

Answers to Questions about Proposals Received in Response to IFP

Answers received by 3:00 p.m. October 23, 2025

Jack Fawcett Analytics, LLC:

1. Your cost proposal stated your total proposed costs for Appendix A, Section I task to be \$X. In your description of services to be provided you include Phase 3 as ongoing support and dissemination, which includes “on-going assistance to the Task Force as directed by the chairs, including fulfilling specific requests for further data analysis,” which is specific to Appendix A, Section II. Are the costs for providing ongoing support as described in your Phase 3 included in your total proposed cost? If so, are you able to separate out the cost for only those services to be provided based upon the criteria in Appendix A, Section I?

Answer: JFA, Inc. provided a written response to staff that clarified elements of their cost proposal regarding Appendix A, section I and section II. Staff used this information to calculate points more accurately under the cost proposal section using the mathematical formula. The response letter will be included in your materials on Friday.

Progress and Poverty Institute (PPI):

1. On page 15 of your written proposal, you state that “the project team will also schedule bi-monthly checkins, unless more frequent checkins are needed” and on page 16 you state that under Phase 3 “we envision bi-monthly meetings to ensure the flow of information...”. In this case, does “bi-monthly” mean twice a month or every two months? From the project schedule chart, it can be inferred that this means every two months, but we would like to confirm.

Answer: The evaluation subcommittee is correct to infer that during the second half of Phase 3 (May - Dec 2026), we intend to meet with the Task Force at least once every two months. However, to be clear, this is intended as a minimum frequency of contact, and we are quite flexible on this point. Should there be periods of Phase 3 during which the Task Force has a high volume of requests for additional research and analysis, we will request more frequent meetings so as to ensure that the Task Force remains up-to-date with our progress and well-informed of our key findings. Please also note that the first half of Phase 3 (Dec 2025 - Apr 2026) overlaps with Phase 2, during which we intend to meet with the Task Force at least once every two weeks.

Stepwise Data Research/Maine Applied Research:

1. Do you plan to utilize spatial/GIS software to conduct any of your analyses?

Answer: No, we do not plan to use any GIS software for our analyses. In our experience, the GIS data that some municipalities have is often inaccurate and incomplete and would take an inordinate amount of time to process, likely with misleading results. However, if the Task Force had access to a high-quality dataset that included GIS characteristics like the presence of waterfront (for example, from an interested party to the Task Force), we would gladly include it in the set of materials we plan to analyze.

Answers to Questions about Proposals Received in Response to IFP

Answers received by 3:00 p.m. October 23, 2025

2. On page 4 of your written proposal, you state that from November 2025 – December 2026 you will provide “bi-weekly updates to Task Force chairs.” In this case, does “bi-weekly” mean twice a week or every two weeks?

Answer: *"Bi-weekly" was intended to mean every two weeks, as the Invitation for Proposals requested. However, we are happy to provide updates more or less frequently, as needed or requested.*

*** The following question was asked of Maine Revenue Services to assist the IFP subcommittee in evaluating information contained within the proposals.**

Maine Revenue Services:

1. Could MRS either provide, or ask municipalities to provide, machine-readable exports of valuation books/assessment rolls and GIS shapefiles or links to GIS data for parcels or parcel-level data for MVR and SV?

Answer: *With the exception of the unorganized territory, where MRS is assessor/tax collector, any parcel level data and/or GIS data would generally be maintained by the municipalities or their 3rd party vendor and would require some legwork. MRS has some limited valuation books, but they're not consistently retained and we only keep them for a short period of time for our SV purposes. Municipalities are the owners of the books for archival purposes.*

Maine GeoLibrary had parcel level data for a number of towns at one point: [Maine GeoLibrary Parcel Viewer Application](#) | [ArcGIS Hub](#). Not sure how updated it is but would likely require a discussion with them to get some details.