonington site – need more detail, ground mounted solar?
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes, DOE NEPA review for Stonington site, will need more information
 - DBA, BABA

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - NEPA review for Stonington site

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - 24 months, 18 months for installation

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - The 2 towns are on an island that is vulnerable to SLR and coastal storms.
 - Unreliable electric grid is a challenge to beneficial electrification goals
 - Town projects will demonstrate the benefits of energy resilience to residents and businesses
 - Both towns are receiving technical assistance from US DOE ETIPP program

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*]
 - reduced oil consumption
 - reduced energy costs
 - proof of concept of PV + battery microgrid system to achieve better reliability and resilience through frequent power outages
 - public support for energy efficiency measures
 - all calculations courtesy the Lawrence Berkeley and National Renewable Energy Labs as part of the towns' collaborative ETIPP project

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Deer Isle – 50% estimated reduction in fuel oil consumption
- Battery storage for 12 hours or more at each site

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Roles are detailed and reasonable.
 - Identifies leads and support staff for both towns
 - Multiple subcontractors and project partners
 - Unclear what Allen K's role is

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Stonington will administer grant, including reporting and compliance.
 - Stonington has experience with federal grants
 - MOU between the towns (GOPIF should have a copy)
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable. MOU may provide more detail
 - Will vendor(s) be familiar with federal requirements? Is important for ground disturbance.

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Will subcontract documentation of energy cost savings. Fee not identified in budget.
 - Would benefit from more detail on timeframe and mechanisms for retaining savings

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Lists previous energy resilience activities and grants.
 - Minimally considered - Would benefit from more attention to community engagement activities planned for this project
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*].
 - Somewhat – talks about general resiliency benefits to community
 - Would benefit from consideration of how specific vulnerable groups will participate and benefit

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Stonington – will direct savings to initiatives that increase supply of affordable, energy efficient housing. Dedicated town account for savings.
 - Deer Isle – will direct savings to local nonprofits that support LMI families (including Island Workforce Housing, Healthy Island Project, Eastern Area Agency on Aging and Downeast Community Partners.)

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Stonington – would benefit from more detail on how cost savings will be spent on housing goals
 - Deer Isle project is highly visible, and town already displays energy savings resources for residents

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request:
 - \$200,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Would benefit from information on how equipment and installation costs were estimated. Project may be sized according to budget. Would more funding allow great offset of electricity use?
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - Battery incentives
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - Yes, both towns
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Deer Isle to improve roof and insulation with town funds prior to solar installation
 - In kind from both towns
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Stonington
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Kathleen Billings, Stonington Town Manager
 - Deer Isle Selectboard
 - Sen. Nicole Grohoski
 - Rep. Holly Eaton
 - Hancock County Emergency Management Agency
 - Island Institute
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable:
 - Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements:
 - Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
 - Multi-community
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Small
- SVI (low, med, high): High

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: The Stonington-Deer Isle Energy Efficiency Pilot Project

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Clean energy and distributed energy systems

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Task 1: Purchase and install at two sites, one in each municipality, solar energy systems of 60 kWh
 - Task 2: Purchase and install battery storage systems of less than 1,000 kWh capacity to work in conjunction with their respective photovoltaic (PV) energy system.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Would benefit from more information about the contracting and installation process to illustrate readiness of the project

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - None of the above
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - Yes
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes, NEPA in Stonington

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Deer Isle Town Office – rooftop
 - Stonington Business Incubation Center –
 - Would benefit from more information on where the solar panels will be placed.
 - Placement of Stonington array will determine whether Federal requirements are triggered.

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described
 - 24 months
 - Would benefit from schedule outlining each step in the process with associated timeline

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Would serve as a pilot project in each town, providing proof of concept toward the goals of the larger U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Transitions Initiative Partnership Project (ETIPP) grant program in which both communities are enrolled.
 - Project would demonstrate value of renewable energy and on-site storage to other property owners
 - Lack of electric grid reliability in the region makes transitioning away from fossil fuels challenging
 - This project would demonstrate energy resilience – providing energy during prolonged outages

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - The anticipated outcomes for this pilot project are as follows:
 - reduced oil consumption
 - reduced energy costs
 - proof of concept of PV + battery microgrid system to achieve better reliability and resilience through frequent power outages
 - public support for energy efficiency measures
 - all calculations courtesy the Lawrence Berkeley and National Renewable Energy Labs as part of the towns' collaborative ETIPP project
 - Estimated reduced energy consumption, Deer Isle Town Office: 45,670kWh/year (calculation by Lawrence Berkeley National Lab), with reduced oil consumption by an estimated 50%. In 2023 the Town Office consumed 1,960 gallons of heating oil; estimated reduction is 980 gallons/year.
 - For both towns, estimate a cost savings of \$320/year per kW of array capacity
 - 30kWh batteries will power buildings for 12 hours during outage

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Town Mangers Kathleen Billings and Jim Fisher will serve as project managers
 - Other Town staff will support
 - Specific roles and responsibilities not included
 - Allen Kratz to serve as a contractor –
 - Would benefit from more detail on what his role will entail and a letter of support from Allen
 - Multiple project partners, would benefit from more detail on what their roles will entail

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Towns will be responsible for reporting requirements per established MOU
 - Town of Stonington allocated more time for staff time and technical assistance for reporting and compliance as they have more experience administering federal grants
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Partially described

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Would benefit from specific detail on who will be developing and submitting the reports and ensuring the Federal requirements are met

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Minimally described
 - Plan to subcontract with an energy efficiency specialist to perform these services for a fee

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - Detailed description of past community engagement activities but no inclusion of how community will be engaged in this project
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally
 - Vulnerable/disadvantaged groups were not identified within this section
 - Within Project Need section, fishermen, students, seniors, and local businesses were identified as the most vulnerable to power outages

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Stonington will transfer cost savings into a new account to support affordable housing
 - Deer Isle will direct cost savings to support local non-profit organizations that support low-moderate income families

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes and well-designed
 - Extended power during outages will help to support residents
 - Cost savings will support affordable housing and non-profits working with low-moderate income families
 - Visible renewable energy and storage project will help engage residents in learning more about these types of energy resilience solutions

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$200,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - Unable to determine
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Budget narrative would benefit from more detailed explanation of how solar array and battery storage costs were determined.
 - Attached PVWatts analysis provides detail on how size of arrays and batteries were determined

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - Yes – battery storage incentive
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - Yes, they plan to apply for the direct pay tax credits; this is not factored into their budgets
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - Yes
 - It is mentioned in the Project Management section that Stonington will contribute \$5k in in-kind costs, but budget worksheet only include \$2500

- Other notes
 - Deer Isle plans to make additional energy efficiency improvements as part of this project – new insulation and windows

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Stonington
DATE: 3/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: Yes, Senator Grohoski, Island Institute
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: Yes
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? Multi-community
- Community Type: Municipalities
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): both small
- SVI (low, med, high): both high

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: The Stonington-Deer Isle Energy Efficiency Pilot Project

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*): Clean energy

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. 2 on site solar energy systems of 60kWh, 2 battery storage systems of less than 1000kWh, would benefit on more detail on specific tasks, such as vendor selection.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*] Somewhat Likely

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*] No
- Will the project cause ground disturbance? Yes (at Stonington)
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*] Yes

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements? NEPA, Davis Bacon, BABA. More description of the Stonington site would be helpful.

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Minimally described, 24 months (18 months expected completion)

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable, exposure to climate change hazards, participation in DOE's Energy Transition Initiatives Partnership Project with the Island Institute

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*] Detailed and reasonable (NREL calculations) - \$320/yr of savings per kW of array capacity and increased resilience

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements? Town of Stonington for both towns (specific staff not identified), has experience with federal grants
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Partially described

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*] Minimally described, subcontract the documentation of energy cost savings, but the fee is not identified in the budget

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*]. Moderately expected – lists robust engagement in the past but not what will be done specific to this project

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Stonington

DATE: 3/14/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Somewhat – general resiliency benefits to community

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] yes and well-designed

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Somewhat; identify low-income and elderly identified as vulnerable, channeling savings towards programs that impact them, such as housing. More detail on how savings from this project would benefit these specific populations would be helpful.

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$200,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable, but would benefit from detail on how equipment costs were estimated
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) Yes (batteries)
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) Yes
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) Yes (for roof repairs prior to start of project)
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Waterville
DATE: 3/14/2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Rep Bruce White
 - Mayor
 - Police chief
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: n/a
- Acceptance of federal requirements: yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? no
- Community Type: municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): large
- SVI (low, med, high): high

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Retrofitting for our Future

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Upgrade to LED lighting in two buildings
 - 108 fixtures in police building
 - 78 fixtures in city hall
 - Partially described -- Would benefit from clearly defined tasks around administration, community engagement
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - somewhat

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- All of the above for city hall
 - n/a to policy building
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - no
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Historic preservation for city hall

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Davis-Bacon requirements, BABA, historic preservation

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - 12 months – goal to finish within 6 months
 - Basic timeline

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 -

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Reduce electrical costs
 - increase comfort for occupants
 - set an example for the community

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Community Development Specialist will oversee city hall work. Police chief will oversee PD work.

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Community Development Specialist
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Estimated to save \$4900/year.
 - Will compare future energy bills to past bills
 - Would benefit from how savings will be captured. Dedicated account? Annually? Monthly?
 - Cannot count EM rebate to savings, this should be reduced from project cost in the budget

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - No planned community participation activities
 - Press release, website, and social media notifications about the project, CRP participation, and energy savings
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - None

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Will put savings into a fund to support EV charging installations in the community
 - Would benefit from estimation of how many charging systems, how frequently the fund would allow installations, etc.

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - More comfortable buildings for occupants and visitors
 - Reduce costs and save taxpayer money
 - Reinvest back into community

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request:

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/14/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- \$40,300
 - Must subtract EM rebate from this. Award would be \$29,009
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
 - Yes but needs amending
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - Included but needs to be subtracted from the funds requested
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Waterville
DATE: 3/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Rep. Bruce White
 - Mayor Michael Morris
 - Chief of Police William Bonney
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: No
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Large
- SVI (low, med, high): High

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Retrofitting For Our Future

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described.
 - Task 1: Retrofit Waterville Police Department and Waterville City Hall with LED lights; replace 186 fluorescent lights
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat
 - Would benefit from more details on the contracting, installation, and management of the project including reporting and meeting the federal requirements.

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Yes, all of the above
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes – historic preservation

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Waterville City Hall is a historic building and will trigger Federal requirements

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - 12 months – plan to finish the project in 6 months
 - Would benefit from a more detailed timeline the outlines each step of the project.

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable
 - Goal of City Hall and Waterville Police Department to be more eco-friendly, save staff time spent changing lightbulbs, and lead by example in highly visited buildings

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Partially described
 - Will make the buildings more comfortable for staff and visitors, reduce staff time spent changing lightbulbs, and reduce energy
 - Will apply EMT rebates toward other energy efficient projects, such as EV chargers

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable
 - Community Development Specialist to oversee City Hall project and Police Chief to oversee Police Department work
 - Will work with a EMT approved contractor

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Community Development Specialist
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Minimally described
 - Would benefit from more detail on whether the CDS is familiar with the reporting and federal requirements and understands the work involved.

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - Partially described
 - Estimate annual savings of \$4900 plus \$10,391 EMT rebate
 - Plan to track cost savings by comparing past/future utility bills.
 - Would benefit from more detail on how the savings will be retained/used

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - Municipality will lead by example by showing benefits of LED lighting
 - No public engagement was mentioned in the planning of this project.
 - A press release will be distributed after the project is complete and information will be added to the City website and social media.
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Energy savings will result in savings for taxpayers, but a mechanism to distribute those savings to residents is not included in the proposal
 - Would benefit from a more detailed plan to utilize this opportunity or the savings to support most vulnerable/disadvantaged groups

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes
 - Savings will be collected in a separate fund to be used to install EV chargers throughout the City
 - Will any savings be directed back to taxpayers as mentioned in the previous sections?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes
 - More comfortable space for staff/visitors
 - Reduced costs
 - Reinvest money directly back into the community

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$40,300
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Yes
 - Vendor estimate included
 - Project management/in-kind time not included

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - EMT rebates included but need to be subtracted from the total cost
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) No
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) n/a

- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Waterville
DATE: 3/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: Yes, Representative, Mayor, Chief of Police
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: N/A
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 3
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): No, high population
- SVI (low, med, high): high

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Retrofitting For Our Future

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*): energy conservation and efficiency retrofits

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Retrofitting Waterville Police Department and Waterville City Hall with LED lights (186 light fixtures), partially described.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*] Likely

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*] Yes for City Hall, no for police building
- Will the project cause ground disturbance? No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*] Yes

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements? Two buildings, yes federal requirements – Davis Bacon, BABA, historic preservation

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. 12 months, detailed and reasonable (work expected to be complete within 6 months). Contractor, Perry Electric, has already been selected.

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Partially described. States that it has been a long-standing goal of the municipality to upgrade its lighting.

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc.* [*detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described*] Partially described. States there will be softer lighting for those working and visiting the buildings, reduced electricity costs (roughly \$4900 a year, estimated from Bulbs.com), and setting example for the community.

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Reasonable. Staff at each building are identified, and the contractor has been selected and will lead project management.

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements? Community Development Specialist, Michael Hall.
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Minimally described.

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*] Will compare future utility bills to baseline bills. Partially described. More information needed on capture of savings.

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Waterville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*]. Moderately expected – press release, website, social media
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Minimally

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Somewhat, the City intends to reinvest savings into a fund to support EV charger installation.

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Somewhat – more welcoming experience for the public, saving taxpayer money, and reinvesting money into the community.

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$40,300
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes, but will need to subtract the Efficiency Maine Rebate
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. The number of lights per building is detailed, but without disaggregated costs. Staff time is not accounted for.
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no) Yes
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) No
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) No
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/15/2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Town clerk
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: no
- Acceptance of federal requirements: yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? no
- Community Type: municipality
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): high

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Whitneyville, Maine Hillgrove Community Hall and Town Clerk office Energy Retrofits

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Task 1: Replacing all 13 windows and 2 exterior doors with Energy Star, energy efficient products from Renewal by Andersen.
 - Task 2: Convert to energy efficient lighting in the Clerk's office and elsewhere with Efficiency Maine Incentives
 - Task3: Convert 22 existing light fixtures in the Community Hall to energy efficient LED's (not qualified for Efficiency Maine Incentives)
 - Task 4: Install 2 heat pumps to fuel switch from oil to electric as the prime heating method. One heat pump to be installed in the Clerk's office, one in Hillgrove Hall
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - somewhat

Project Site(s)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - no
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - historic preservation
 - DBA, BABA

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - historic preservation?
 - DBA, BABA

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Would benefit from task-by-task timeline details
 - 24 months in case of delays

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described – would benefit from information on current energy costs
 - Energy savings were prioritized in CRP enrollment workshop
 - Building is closed in January due to heating costs. This project will allow it to be open year round

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? [*This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]*]
 - Partial described – would benefit from information on expected energy reduction and cost savings
 - Fuel switching
 - Cost savings
 - Open building year round. Possible emergency heating and cooling shelter

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Project management by selectboard chair with limit support from SCEC,. Nate Pennell will be the coordinating point of contact for all installations.
- Renewal by Anderson is the window contractor but they do not identify the installation subcontractor that will be used.
- Electrical LED retrofits are by Gillman Electric of Ellsworth. Heat pump installations will be managed and installed by RH Foster of Machias.

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Town with limited support from SCEC
 - SCEC will assist with energy and savings tracking
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
 - SCEC will build a spreadsheet to show past and future energy use, changes in vendor pricing

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*].
 - Moderately expected
 - Information about project benefits to be posted at library and clerks office, and included in town's annual report
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimal – does not identify vulnerable community members who might benefit or participate
 - Will keep community center open in January, potential for emergency warming center

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Will either be tax savings or “will discuss” putting savings toward local heating assistance or similar uses
 - Would benefit from a commitment to a particular use and a mechanism (such as a dedicated account to collect the savings)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/2024

EVALUATOR NAME: Brian Ambrette

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally described
 - Tax savings or tax stability will benefit most vulnerable
 - How would savings be passed on to taxpayers? Reduction in millrate?

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request:
 - 79,477.62
 - Task 4 need to subtract \$1000 from requested amount for EM rebate
 - Total request should be 78,477.62
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - yes
- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - yes
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
 - Not sure that towns are eligible for window tax credit
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no)
 - n/a
- Other notes
 - Vendor quotes provided.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
 - Whitneyville Town Clerk
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: n/a
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): small
- SVI (low, med, high): high

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Whitneyville, Maine Hillgrove Community Hall and Town Clerk office Energy Retrofits

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*):

- Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Task 1: Replacing all 13 windows and 2 exterior doors with Energy Star, energy efficient products from Renewal by Andersen.
 - Task 2: Convert to energy efficient lighting in the Clerk's office and elsewhere with Efficiency Maine Incentives
 - Task3: Convert 22 existing light fixtures in the Community Hall to energy efficient LED's (not qualified for Efficiency Maine Incentives)
 - Would benefit from more information on why these fixtures aren't eligible for EMT rebates.
 - Task 4: Install 2 heat pumps to fuel switch from oil to electric as the prime heating method. One heat pump to be installed in the Clerk's office, one in Hillgrove Hall
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
 - Somewhat

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Would benefit from more detail for each task speaking to all the components of each deliverable – contracting, installation, management, etc.

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*]
 - More than 50 years old
- Will the project cause ground disturbance?
 - No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*]
 - Yes – Historic Preservation

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements?
 - Community Hall is a wood framed building constructed in the 1960s
 - Would benefit from a description of the Clerk's office buildings as well
 - Applicant states that they do not believe that NEPA or HP requirements will be applicable to this project.
 - Due to age of the building, HP requirements will be applicable

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Reasonable
 - 24 months
 - Includes detailed timeline narrative

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Detailed and reasonable
 - Residents prioritized energy saving actions during CRP enrollment process
 - Installation of heat pumps will allow the Community Hall to serve as a warming and cooling shelter and be open year-round
 - Currently closed in January due to cost of heating
 - Heat pumps and LED lighting will reduce costs and reliance on fossil fuel

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased*

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]

- Partially described
- \$386 estimated annual savings per attached spreadsheet for the LED lighting
- Would benefit from estimated fuel savings and mechanism to track/measure energy consumption and savings.

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Reasonable
 - Nate Pennell of Whitneyville will be coordinating point of contact and will manage the projects with limited support from SCEC
 - Contractors will lead installation

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements?
 - Whitneyville (Nate Pennell?), with limited support by Sunrise County Economic Council (SCEC)
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
 - Minimally described
 - Would benefit from determining lead point of contact for grant administration and including more detail on whether grant administrator has an understanding of the reporting and Federal requirements, and a plan for how those requirements will be met.

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*
 - Reasonable
 - Town will work with SCEC to develop a tracking spreadsheet to record energy use and past consumption and use that data to evaluate energy cost and consumption savings.

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is *[robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered]*.
 - Moderately expected
 - Residents prioritized energy saving actions during CRP enrollment process
 - During implementation of the energy work and beyond, information about the project and its benefits will be communicated through informational postings at the library and Clerk's office. Additional information will be included in the Town's annual report/annual Town meeting

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Ashley Krulik

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: GOPIF

- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Minimally – vulnerable/disadvantaged groups were not identified

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Yes
 - Savings will be used to reduce annual town budget and result in tax savings or tax stability that will benefit most vulnerable populations
 - May result in the opening of the Community Hall during January
 - Also discussing using savings toward supplementing local assistance funds for people in need of emergency heating assistance or other assistance

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*]
 - Somewhat
 - Stabilization of taxes through reduction of operating costs is important for all community members within an overall vulnerable community
 - Year-round heating/cooling shelter will benefit most vulnerable community members

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$78,477.62
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
 - Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
 - Partially described
 - Would benefit from more detailed cost (including estimates and rebates) in the budget narrative

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
 - Yes
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no) No
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) No

- Other notes
 - Federal tax rebates not factored into the total cost

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant
BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville
DATE: 3/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Criteria 1 –

Applicant Information and Eligibility

- Enrolled in the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP): Yes
- Meets the Disadvantaged Community definition: Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support: Town of Whitneyville
- Any active CRP grants are in good standing, if applicable: N/A
- Acceptance of federal requirements: Yes

Community Characteristics

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application? No
- Community Type: Municipality
- CRP Region(s): 2
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000): Small
- SVI (low, med, high): High

Criteria 2 – Scope of Work

Project Name: Whitneyville, Maine Hillgrove Community Hall and Town Clerk office Energy Retrofits

Project Type (*One or more of: Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings; Transportation electrification; or Clean energy and distributed energy systems*): Energy conservation and efficiency retrofits in buildings

Project Description

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Replacing 13 windows, 2 exterior doors; convert to energy efficient lighting in the clerk's office (number of bulbs not specified), convert 22 light fixtures in Community Hall, 2 heat pumps, one in Clerk's office, one in Hillgrove Community Hall
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's final deliverables? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*] Somewhat – mentions fuel switch from oil to electric as prime heating method, but unclear based off information provided whether one heat pump will be sufficient to do so.

Project Site(s)

- Will any part of the project improve or alter a building that is [*more than 50 years old, located in a historic district, historically significant, none of the above*] Yes
- Will the project cause ground disturbance? No
- Are NEPA/Historic Preservation guidelines applicable to this project? [*Yes, if answered yes to either of the above questions*] Yes, (states that National Historic Preservation Act and NEPA permitting are not required for this project)

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

Site Description

- Type of site or building where the project will take place; Will site/building trigger Federal requirements? Yes, Davis Bacon, BABA, building built in 1960s, with original heating system. Clerk's office building not described

Project Timeline

- 12 or 24 months; Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. 24 months. Partially described. Requests 24 months to account for any supply chain delays, but doesn't describe anticipated timeline.

Project Need

- Demonstrates why the project is a community priority [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Energy saving project elements were identified and prioritized by the community as part of their Community Resilience Partnership community public input process. Hillgrove Hall upgrades to LED lighting, weatherization of windows and doors and heat pumps received the largest number of votes as action priorities identified in the community survey and at the school budget public hearing where this action was discussed. Community Hall will serve as emergency heating and cooling center for residents (currently closed to public in January due to the cost of heating), but this will allow the town to consider opening the facility year-round.

Criteria 3 – Feasibility

Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? Is there an explanation for how these outcomes were estimated and will be measured? *This may include expected cost savings, kilowatt-hours of reduced energy consumption or renewable energy generation, or gallons of fuel reduction. This may also include increased energy reliability, improved building comfort and utility for occupants and visitors, decreased maintenance requirements, etc. [detailed and reasonable with measurable results, partially described, minimally described]* The Town will consider opening Hillgrove Hall in January as a result of the new heat system and related savings. Cost savings are estimated as presented in the accompanying spreadsheet. Fuel oil savings are estimated to be \$4000/annually (80% reduction), LEDs to reduce energy bills by \$386/year.

Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Partially described. Project manager is Nate Pennell of Whitneyville, with "limited support" by Sunrise County Economic Council. Renewal by Anderson is the window contractor (deposit already paid), LED retrofits are Gillman Electric, heat pump installations are by RH Foster

Criteria 4 – Administrative Process

Grant Administration

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- Who will be responsible for meeting the grant reporting requirements? Whitneyville with limited support by SCEC – specific staff not identified
- Is the community's approach to meeting the grant reporting requirement clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Partially described – SCEC will make spreadsheet for tracking electrical and fuel costs pre and post installations

Energy Cost Savings Tracking and Capture

- Is the method for tracking, capturing, and retaining the cost savings resulting from the project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*] Reasonable. Spreadsheet tracking energy use and cost.

Criteria 5 – Public Engagement and Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Community Engagement

- The approach to community participation throughout the duration of the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered*]. This project was prioritized based on community input, and information about the project will be communicated through postings at the library and Clerk's office, annual report/Town meeting. Moderately expected.
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will be identified and participate in the project? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Minimally, in keeping the Community Center open in January to benefit the most vulnerable populations in the community, and reinvestment of savings into local assistance funds.

Reinvestment of Cost Savings

- Does the proposal describe how cost savings will be redeployed? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] reinvestment of savings into local assistance funds. Does not specify how funds will be collected, if there will be a dedicated fund, and how decision making about fund dispersal will be done.

Community Benefits

- Does the proposal describe how community members will benefit from this project, especially the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged groups? [*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally*] Somewhat ("tax savings")

Criteria 6 – Budget

- Total request: \$78,477.62
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no) Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no) Yes
- Is the budget narrative detailed? Are cost estimates clearly explained (included vendor estimates, hourly breakdowns, other reference materials)? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]. Detailed and reasonable. Quotes provided for each task

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202312241

RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

BIDDER NAME: Whitneyville

DATE: 3/15/24

EVALUATOR NAME: Claire Swingle

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Governor's Energy Office

- If Efficiency Maine incentives are available for the scope of work, are they included? (yes, no)
Yes for Clerk's office, not eligible for EMT incentives in Community Hall
- Does the applicant make use of the federal "direct pay" option for tax credits? (yes, no) N/A
- Is cost share provided (not required)? (yes, no) No

- Other notes



STATE OF MAINE
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Hannah Pingree
Director

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA# 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

I, Brian Ambrette accept the offer to become a member of the Request for (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

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

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

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brian Ambrette'.

3/7/2024

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Hannah Pingree
Director

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA# 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

I, Ashley Krulik accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

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

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

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

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

Ashley R. Krulik

March 11, 2024

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Hannah Pingree
Director

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA# 202312241
RFA TITLE: Energy Efficiency Priorities Grant

I, Claire Swingle accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

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

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

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

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



Signature

 3/8/24

Date