

## State of Maine RFP / Proposal Master Score Sheet

**Instructions:** Complete the Master Score Sheet below providing all of the requested information for each bidder that submitted a proposal in response to the RFP. This document is to be included in the Selection Package submitted to the Division of Procurement Services for review/approval.

<b>SCORESHEET FOR RFP#202002031: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Development</b>									
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		CWD Wilson Pond		CCSWCD Black Brook		WCSWCD Unity Pond		YCSWCD Biddeford Pool	
COST:		Cost:	\$22,692	Cost:	\$17,862	Cost:	\$45,508	Cost:	\$50,000
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Applicant Qualifications Experience	15	12		13		7		9	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5		4		8		7	
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	7		6		9		4	
Section IV. Nature Extent Severity NPS Prob.	10	6		5		7		4	
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	20		16		14		10	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	19		19		18		8	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	4		5		0		0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>73</b>		<b>68</b>		<b>63</b>		<b>42</b>	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:									
COST:		Cost:	\$	Cost:		Cost:		Cost:	
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Applicant Qualifications Experience	15								
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10								
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10								
Section IV. Nature Extent Severity NPS Prob.	10								
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25								
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25								
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5								
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>								

**Award Justification Statement**  
**RFA# 202002031**  
**Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects**  
**Watershed-Based Plan Development**

**I. Summary**

The aforementioned RFA was seeking applications for projects to help communities develop Watershed-based Plans (WBP) to restore nonpoint source (NPS) impaired water bodies or to protect water bodies threatened by NPS pollution. A watershed-based plan provides assessment and management information and describes actions needed to restore nonpoint source (NPS) impaired water bodies or to protect water bodies threatened by NPS pollution. A watershed-based plan accepted by the Department is a prerequisite to be eligible to apply for CWA Section 319 funds to help implement the plan.

Five applications were received and reviewed to determine if each proposal was acceptable. Four applications were found to be acceptable, and the application from Central Aroostook SWCD was ineligible because it did not include waterbodies on the DEP's NPS Priority Watersheds list. This application was not scored. Based on the applications, amount of funding requested and funding available under the RFP, the team recommended funding three applications. Applications were shared with the funding agency, US EPA, and they supported DEP's findings and recommendation to fund all three projects.

**II. Evaluation Process**

The Evaluation Team (ET) for this RFA included the following people: Wendy Garland (NPS Program Coordinator, DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (Senior Planner, DACF), Addie Halligan (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP) and Greg Beane (DEP).

Three of the evaluation team members have participated in previous grant reviews and all are familiar with the State's process. Maine DEP staff participating on the evaluation team have extensive experience with these types of projects, including the typical costs and scope of work. Tom Miragliuolo has experience with application reviews for Maine Coastal Community grants program and his past position with Land for Maine's Future program.

The ET participated in a pre-review meeting on 4/24/20 to review the RFA materials and ET process. ET member conducted independent reviews of the four applications that met eligibility criteria and took notes on the applications received. Tom Miragliuolo calculated the Comprehensive Plan scores for each proposal. The group held a day-long meeting on 5/8/20 via MS Teams to score the proposals using a consensus decision-making process. Wendy Garland served as the RFP Coordinator/Lead Evaluator and took notes on the team consensus evaluation.

**III. Qualifications & Experience**

Applications that scored highest on the Qualifications and Experience criteria had staff with recent and extensive experience with similar NPS grants projects. They also had organizational

capacity and/or well-rounded teams that would allow for project success even in the event of staff turnover.

**IV. Proposed Services**

Each of the four scored applications included a series of tasks designed to help develop the associated watershed-based plan. Some of the factors that reflect differences in scoring are listed below. Projects that scored higher tended to demonstrate:

- the importance and uses of the water body to local residents, the larger public and wildlife;
- an informed understanding of the water quality problem;
- an informed understanding of the additional monitoring needed to answer remaining water quality questions and identify NPS sources;
- strong local support and a well-rounded team of partners participating in the project; and
- consistent comprehensive plans in watershed towns.

**V. Cost Proposal**

The grant amounts requested, local match amount and total project costs for the four eligible applications are listed below.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Grant Funds</b>	<b>Match Funds</b>	<b>Total Budget</b>
Lower Aroostook River	SASWCD	25,986	21,383	47,369
Biddeford Pool	YCSWCD	50,000	37,682	87,682
Black Brook	CCSWCD	17,862	21,227	39,089
Unity Pond	WCSWCD	45,508.30	21,316.79	68,825.09
Wilson Pond	CWD	22,692	8,289	30,981

**VI. Conclusion**

The three applications that were selected for funding stood out in several ways. The highest scoring proposal (Cobbossee Watershed District) stood out because of the strong staff qualifications/experience and understanding of the lake’s water quality issues as well as the project’s high cost effectiveness and feasibility for success. The next highest proposal (Cumberland County SWCD) scored well because of the strong qualifications/experience, project’s cost effectiveness, extensive partner involvement and strong match. The final funded project (Waldo County SWCD) scored just slightly lower due to the lack of consistent comprehensive plans in the watershed towns. However, they scored very well on the value of the water body, strong understanding of the water quality issues in Unity Pond and cost effectiveness.

## Garland, Wendy

---

**From:** Garland, Wendy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2020 1:06 PM  
**To:** Central Aroostook Soil & Water  
**Cc:** Hoppe, Kathy M  
**Subject:** Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development  
**Attachments:** CASWCD Letter.pdf

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development (RFP#202002031). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Although the **Lower Aroostook River Watershed-Based Management Plan Development Project** was not selected for funding under this RFA, I encourage you to contact me to further discuss your application and why it was not considered an eligible project. I can share some feedback from our Evaluation Team so you can consider ways to strengthen a future proposal and thereby further protect this important resource.

### Wendy Garland

Nonpoint Source Program Coordinator  
Division of Environmental Assessment, [Maine DEP](#)  
17 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333  
(207) 615-2451, [wendy.garland@maine.gov](mailto:wendy.garland@maine.gov)



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS  
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID  
COMMISSIONER

Randy Martin  
Central Aroostook SWCD  
735 Main Street, Suite 3  
Presque Isle, ME 04769

June 2, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202002031, Watershed-based Plan Development

Dear Randy:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) referenced above, issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA and is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following applicants:

Bidder	Proposal Title
Cobbossee Watershed District	Wilson Pond Watershed-Based Management Plan Development
Cumberland County SWCD	Black Brook Watershed Management Plan Project
Waldo County SWCD	Unity Pond (Lake Winnecook) Watershed-Based Plan Update

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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 submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine’s waters.

Sincerely,

Wendy Garland  
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

AUGUSTA  
17 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017  
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

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

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

PRESQUE ISLE  
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK  
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769  
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

### **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

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

## Garland, Wendy

---

**From:** Garland, Wendy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2020 1:05 PM  
**To:** 'Heather Huntt'  
**Cc:** Halligan, Addie  
**Subject:** Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development  
**Attachments:** CCSWCD Letter.pdf

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development (RFA#202002031). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

**Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Black Brook Watershed Management Plan Project.** Addie Halligan will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

### Wendy Garland

Nonpoint Source Program Coordinator  
Division of Environmental Assessment, [Maine DEP](#)  
17 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333  
(207) 615-2451, [wendy.garland@maine.gov](mailto:wendy.garland@maine.gov)



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS  
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID  
COMMISSIONER

Heather Huntt  
Cumberland County SWCD  
35 Main Street, Suite 3  
Windham, ME 04062

June 2, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202002031, Watershed-based Plan Development

Dear Heather:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) referenced above, issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA and is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following applicants:

Bidder	Proposal Title
Cobbossee Watershed District	Wilson Pond Watershed-Based Management Plan Development
Cumberland County SWCD	Black Brook Watershed Management Plan Project
Waldo County SWCD	Unity Pond (Lake Winnecook) Watershed-Based Plan Update

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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 submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine’s waters.

Sincerely,

Wendy Garland  
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

AUGUSTA  
17 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017  
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

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

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

PRESQUE ISLE  
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK  
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769  
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

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

## Garland, Wendy

---

**From:** Garland, Wendy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2020 1:04 PM  
**To:** wmonagle@roadrunner.com  
**Cc:** Beane, Greg E  
**Subject:** Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development  
**Attachments:** CWD Letter.pdf

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development (RFA#202002031). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

**Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Wilson Pond Watershed-Based Management Plan Development.** Greg Beane will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

### Wendy Garland

Nonpoint Source Program Coordinator  
Division of Environmental Assessment, [Maine DEP](#)  
17 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333  
(207) 615-2451, [wendy.garland@maine.gov](mailto:wendy.garland@maine.gov)



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS  
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID  
COMMISSIONER

Bill Monagle  
Cobbossee Watershed District  
167 Main Street, PO Box 418  
Winthrop, ME 04364

June 2, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202002031, Watershed-based Plan Development

Dear Bill:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) referenced above, issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA and is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following applicants:

Bidder	Proposal Title
Cobbossee Watershed District	Wilson Pond Watershed-Based Management Plan Development
Cumberland County SWCD	Black Brook Watershed Management Plan Project
Waldo County SWCD	Unity Pond (Lake Winnecook) Watershed-Based Plan Update

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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 submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine’s waters.

Sincerely,

Wendy Garland  
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

AUGUSTA  
17 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017  
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

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

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

PRESQUE ISLE  
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK  
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769  
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

### **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

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

## Garland, Wendy

---

**From:** Garland, Wendy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2020 1:04 PM  
**To:** areed@uninets.net  
**Cc:** Pratt, Amanda  
**Subject:** Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development  
**Attachments:** WCSWCD Letter.pdf

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development (RFA#202002031). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

**Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Unity Pond (Lake Winnecook) Watershed-Based Plan Update.** Amanda Pratt will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

### Wendy Garland

Nonpoint Source Program Coordinator  
Division of Environmental Assessment, [Maine DEP](#)  
17 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333  
(207) 615-2451, [wendy.garland@maine.gov](mailto:wendy.garland@maine.gov)



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS  
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID  
COMMISSIONER

Andrew Reed  
Waldo County SWCD  
46 Little River Drive  
Belfast, ME 04915

June 2, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202002031, Watershed-based Plan Development

Dear Andy:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) referenced above, issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA and is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following applicants:

Bidder	Proposal Title
Cobbossee Watershed District	Wilson Pond Watershed-Based Management Plan Development
Cumberland County SWCD	Black Brook Watershed Management Plan Project
Waldo County SWCD	Unity Pond (Lake Winnecook) Watershed-Based Plan Update

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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 submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine’s waters.

Sincerely,

Wendy Garland  
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

AUGUSTA  
17 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017  
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

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

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

PRESQUE ISLE  
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK  
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769  
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

### **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

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

## Garland, Wendy

---

**From:** Garland, Wendy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2020 1:05 PM  
**To:** melissabrandt@yorkswcd.org  
**Subject:** Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development  
**Attachments:** YCSWCD Letter.pdf

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Development (RFP#202002031). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Although the **Biddeford Pool Watershed-Based Plan Development Project** was not selected for funding under this RFA, I encourage you to contact me to further discuss this application. I can share some feedback from our Evaluation Team so you can consider ways to strengthen a future proposal and thereby further protect this important resource.

### Wendy Garland

Nonpoint Source Program Coordinator  
Division of Environmental Assessment, [Maine DEP](#)  
17 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333  
(207) 615-2451, [wendy.garland@maine.gov](mailto:wendy.garland@maine.gov)





STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS  
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID  
COMMISSIONER

Melissa Brandt  
York County SWCD  
21 Bradeen St, Suite 304  
Springvale, ME 04083

June 2, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202002031, Watershed-based Plan Development

Dear Missy:

This letter is in regard to the Request for Applications (RFA) referenced above, issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. The Department has evaluated the applications received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA and is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following applicants:

Bidder	Proposal Title
Cobbossee Watershed District	Wilson Pond Watershed-Based Management Plan Development
Cumberland County SWCD	Black Brook Watershed Management Plan Project
Waldo County SWCD	Unity Pond (Lake Winnecook) Watershed-Based Plan Update

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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 submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine’s waters.

Sincerely,

Wendy Garland  
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

AUGUSTA  
17 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017  
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

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

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

PRESQUE ISLE  
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK  
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769  
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

### **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

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

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Maine DEP

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Wendy Garland

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Greg Beane (DEP), Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

<b>Pass/Fail Criteria</b>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 25%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed		X See below
CASWCD's application proposed developing a watershed-based plan for two tributaries of the Lower Aroostook River. None of these waters (Lower Aroostook River, Barring Brook, unnamed Brook) are currently on the NPS Priority Watersheds list. Therefore, the application was not eligible for funding. The Evaluation Team did not score the proposal. Although not grounds for rejection, the application did not include a watershed map or information on Applicant Qualifications and Experience.		
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
<b>Numerical Score:</b>		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	(Max: 10 Points)	
Section III. Water Quality Problem	(Max: 10 Points)	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems	(Max: 10 Points)	
Section V. Feasibility for Success	(Max: 25 Points)	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	(Max: 25 Points)	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	(Max: 5 Points)	
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (Max: 100 Points)		

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION I  
Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**Total Points Available:** 15 points                      **Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Application Qualifications**

- Relevant experience –
  
- Financial, administrative -
  
- Technical qualifications -
  
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe -
  
- Past performance on relevant projects –

**2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance** - If the project plans to issue a sub-grant to an eligible recipient, consider the adequacy of the subgrantee’s qualifications and relevant past performance.

**3. Consultant Qualifications** - If the project plans to acquire consultant services, consider the adequacy of the qualifications and experience that will be requested in the project’s solicitation for services.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Relative Value of Waterbody**

**Total Points Available: 10      Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Degree to which the public currently uses and values the waterbody**

- Availability (access) of use –
  
- Extent of use -

**2. Types of Uses**

- Drinking water supply
- Public recreational opportunities
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
- Commercial benefits
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat
- Other

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Water Quality Problem**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

1. Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.
  
2. Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

1. Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.
  
2. Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V  
Feasibility of Success**

**Total Points Available: 25 Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

1. **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**
  
2. **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**
  
3. **Consideration**
  - Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.
  
  - Effective well-sequenced tasks
  
  - Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
  
  - Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts
  
  - Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI  
Cost Effectiveness**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

1. Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)
  
2. Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes
  
3. Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Central Aroostook County SWCD – Lower Aroostook River

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII  
Comprehensive Plan**

**Total Points Available: 5 Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Maine DEP

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Wendy Garland

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Greg Beane (DEP), Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

<b>Pass/Fail Criteria</b>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 25%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
<b>Numerical Score:</b>		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>13</b>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	(Max: 10 Points)	<b>4</b>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	(Max: 10 Points)	<b>6</b>
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems	(Max: 10 Points)	<b>5</b>
Section V. Feasibility for Success	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>16</b>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>19</b>
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 100 Points)	<b>68</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION I  
Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**Total Points Available:** 15 points                      **Score:** 13

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Overall, very strong qualifications and experience – both within CCSWCD and with the project partners (PRLT and Town of Windham). Strong and well-rounded team assembled.

**1. Application Qualifications**

- Relevant experience – CCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects. They have done fewer WBP planning projects, but they just completed a successful Highland Lake WBP project.
- Financial, administrative – CCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.
- Technical qualifications – Project manager has many years of experience and is very effective. Lots of experience in their diverse staff.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone very well.

**2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance** - If the project plans to issue a sub-grant to an eligible recipient, consider the adequacy of the subgrantee's qualifications and relevant past performance.

PRLT has strong qualifications to assist with water quality monitoring. They have worked with DEP for many years through the VRMP to collect high quality data in their region.

**3. Consultant Qualifications** - If the project plans to acquire consultant services, consider the adequacy of the qualifications and experience that will be requested in the project's solicitation for services.

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Relative Value of Waterbody**

**Total Points Available: 10                      Score: 4**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Degree to which the public currently uses and values the waterbody**

- Availability (access) of use – Main access appears to be via Black Brook Preserve (105 acres), which includes two miles of trails, 600 feet of bog bridges and multiple recreational uses.
- Extent of use – Appears to be well-used based on personal observations and location in center of town.

**2. Types of Uses**

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Noted above.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Local farms and associated aesthetics are important to the Town of Windham. Two farms protected with easements in the watershed.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Some animals mentioned that have been observed. Limited information provided otherwise. Any fish info on the stream?
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other – Overall, fairly good public value for a small stream in a suburban area. Somewhat recognized and valued by the public.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Water Quality Problem**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**

Application provided some information about the water quality conditions. Impaired for DO and bacteria. Maine DEP habitat assessment indicated that habitat was not a major issue.

However, much more water quality data was readily available through PRLT and Maine DEP's VRMP program.

**2. Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.**

Limited information provided make it difficult to gauge. DEP review shows that DO impairment may not be to severe. Bacteria appears to be quite elevated, however.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

**Total Points Available: 10   Score: 5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.**

Application noted agricultural NPS, habitat and 10 sites mentioned in the draft TMDL. Limited information provided – could have talked about other potential issues based on analysis of watershed.

**2. Work plan’s understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.**

Application didn’t mention potential actions needed to address NPS issues.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V  
Feasibility of Success**

**Total Points Available: 25 Score:   16**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**

Very likely that CCSWCD will successfully complete the project as proposed.

**2. Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**

Not sure if stream can be restored given the DO and bacteria impairments. Challenging to address bacteria. Also watershed will likely face development pressure in the future. That said, Town is committed to protecting farmland in town and addressing water quality problems.

**3. Consideration**

- Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Tasks are well laid out and sequenced. For example, good to conduct the stream walk at outset. However, could use more detail, especially related to the monitoring task. May be overlooking residential development, geomorphic issues and septic.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Many stakeholders with active participation from PRLT and Town.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Good amount of monitoring data to inform project.

- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

Relatively good. Identified as a high priority for the Town. Councilor owns farm in the watershed.



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI  
Cost Effectiveness**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 19**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**

Overall, very good investment and costs are reasonable to develop a WBP (\$17,862 grant).

**2. Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes**

Most tasks are reasonable. However, Task 3 may be too low to answer questions needed for solid plan. Task 6 could also be bolstered to engage landowners.

**3. Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.**

Very good. Match is over 50% and includes \$10,000 in cash match.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII  
Comprehensive Plan**

**Total Points Available: 5 Score: 5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Points = 5 points x % of watershed with consistent comp plan

Y = Consistent

N = Inconsistent, Unknown (i.e., expired finding) or No Comp Plan on Record

<b>Town(s)</b>	<b>Comp Plan Consistency</b>	<b>% Watershed with Consistent Plan</b>	<b>Points</b>
Windham	Y	100%	5

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Maine DEP

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Wendy Garland

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Greg Beane (DEP), Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

<b>Pass/Fail Criteria</b>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 25%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
<b>Numerical Score:</b>		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>12</b>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	(Max: 10 Points)	<b>5</b>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	(Max: 10 Points)	<b>7</b>
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems	(Max: 10 Points)	<b>6</b>
Section V. Feasibility for Success	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>20</b>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>19</b>
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>4</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 100 Points)	<b>73</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION I  
Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**Total Points Available:** 15 points                      **Score:**   12  

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Application Qualifications**

- Relevant experience – CWD has extensive, relevant experience with watershed planning and implementation grant projects. Also, several projects focused on Wilson Pond.
  
- Financial, administrative – Not much information provided, but CWD has track record of managing financial and administrative aspects of projects.
  
- Technical qualifications – Experienced staff (3) with limnology and watershed qualifications.
  
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Very good. Stable staff with little turnover. Typically completes projects successfully.
  
- Past performance on relevant projects – Very strong performance on past projects, although often extended time frames and delayed submittals of deliverables.

**2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance** - If the project plans to issue a sub-grant to an eligible recipient, consider the adequacy of the subgrantee’s qualifications and relevant past performance.

FOCW – Limited role in project, but very good at outreach. Didn’t state outright, but they will help with the watershed survey. This worked very well with recent Annabessacook Lake project.

**3. Consultant Qualifications** - If the project plans to acquire consultant services, consider the adequacy of the qualifications and experience that will be requested in the project’s solicitation for services.

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Relative Value of Waterbody**

**Total Points Available: 10                      Score: 5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Overall, moderate value lake. Not a regional destination, but value for residents and wildlife/habitat.

**1. Degree to which the public currently uses and values the waterbody**

- Availability (access) of use – Two public access points: state boat launch and public beach owned by N. Monmouth Community Club.
- Extent of use – Used mainly by local residents (120 camps around lake), not a regional destination lake. Relatively low amount of shoreline development compared to other lakes in developed parts of the state.

**2. Types of Uses**

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities - Recreational uses includes boating and passive uses such as canoeing, kayaking, fishing, swimming, birding.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Not mentioned
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits - Cold and warmwater fishery with 8 native fishes, 6 introduced and pike. IFW stocks brown and brook trout annually. GBH habitat and inland wading bird/waterfowl habitat on Wilson and Berry Ponds.
- Commercial benefits – Not mentioned
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat
- Other - Flows into Annabessacook Lake, which is impaired so efforts would provide benefits there as well.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Water Quality Problem**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**

Very good job explaining the problem; lots of data. Internal recycling likely. Sediment chemistry not provided in application.

**2. Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.**

Impaired due to declining trend.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.**

2007 TMDL provided % contributions. Internal loading also noted, although not clear how significant. Did not provide information on the numbers and types of NPS sites from the 2005 watershed survey.

**2. Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.**

Not mentioned.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V  
Feasibility of Success**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**

Very likely to be completed successfully as proposed.

**2. Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**

Not severely impaired, so good opportunity to reverse the declining trend.

**3. Consideration**

- Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.

Project will generate information needed for restoration plan.

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Effective series of tasks in project that would lead to a strong plan. Task 3 is strong and clearly thought out. Not sure if/how agriculture will be surveyed/addressed. Recommend incorporating.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Good support and involvement from DACF and FOCW, although no letters of commitment provided. May want to also involve dam owners in steering committee if considering a drawdown recommendation.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Lots of past work leading to this point. Project would maintain momentum.

- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

Important to stakeholders



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI  
Cost Effectiveness**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   19**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- 1. Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**  
Project is a good value and investment that could result in a restoration story.
- 2. Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes**  
Costs reasonable for tasks. 360 hours for project manager and reasonable rates.
- 3. Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.**  
Local match is only 27% - not much over minimum.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII  
Comprehensive Plan**

**Total Points Available: 5 Score:   4**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Points = 5 points x % of watershed with consistent comp plan

Y = Consistent

N = Inconsistent, Unknown (i.e., expired finding) or No Comp Plan on Record

<b>Town(s)</b>	<b>Comp Plan Consistency</b>	<b>% Watershed with Consistent Plan</b>	<b>Points</b>
Wayne	Y	83%	4
Readfield	Y		
Monmouth	N		
Winthrop	Y		

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Maine DEP

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Wendy Garland

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Greg Beane (DEP), Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

<b>Pass/Fail Criteria</b>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 25%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
<b>Numerical Score:</b>		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	<b>7</b>	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	<b>8</b>	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	<b>9</b>	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	<b>7</b>	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	<b>14</b>	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	<b>18</b>	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	<b>0</b>	
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (Max: 100 Points)	<b>63</b>	

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION I  
Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**Total Points Available:** 15 points                      **Score:**   7  

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Application Qualifications**

- Relevant experience – WCSWCD has been involved with Unity Pond efforts for many years and has been a grantee in the past. WCSWCD has a limited role; hasn't been involved in NPS grants for over 10 years.
- Financial, administrative – Has successfully administered NPS grants in past.
- Technical qualifications – WCSWCD board has long term involvement. Rick K from Cooperative Extension is an excellent technical resource.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Consultant will carry out much of the project.
- Past performance on relevant projects – No recent experience.

**2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance** - If the project plans to issue a sub-grant to an eligible recipient, consider the adequacy of the subgrantee's qualifications and relevant past performance.

Will need to explore whether Unity College is considered a subgrant. No information provided on qualifications of the professors. FOWL listed as a subgrant. No quals provided for FOWL, and not clear if they have strong skills and capacity to lead the watershed survey.

**3. Consultant Qualifications** - If the project plans to acquire consultant services, consider the adequacy of the qualifications and experience that will be requested in the project's solicitation for services.

Good to hire consultant for the project. Identified the important qualifications and experience for them. Not clear, but assumed, that the consultant will have expertise in evaluating internal loading issues and options.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Relative Value of Waterbody**

**Total Points Available: 10                      Score: 8**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Degree to which the public currently uses and values the waterbody**

- Availability (access) of use – Excellent. 2 public beaches, 2 public boat launches, Field of Dreams recreational facility.
  
- Extent of use – The lake is central to the community and surrounding areas. Well used and important to the area.

**2. Types of Uses**

- Drinking water supply - NA
- Public recreational opportunities – Heavy use with beaches, several boat launches
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Not mentioned
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Very important wildlife habitat in lake and watershed.
- Commercial benefits - NA
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not mentioned, but high potential if water quality improves.
- Other – High educational resource for college. Land for Maine’s Future has many ag. easements in the watershed.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Water Quality Problem**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**

Excellent, thorough description of water quality and issues. Backflushing issue not well understood.  
Extensive data set.

**2. Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.**

Severe impairment with internal loading.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.**

Agricultural NPS and internal loading are the major issues. Also shoreline and road NPS sources. Past survey findings not discussed. Could have elaborated on 2019 results more.

**2. Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V  
Feasibility of Success**

**Total Points Available: 25 Score: 14**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**

Very likely to be completed with a consultant at the helm.

**2. Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**

Not clear whether the lake can be restored, but it can be improved.

**3. Consideration**

- Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.

Tasks, team and past data will help determine needed actions.

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Important pieces/tasks included. Good to include culvert analysis.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Many partners with expertise and strong contributions and involvement

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Numerous past efforts and extensive monitoring to leverage the proposed project.

- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

Strong interest demonstrated in application. However, will there will adequate local capacity and resources to carry out the plan? Very little activity in recent years.



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI  
Cost Effectiveness**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**

Good investment for a strong plan for a complex, impaired lake.

**2. Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes**

Reasonable task costs overall. Task 3 – Not enough information provided on grant/match and roles. Task #6 - \$6500 high cost for 4 meetings. Is Burnham match for CBI or this grant project? Confirm that it's for WBP project.

**3. Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.**

Overall match 30.9% (after ineligible septic grants removed). Good quality from several partners including \$5800 cash match from FOWL, cash match from two small towns and in-kind match from Unity College.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII  
Comprehensive Plan**

**Total Points Available: 5 Score: 0**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Points = 5 points x % of watershed with consistent comp plan

Y = Consistent

N = Inconsistent, Unknown (i.e., expired finding) or No Comp Plan on Record

<b>Town(s)</b>	<b>Comp Plan Consistency</b>	<b>% Watershed with Consistent Plan</b>	<b>Points</b>
Burnham	N	0%	0
Thorndike	N		
Troy	N		
Unity	N		

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Procurement Services as part of your contract award selection documents.

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Maine DEP

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Wendy Garland

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Greg Beane (DEP), Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

<b>Pass/Fail Criteria</b>		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 25%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Points Awarded:</u>		
<b>Numerical Score:</b>		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	<b>9</b>	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	<b>7</b>	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	<b>4</b>	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	<b>4</b>	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	<b>10</b>	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	<b>8</b>	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	<b>0</b>	
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (Max: 100 Points)	<b>42</b>	

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION I  
Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**Total Points Available:** 15 points                      **Score:**   9  

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Application Qualifications**

- Relevant experience – YCSWCD has extensive experience with DEP implementation grant projects. Current project manager, Jen Harris, has only been at the District for a year and has a degree in marine science from UNE. She is working on the Kennebunk River planning project so has some relevant experience. Melissa Brandt is listed with the bulk of the staff hours and has very limited experience managing planning or implementation grants. She has been with the District for many years but serves in a more administrative role on projects, not as the project manager.
- Financial, administrative – District has managed numerous projects in past.
- Technical qualifications – District technical qualifications developing plans and dealing with monitoring and bacteria is limited. Project pulls in other partners with strong technical qualifications – including Wells Reserve, CCSWCD engineer and consultant.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Small staff at District and they have the bulk of the project hours. Not clear which person is doing which tasks and whether it's possible to carry out in the timeframe.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Current projects run by Jen Harris are going well. District projects have been successful for the most part.

**2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance** - If the project plans to issue a sub-grant to an eligible recipient, consider the adequacy of the subgrantee's qualifications and relevant past performance.

CCSWCD Engineer – Strong experience and performance on other grant projects.

Wells Reserve – Good to involve. Strong monitoring experience and plays important role in Kennebunk River WBP project.

**3. Consultant Qualifications** - If the project plans to acquire consultant services, consider the adequacy of the qualifications and experience that will be requested in the project's solicitation for services.

Good to hire consultant with strong background in bacteria NPS to write the plan. However, application is inconsistent about who will write plan. YCSWCD or consultant?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Relative Value of Waterbody**

**Total Points Available: 10                      Score: 7**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Application did not provide correct/accurate information. For example, it lists three coastal beaches that are adjacent to but outside the watershed. Regardless, the water resource is very important in many ways.

**1. Degree to which the public currently uses and values the waterbody**

- Availability (access) of use – Conserved land with public access - BPLT has a 4 acre parcel; USFWS has 19.7 acre parcel and NWR has 40+ acres. Also, Vines Landing Park at mouth and Park in the Pines on Hill Beach are two town parks, that aren't listed.
- Extent of use -

**2. Types of Uses**

- Drinking water supply - NA
- Public recreational opportunities – Boating, fishing (especially striped bass), bird watching. 130 moorings at yacht club.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Very scenic resource visible from adjacent town roads.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Estuary and inland march with rare communities with valuable wading bird habitat. National Wildlife Refuge. Very good.
- Commercial benefits – Very good. \$500,000 shellfish harvest from Biddeford Pool (is this town wide or Biddeford Pool alone?) 10 commercial licenses and 240 recreational licenses. Popular tourist area.
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat
- Other

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Water Quality Problem**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score:   4**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**

Water quality is threatened, not impaired although shellfish harvesting is closed more and more over time. DEP has sampled one time, and pointed to bird as the bacteria source.

Application did not demonstrate understanding of water quality or reference the available DMR data. Also, past macroalgae issues are not mentioned. Provided information from beaches outside the watershed.

**2. Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.**

Water quality declining over time. Did not present data to indicate the magnitude of the exceedances.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

**Total Points Available: 10 Score: \_\_4\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.**

Very little information provided on NPS problems in the watershed. Mentions shoreline sanitary surveys but did not mention findings. Alluded to potential wildlife, septics, stormwater, boats and pet waste. Did not mention past UNE work on campus.

**2. Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V  
Feasibility of Success**

**Total Points Available: 25 Score:   10**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Evaluation Team had many questions about the tasks in the application. Who is doing what? Does team know enough to be able to complete successfully?

**1. Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**

Would need lots of support and adjustments to the work plan to be successful. Who is writing the plan – consultant or YCSWCD? Consultant with WBP writing and bacteria experience would be more fitting than YCSWCD.

**2. Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**

Not clear based on the information provided and lack of understanding of the watershed and water quality. Bacteria is challenging to address. Is there enough monitoring proposed in project to understand sources?

**3. Consideration**

- Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.
- Effective well-sequenced tasks – Several good components in the application. However, Tasks 3 and 4 not clearly laid out. Monitoring parameters listed are not all important (e.g., specific conductance in tidal waters). Is the timeline feasible? Didn't explain the purpose of the drifter survey? Is it feasible or useful? In Medomak, wasn't used to track pollution sources. Will all of the nine WBP elements be addressed?
- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government – Strong partner involvement and several partners involved.
- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts – Some very limited efforts and growing interest.
- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody – Many partners invested in the resource, including the City, Wells Reserve, Saco Watershed Collaborative and Biddeford Shellfish Committee. Past history of conflict.



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI  
Cost Effectiveness**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   8**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**1. Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**

\$50,000 is somewhat high cost for a small watershed. If it was a well-laid out project, however, it would be reasonable amount to develop a develop a WBP and guide restoration. ET did not have confidence in the work plan as proposed would be a good investment.

**2. Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes**

Tasks 1, 2, 5 and 7 are reasonable. Many problems, omissions and inconsistencies with the budget. Not clear about the specific costs for drifter study (equipment, student interns??).

**3. Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.**

43% match from several sources is good. \$8,000 match from City is very good. Only \$277 match from Saco Collaborative?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** Grants for Nonpoint Source Projects Watershed-based Plan Development

**BIDDER:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/8/20

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII  
Comprehensive Plan**

**Total Points Available: 5 Score: 0**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

Points = 5 points x % of watershed with consistent comp plan

Y = Consistent

N = Inconsistent, Unknown (i.e., expired finding) or No Comp Plan on Record

<b>Town(s)</b>	<b>Comp Plan Consistency</b>	<b>% Watershed with Consistent Plan</b>	<b>Points</b>
Biddeford	N	0%	0

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District

**DATE:** 5/6/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Addie Halligan

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:

P= Positive, N=Negative, Q=question O=other

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

P= CCSWCD has ample experience carrying out successful nonpoint source pollution grants (604b/319). Their staff is well equipped and diverse with an engineer, educators project managers, planners, and admin personal. The project Manager has years of experience and has utilized her team at the district of varying expertise to complete successful projects.

P= Strong partnerships- they have municipality involvement, especially with the Environmental and Sustainability Coordinator (Gretchen) is a huge asset, and PRLT – further diversify the skills and resources. Through PRLT they have access to volunteers and water testing experience/knowledge

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

P = Flows through a PRLT Black Brook Preserve – recreational/scenic and aesthetic value. It is a 105 acre preserve, has 2 miles of trains, 600' of bog bridges over protected wetlands.

P= Local residents protected the preserve from becoming a subdivision, showing local interest in the value of the preserve for habitat and aesthetics (rolling hills, trees, streams)

P= Terrestrial habitat for wildlife observed

P= Agricultural parcels protected as forever farms ((over 350acres) and therefore potential to further protect and create a riparian habitat corridor – potential for improved habitat

N= no commercial benefits/ economic importance, the brook itself doesn't seem to have as much recreational vale.

Q= Is the preserve well used? Clearly great habitat for wildlife, but how important is it to the public for recreating? Where else does the community recreate in this vicinity?

**Water Quality Problem**

P = It is impaired due to DO and bacteria (E.coli). It is not meeting it's Class B water quality designation for either.

P= 10 years of data at the headwaters and the outlet of Black Brook (2009-2018). Key finding – data is only meeting State bacteria standards 11% of the time, and DO standards only 50% of the time.

N= Needs additional data for lower watershed

N= Would be more strong if data was summarized and key findings were shared, so it could be determined if the data suggest NPS issues or other sources.

Q= What does the data from the 10 years suggest? What were key findings?

Empty box for additional comments.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District

DATE: 5/6/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

### Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P = A draft TMDL summary was completed in 2015, including a watershed source assessment which identified 10 specific pollution source sites, including erosion, extensive impervious surfaces, and high-density neighborhoods.

P = 27% of watershed is agricultural, and of the 10 sites identified, most were agriculture activities that were impacting water quality – including lack of vegetative buffers. Livestock, however, was not observed but unknown of what practices were occurring for manure/fertilization.

N: Limited information provided from the TMDL assessment.

### Feasibility for Success

P = Participation from stakeholders and municipalities: The Town of Windham is interested in addressing their 5 impaired waters and beginning with Black Brook as the best candidate because data is available, information is known about the watershed, public visibility, current community interest and resources available. Town of Windham and PRLT submitted letters of support.

P= Strong community resources; advisory committee, Environmental and Sustainability coordinator position, Town councilor owns agricultural land in the watershed and therefore could show landowner buy in already.

P: Task 3 Identify and Confirm activities causing impairments: Basic desktop analysis (review physical information of watershed, land uses), a stream walk, site visits, additional water quality sampling

P: Task 4 Pollutant Load Model will make for a strong project, and understanding of what reductions need to be done to reach attainment, and satisfy EPA 9-elements, specifically pollutant load reductions.

N: Task 3 seems critical but not a lot of allocated funding, especially for water quality monitoring given we don't know what data is needed, since previous data was not shared and conclusions or hypothesis were not made.

N=Task 6 could be stronger if they planned to conduct outreach to ALL landowners in the watershed. Public releases can be good, but do they usually stir up much response?

N= Unclear if there has been any clear landowner buy-in, except for the Councilor.

Q/N = Water quality monitoring should be it's own task.

Q/N: Under VI partners, it says PRLT will gather data for at least one additional sampling site – but in task 3 it says they will conduct additional water quality data – but only 1 site wouldn't be sufficient enough.

### Cost Effectiveness

P = I think there is a good return for grant investment with this project. Thorough analysis will be conducted, pollutant loads will be modeled, community outreach will be conducted, and a plan will be written for not a significant amount of grant funding.

P: Town of Windham supplying significant match – for staff hours, supplies for water quality.

N: Task 3 seems to be rather low for the amount of work and analysis to be conducted. If under budgeted, the plan might be compromised.

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cobbossee Watershed District

**DATE:** 5/6/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Addie Halligan

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:

**P = positive, N= negative, Q= question**

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

Financial, admin, technical, personnel past performance. ubgrant eligibilities, consultants

**P=** CWD has administered numerous watershed improvement and protection grants over many years

**P=** Bill Monagle – Project Coordinator, years of experience/knowledge. Supported by limnologist and water resources technician – both with years of experience/knowledge.

**P =** Extensive knowledge/database of Wilson Pond both water quality data and land use info.

**P =** Partnering with Friends of Cobbossee Watershed – will bring experience in education, YCC, LakeSmart-Start!

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

Public use access Drinking water, recreation, scenic and aesthetic benefits, aquatic and terrestrial benefits, commercial, potential for increased public us and improved habitat

**P** 120 structures, half of which are seasonal

**P=** Recreation – boat launch, public beach, canoeing, kayaking, angling, swimming, birding. Etc.

**P=** Aquatic habitat - cold/warmwater fishery, including 8 native indigenous fish, 6 introduced fish, annually stocking of brook and brown trout. Terrestrial habitat – State Listed Habitat for Great Blue Heron (species of special concern), Inland wading bird and waterfowl habitat.

**Q:** Is it a drink water supply for the seasonal camps? (~60)

**Water Quality Problem**

Informed understanding of issues everty, and nonattainment in future

**P=** Impaired due to deteriorating trophic trend – increases in total phosphorous, reduced water clarity, depletion of DO, declining SDT for 25 years, 2018 algae bloom (SDT 2.0meters). Upstream ponds consistently average water clarity

**P=** On NPS Priority Watershed List and Lakes Most at Risk from New Development, Maine's 303(d) (TMDL) list in 2006, Phosphorus Control Action Pland and TDML was prepared in 2007

**Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

nderstand of what actions are needed to address NP issues

**P =** TMDL & Phosphorus Control Action Plan – principal NPS sources include upstream lakes (30%), agriculture (21%), other, or non-developed (15%), and atmospheric deposition – 8%

**P=** internal recycling has been studied – 90KgP/yr

**P =** Improvement project (#2009RT06) BMPs installed at 24 NPS sites on 6 properties, Phase II (#2014RT05) BMPs installed at 16 NPS sites on 3 camp roads, education included.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cobbossee Watershed District

**DATE:** 5/6/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Addie Halligan

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

**P=** mentions a need for an action plan to reduce internal loading, need to explore the influence of septic systems impacts, and to address stormwater-related infrastructure (culverts, ditches) to address increased frequency of intense rain events due to climate change.

**N=** Mention Watershed Survey Project (#2005R-02) twice, but no information on what the findings were.

**Q** Wilson Lake impaired, Upstream ponds (Dexter and Berry Ponds) have exhibited consistent water clarity and considered average BUT the TMDL and survey project identified the principal nonpoint sources of phosphorus pollution from Dexter and Berry Ponds – is this because they have a high flushing rate, and Wilson Lakes is 1.8x per year?

**Q:** What does the 90KgP/yr say about internal vs external loading, what percentage is this?

### **Feasibility for Success**

Likelihood waterbody protected or restored Capacity info to determine actions needed, well sequenced tasks, stakeholders municipalities, other concurrent efforts, community support

**P:** Wilson Pond is a priority for many stakeholders- CWD, the Berry Dexter Wilson Watershed Association, Towns of Monmouth, Wayne and Winthrop, and the Friends of Cobbossee Watershed. Includes MDACF as partner for on-site wastewater systems. Additionally – Task 6 will garner further support and interest to make for successful implementation projects in the future

**P:** Momentum from TMDL and previous implementation projects, but continued work needs to be done to reach attainment – confident it can be rehabilitated.

**P=** Community support via BDWWA volunteers to survey both direct and indirect watersheds.

**P=** Task 3 is strong and well thought out; survey, suitability of soils for on-site subsurface wastewater treatment

**P=** Pollutant Load reduction plan – to meet elements a, b, and c of a Watershed-Based Plan and form strong guidelines for what needs to be implemented to improve water quality and meet standards / Internal Phosphorus load – combined Task 4 and Task 5 will create a thorough analysis of both internal and external loading.

### **Cost Effectiveness**

Good return for investment  
Cost estimates are reasonable Quality of proposed match

**P:** Costs are reasonable for all Task and a good return for investment.

**N:** Task 2 match seems very low for 4 meetings and that many participants – between watershed survey and steering committee I think this could be a lot higher.

**N=** not a lot of match per task 27% overall.

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Waldo County SWCD

**DATE:** 5/7/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Addie Halligan

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

Financial, admin, technical, personnel past performance. ubgrant eligibilities, consultants  
**P=** Strong collaborative approach – WCSWCD, - admin/financial support, conservation biologist – land/ag, NRCS, Cooperative Extension, Unity College – volunteers, wqm, sediment sampling, Friends of Lake Winnecook (FOLW) – watershed nps survey, septic outreach, qualified consultant → letters of commitment from WCSWCD, FOLW, Unity College, Town of Unity, Town of Burnham.  
**N:** Last NPS implementation project was in 2006 – almost 15 years ago.  
**N:** no mention of FOLW ability and experience leading an NPS survey (it's stated they've been partners in several surveys, but leads?)  
**N:** Qualifications not provided for the Unity College professors.  
**Q:** Internal Loading  
**Q:** Unity College as a subgrant?

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

Public use access Drinking water, recreation, scenic and aesthetic benefits, aquatic and terrestrial benefits, commercial, potential for increased public us and improved habitat  
**P** Recreation public beaches, 2 public launches on lake, 3 on Sandy stream, heavily used for recreation – boating, fishing, swimming, Unity college Field of Dreams  
**P:** home to 286 shoreline houses ( 57% seasonal)  
**P=** Aquatic/Terrestrial Benefits: pond is managed for both warm and coldwater fishery – 20 fish species (12 native), inland wading and waterfowl habitat, deer wintering area, Great Blue Heron ( species of Greatest Conservation Need), Nesting Bald Eagle paid – Species of Special Concern, Yellow Lampmussel (SGCN), 2 Rare Plants (SSC), Carlton Pond (indirect watershed) – designated wildlife refuge - nesting habitat for Balck Terns – endangered. Rare expanse of wetlands and uplands – Focus Area of Statewide Ecological Significance.  
**?** Is there a way to determine # of boat visitors per year / CBI inspections #'s – to determine if it's used by more than just residents.

**Water Quality Problem**

Informed understanding of issues everity, and nonattainment in future  
**P=** Impaired due to changes in water quality over time / nuisance summer-time algal blooms – yearly, low DO and internal recycling of phosphorus.  
**P=** Data collection since 1977, 38 years of data. Significant data to track trends, SDT readings 38 years, 23 years of TP, 9 years of TP surface grab samples.

**Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

**P =** Extensive assessments and actions taken between 2001-2008, and a 2019 study. 2004 TMDL - estimates 1728 mg of Phosphorus exported to Unity Pond from direct watershed. Goal of 759 kg reduction to attain water quality standards. 2006 WBP goal of addressing 15% of load (at 4 ag, 2 town roads, 3 public access, and 11 residential. . 2007,septic tank program, -2008 Unity Pond road surveys.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Waldo County SWCD

**DATE:** 5/7/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Addie Halligan

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

2019 Lake Winnecook non-paved road survey/assessment – 54 roads surveyed and 20 identified as needing improvements (culverts assessed)

**P=** Indirect watersheds studied; Carlton Pond - 542kg annually. Sandy Stream - watershed survey of state and town roads – 29 high priority sites.

**P =** Septic systems in areas with high groundwater tables in flood prone areas have been a concern for water quality

**Q:** How do, what does the data show, has there been any surveys done?

**P=** 420 farms in 1974 & 2014-2019 USDA NWQI practices installed for livestock waste management. Soil and erosion BMPs, grazing systems, nutrient mgmt plan development.

**Q:** Seems like with that number of farms in the past, and a significant amount of money was contracted to install BMPs in the area (\$1.27 Million), than how many NPS Ag sites are there now, and would mismanaged ag sites from the past cause high Phosphorus loading previously and therefore internal loading could be caused from these sites.

**N:** What types of problems were identified for the 29 high priority sites in Sandy ? How many sites and what types of sites were identified in the 2007-2008 road surveys? Mentions culverts were looked at in 2019 – but what were the conclusions of the survey – types of Issues, estimated P load from these sites?

**N:** Doesn't say how many farms there are today, and how many NPS Ag sites were addressed during the NWQI.

### Feasibility for Success

**P =** Many stakeholders with varying expertise.

**P =** Thorough analysis of internal and external loading, modeling, and a watershed survey will all help determine actions needed in the Watershed-based plan.

**P =** Task 6 – Great addition to include assessing culverts in the watershed survey to ensure they are properly sized to accommodate changes in precipitation resulting from climate change.

**P=** A septic system vulnerability analysis seems beneficial, however...

**Q=** Does education via a brochure seem appropriate at this stage, since the majority of the efforts of this plan is to focus on analysis, not on implementation/education and therefore seems premature.

**N/Q=** Task 7- two steering committee meetings seems low.

**Q:** Task 5 – updating septic system isn't an eligible activity. However, the budget for task five wouldn't be enough to upgrade systems, is this just to provide technical assistance?

**Q:** Task 6 – 24% of total P Load was estimated from ag (2004) -what does the water quality data taken from the NWQI suggest about this load? Were improvements seen?

### Cost Effectiveness

**P=** Project should be a good return for the investment – the grant funding is on the higher side, but does have complex issues to be analyzed and experience consultants seem necessary.

**N =** Task 7, it appears the consultant is only required to meet a total of 4 times (two steering committee meetings, two water quality review committee meetings) but is budgeted for \$6,468 – seems high.

**N=** Task 3 seems very expensive.

**Q:** It appears the subgrantee (FOLW) isn't described in Partner Coordination, Roles and Responsibilities as being involved in the monitoring, but are budgeted for significantly more than the consultant. Confused about who is doing what in this task - FOLW is providing support"

Other:

- Is Sandy Stream going to be included in this project? An additional 65 square miles.
- Question: Can colleges be subgrantees?



**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** York County SWCD

**DATE:** 5/7/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Addie Halligan

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**P:** YCSWCD has years of experience with water quality improvement projects/grants.

**P:** Strong partnership with array of expertise – Melissa- administrative work, Wells NERR – monitoring, education and hired consultant – will have a solid understanding of fecal indicator bacteria, and Wells NERR- monitoring experience

**N:** Is Jen the Project manager? Education in Marine Science from UNE, but only one year of experience with project manager, and limited experience with 604b.

**Q:** What role will Chris Baldwin play for this project?

**Q:** Wells NERR – Is Annie Cox a federally funded employee –this may not be included as match. Are other employees also federally funded?

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

Public use access Drinking water, recreation, scenic and aesthetic benefits, aquatic and terrestrial benefits, commercial, potential for increased public use and improved habitat

**P:** Boat Launch, fishing, swimming, kayaking, boating, bird watching – Striped Bass fishing important for recreational

**P:** Shellfish economy - \$500,000 of shellfish harvested in the pool with 10 commercial licenses , and 240 recreational licenses given out annually.

**P:** The estuary provides significant marsh habitat for rare waterfowl species, wading bird habitat and rare plant species (Saltmarsh Sparrow – rare species, Saltmarsh false-foxglove, Beach Plum, American Sea-Brite), and wetlands

**N:** Sandy beaches – in the pool? The sandy beaches of Hills Beach are outside of the watershed.

**Q:** Is there public access to the Pool other than the boat launch?

**N:** The majority of the commercial aspects are in the town of Biddeford Pool but not in the watershed – beaches, golf course East Point Sanctuary – these would not be impacted by work to this watershed.

**Water Quality Problem**

Informed understanding of issues severity, and nonattainment in future

**P:** Threatened, but not impaired. Listed in 2016 integrated report for Estuarine and Marine waters attaining some designated uses. Listed for under category 5-B-1 for elevated fecal indicators.

**P:** Shellfish closures have drastically increased from 61 days in 2017/2018 to 2020 where it is anticipated to be closed for 122 days

**N:** The water quality issues are not very well understood, and there is limited data available. The data that is available has been done using varying methodologies and cannot be compared. The data that is mentioned was conducted by DEP but only on ONE sampling day – this is just a snapshot, and therefore it should not be concluded that bird is the source, and the samples cannot be used because the samples exceeded their holding time before being analyzed.

**N:** Potential for backwashing from Saco Bay wasn't mentioned as something to be studied.

**N:** Does not mention that it is listed on the NPS Marine Priority List due to negative water quality indicators.

**N:** Algal blooms are believed to be an issue but not mentioned.

- Saco Bay estuary listing for elevated fecal but it is not in the watershed.
- MHB sampling locations are not in the Biddeford Pool watershed.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: York County SWCD

DATE: 5/7/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

**Q:** Mentions no circulation or drifter study conducted or climate change model developed – will climate change be part of the plan? What is the goal for these studies?

### **Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

**P =** Potential sources from the sanitary survey (?) include septic, stormwater (IC), boats, waterfowl and pet waste. (Is this the 2013 sanitary survey conclusions?)

**N:** Per comment above, the NPS issues are not clear. How were the sources mentioned above determined? How many sites were found? How were septic's proven to be an issue? How are boats contributing to bacteria in the pool?

**N:** There is not a clear understanding of what actions are needed to address NPS issues.

### **Feasibility for Success**

Likelihood waterbody protected or restored Capacity info to determine actions needed, well sequenced tasks, stakeholders municipalities, other concurrent efforts, community support

**P** Strong stakeholder group. Great to see the Shellfish Committee is involved, and the City of Biddeford. Also, great to see watershed residents and landowners will be involved.

**P:** This work plan outlines a lot of investigative work which is needed in order to write a quality plan.

**N:** Likelihood it will be protected seems uncertain/ unclear. This plan outlines a lot of monitoring/analysis to take place, but it is not clear what the plan will provide for guidance on next steps. It seems that this project would benefit from conducting further analysis prior to writing a watershed-based plan.

**Task 3** – Should be broken into separate tasks.

**N: 3a:** There is not a lot of previous data available to organize and therefore Secondary Data Quality Assurance Guide will be a very minor part of this task.

**3b** could be combined with task 4 as a deliverable.

**Q Task 3c:** When will the watershed survey be conducted? After you've analyzed water quality data to determine where the hotspots are?

**N: Task 3d:** Need more details on the stressor analysis.. What is being looked at? Is the Gap Analysis for preexisting data or for data gathered for the plan and then needed for the future? Need more details for this task.

**N:** Unclear the role of the drifter study and what it looks like, especially for \$7000.

**Q:** What will the sequence be for the assessment work? Drift study first? Hotspots determined? Then Survey watershed?

**Q:** Will Task 3 be able to tell us clear next steps or just further analysis?

**Q:** Not sure if bacterial sampling based on circulation patterns will tell you much? Because then where is the source? The stormwater outfall inventory will be helpful in determining hotspots.

**Q:** Task 6: How will pollutant load reductions be calculated?

**Q:** 5 sites in the pool tested- why 5?

### **Cost Effectiveness**

**P** This project does require the amount of analysis and expertise described in the plan, and therefore the amount seems reasonable to what is needed.

**P:** Task 4 has a significant amount of valuable match.

**N:** Task 6 – mentions pollutant load reductions will be estimated, but this can be a significant task on it's own, and the budget doesn't seem adequate for it.

**N:** Drifter study is expensive if its just used to determine where to sample – what is the cost breakdown of this study.

**N:** Engineer for \$3000 but unsure what they will be used for, as sites will not needed to have engineered plans.

**Q:** Volunteer time and stakeholder participation match seems very high (\$24,557), which is great, but is their commitment for all of these hours, what is the breakdown?

# STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: York County Soil and Water Conservation District (Biddeford Pool)

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 4/27/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:

### **Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

YCSWCD – several past 319 projects, previous 604b experience  
Project Manager relatively new, but has experience juggling several projects at once – though no experience writing a WBMP/limited experience working on them.  
Although only 2 staff, have good capacity & qualifications overall

Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve – \*subcontract\* - Involved in Kennebunk River 604b & Cape Neddick 319 projects.

CCSWCD – \*subcontract\* Chris Baldwin, engineer – has lots of experience designing/consulting on 319 projects. Weird that the bio says he works at St Germain Collins – is that an old bio?

Qualified project consultant - \*subcontract\* – writing the plan, SC & TAC, tech assistance, public forum.  
Experience w/ WBMPs and fecal indicator bacteria. \*In section VI & in Tasks it says the consultant will review and edit the WBMP, not write it – inconsistent

### **Relative Value of the Waterbody**

Public boat launch. University Campus. Residential. Shellfishing – worth \$500k – what is specifically collected there? Just clams?. 10 commercial/240 recreational licenses. Commercial land uses. Sandy Beaches. Boating, Sailing, water recreation. Golf course. Marsh habitat for rare flora and fauna. Birding.

Conservation lands  
Tidal marsh with heavy development.

Confusion over what is actually in the Biddeford Pool watershed and what is technically outside of the watershed.

### **Water Quality Problem**

P: On NPS Marine Priority List as Threatened waterbody – IR Category 2.  
Class B tribs & Class SB pool. Nearby Saco Bay is class SC & listed for fecal impairment/closed to shellfishing.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** York County Soil and Water Conservation District (Biddeford Pool)

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 4/27/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

**P:** Pool clam flats - seasonal closures since 2017, extended in 2019 & again 2020 – getting worse

**N:** This section repeatedly presents information about the Saco Bay estuary, which is not relevant to this proposal and makes it confusing to assess. A better watershed map would have helped to determine which areas are part of the pool and which are outside of the study area (although information that is not about the target area should not be included in the proposal).

5 MHB/DMR test sites monitored for 16 years – but not within the pool itself. Irrelevant to current proposal.

**N:** Surely DMR has done monitoring within the pool to make determinations about restricting shellfishing? Why is none of their data presented here?

Proposal cites lack of studies to understand flushing/mixing, climate change impacts

Oct 2019 DEP sampling – bird DNA; outside of ideal testing window

**N:** More detail on results of past monitoring/water quality data would have helped the proposal. Little of the information presented was specific to the pool itself. The reason for the water quality concern (fecal bacteria) should have been stated more clearly at the beginning of the Water Quality Overview section, and information could have been presented in a clearer way.

### Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Main NPS concern is fecal bacteria. – This is evident, but should be stated more clearly.

Septic systems, stormwater, boats, waterfowl and pet waste are all potential sources of NPS.

One previous DNA sample indicated birds were the predominant source of bacteria.

Lack of WQ data within the Pool.

2013 sanitary survey, repeated 2019-2020 – parcels within 250' of resource. What were the results of the 2013 survey?

**N:** Description of watershed activities to address NPS sources lists watershed assessments and future monitoring needs, not actual actions taken.

**N:** There is not enough discussion of the NPS issues in the watershed beyond bacteria. The work plan mentions that the WBMP will specifically focus on bacteria, but I think this approach is too narrow – it needs to encompass other NPS sources.

**N:** “strategy for restoration” used a few times, but this is not an impaired waterbody. Workplan refers to pollutant loading to meet DEP criteria; however, it should be meeting standards since it is not listed as impaired (wording should be finessed a bit here – since it is cat 2, we don't have enough information to determine if it's meeting standards)

### Feasibility for Success

Proposed activities in work plan: Watershed Survey, Septic Survey, Stressor Analysis, Gap Analysis, GIS maps of survey findings & study findings, Drifter study, WQ monitoring – SAP & marine QAPP, Bracket/Blitz sampling, outfall sampling, Action Plan, public meeting

**P:** Lots of project partners

**N:** It may be challenging to balance so many stakeholders & differing opinions.

**N:** I am concerned that there is very little existing data on the pool with which to form a basis for a WBMP. It will be a lot of work to put together a full WBMP in 2 years starting from very little. I also am not sure that the proposed work plan will be sufficient to provide all of the information necessary. Specifically, I

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** York County Soil and Water Conservation District (Biddeford Pool)

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 4/27/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

think there needs to be a watershed modelling/mapping task within the workplan. This could include land cover/impervious surface analysis.

**P:** Watershed survey will be very important – separate ongoing septic survey will also be a key piece of WBMP

**Q:** Drifter study - It seems like there could be more extensive modelling done with the data that could help inform the plan beyond just determining sampling site locations.

**N:** Need water quality data to do a stressor analysis – not just survey results. What about benthic macroinvertebrates in the streams?

**N:** I am concerned about the YCSWCD's lack of experience with writing a WBMP & the number of hours budgeted for the project coordinator

**Q:** September 2020 field work is pretty hopeful – what if grant doesn't get approved in time? How will this affect drifter study & determining sampling locations?

**Q:** Not sure how Pool WQ monitoring will help determine if pollution is from groundwater vs runoff?

**Q:** Stormwater outfall sampling: What parameters?

**Q:** Will this meet EPA's 9 elements? No Pollutant load modelling is mentioned.

### Cost Effectiveness

**P:** 43% match – most of it in-kind, with the exception of \$8,000 cash match from City of Biddeford

**Q:** 200 hours = 5 full weeks (40 hrs/week) over 2 years – is this enough?

**Q:** Budget table lists a YCSWCD Grant coordinator and a Project manager - There is no grant coordinator listed in the qualifications & experience section, though I assume these refer to Jen & Melissa?

**N:** \$87,000 to create a WBP is expensive.

Budget table is confusing and it's hard to track the amounts in the tasks. Not broken down enough to understand what the money was being used for.

High \$ amount for donated services

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cumberland County Soil & Water Conservation District (CCSWCD) – Black Brook

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 4/28/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**P:** CCSWCD has been the recipient of numerous 604b and 319 grants in the past. Project manager has great amount of experience

Subgrant to PRLT – no previous 604b/319 experience highlighted

No consultant

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

Black Brook Preserve – PRLT – Recreational access- headwaters  
27% agriculture in watershed  
No mention of habitat value/fishing use

**Water Quality Problem**

Impaired – Dissolved Oxygen (DO) and Bacteria. NPS TMDL 2015 (**Q:** why still a draft?)  
DEP & PRLT monitoring data  
Class B – does not consistently meet standards along entire length; high bacteria @ headwaters, increase over time  
In 2019, lower reach met bacteria standard 11% of time, DO 50% of the time  
**N:** Wish they had presented data in more detail

**Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

2012 source assessment found 10 sites, mostly ag/buffer related, some impervious/development and erosion.  
No livestock noted, but impacts from field management practices (manure spreading) are unknown.  
**N:** A more thorough description of water quality data/TMDL/Assessment findings would have been helpful in assessing the extent and severity of NPS problems.  
TMDL states 15% developed area – development mentioned in passing, but land use breakdown could have been discussed in more detail.  
TMDL states that habitat is fairly good; focus should be on hot spots.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cumberland County Soil & Water Conservation District (CCSWCD) – Black Brook

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 4/28/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

Is there diurnal fluctuation in DO? Are there wetlands in the watershed (TMDL states no)? Wondering about source of DO depletion and if it is possible it is natural.

Would also be great to have a better description of stream gradient, substrate/habitat, any historical alteration/land uses...

No mention of septic systems.

\*preserve – pet/animal waste?

\*farms – bacteria, nutrients? (that may lower DO)

\*stream bed habitat/siltation?

### Feasibility for Success

**P:** PRLT, Town of Windham are project partners – town is motivated to do work in the watershed – NRAC, town staff

Workplan Tasks: Desktop analysis, site walk, additional monitoring, stream stressor ID, NPS site tracker, pollutant load modelling, action items

Entire application was very short and to the point. I think it would have benefitted from more detail throughout.

Need to include more deliverables?

Seems pretty straightforward, but the lack of information makes me wonder if they are leaving out important pieces (such as septic systems, residential/development).

May not have budgeted enough in the tasks to be successful.

### Cost Effectiveness

54.3% match – good

Overall cost (\$39k) also very reasonable.

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Waldo County Soil and Water Conservation District - Unity Pond

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 5/1/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

-WCSWCD – No 319/604b experience highlighted in bio. It sounds like in all, not much 319 experience (a few previous 319 projects on Unity Pond, although it looks like this was with former staff), several surveys, previous WBP development, works closely w/NRCS.

**Q:** Subgrants to FOLW and Unity College – Is FOLW a 501c3? Is Unity College eligible to receive a subgrant?

**N:** No information included about FOLW background or experience, or who specifically will be doing the work. Small lake association, no technical expertise listed. Not sure a subgrant is necessary or appropriate – could be bundled into consultant's contract?

No indication of whether or not College staff have water quality monitoring training/certification

Consultant will be hired to perform technical tasks as well as project management – sounds like they will be doing most of the work and SWCD will be doing mostly admin.

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

2 public beaches and 2 public boat launches

Recreational use

Unity College - Recreational Facility and student research

Residential – 286 shoreline properties/ roughly half and half seasonal/year round

20 fish species – warm and coldwater

Unity Wetlands/national wildlife refuge area in watershed

Waterfowl habitat, rare plants, mussel species (species of special concern)

Has had water quality issues for many years.

**Water Quality Problem**

Impaired due to nuisance algae blooms

Anoxia; internal recycling

Secchi readings declined dramatically in the mid to late 80s – potential for restoration?

Al:Fe/Al:P ratios under thresholds

Backflushing/watershed modification

Septic systems



## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Waldo County Soil and Water Conservation District - Unity Pond

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 5/1/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

**P:** Overall, good knowledge of water quality issues was demonstrated in the application.

### Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Agriculture, both present and historic

Internal phosphorus recycling

Various previous surveys/assessments were completed, incl. TMDL

2005-2006 survey had 29 high priority sites – what types of sites were found?

2019 road survey and assessment – 20/54 roads needed improvements. More detail could have been included here.

NWQI watershed

Sandy Stream backflushing – increases size of watershed greatly; lots of agriculture in that watershed – important to learn how much & how often backflushing occurs.

### Feasibility for Success

Two previous phases of 319 – 2003 & 2006

Partners – SWCD, FOLW, Unity College, Towns of Unity and Burnham, UMaine Cooperative Extension, Consultant

NRCS should be involved.

Subgrant to FOLW to lead watershed survey – will rely heavily on DEP help – it says they will conduct the training session, but really this will be DEP...

Septic outreach & assisting with lake assessment and backflushing study – interesting way of structuring this as a subgrant – not sure this is the best setup.

Unity College – baseline monitoring, backflushing study \*experience with water quality sampling/similar studies?

Depending heavily on consultant to lead the implementation of the grant

Overall, workplan tasks are well rounded and comprehensive

Giving \$1000 septic system grants will not be fundable through this grant.

#### Work Plan tasks:

Water Quality Analysis

Water Quality Monitoring and In-Lake Assessment – additional sampling required, backflushing study

Watershed Modeling & Internal Recycling Analysis – quantify internal loading, LLRM, pollutant load estimations

\*Septic systems – vulnerability analysis and brochure. \*\*assist two landowners with septic system upgrades\*\* - this is not within the scope of the RFA and will not be funded.

Watershed survey & Ag and Forestry Surveys

Steering Committee & Technical review committee – 2 meetings each

Public outreach – press releases and one stakeholder meeting

### Cost Effectiveness

31% match – not the strongest, but good considering local resources

Subgrant setup is unusual – SWCD administering, but divvying up tasks via various subgrants.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Waldo County Soil and Water Conservation District - Unity Pond

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 5/1/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

Diverse match, including cash match – looks like Burnham cash match is also going to CBI though? – Not eligible to be included as part of the grant. (see letter of support)

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:

### **Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

P: CWD – several past projects, experienced staff, good administrative capacity  
FOCW will be a subgrantee – need to specify better what they will be responsible for in this section. Do they really need a subgrant for participating on the steering committee, helping with the watershed survey, and doing outreach? RFA states subgrants can be issued for completing “significant” parts of the project.

### **Relative Value of the Waterbody**

Boat Launch & public beach – recreational value  
120 shoreline lots, more than half are seasonal  
Cold- and warmwater fishery  
Great Blue Heron, wading bird/waterfowl habitat  
Impacts WQ downstream in Annabessacook Lake.

### **Water Quality Problem**

Deteriorating trophic trend – phosphorus and clarity are worsening  
Dissolved Oxygen depletion  
Early 90s – 20% reduction in clarity that has persisted  
2018 algae bloom – 2 m Secchi reading  
Upstream ponds have average water quality, are significant load to Wilson Pond  
Should have included sediment chemistry data – Al:Fe ratio of 2; Al:P of 34.

### **Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

Impaired  
Lake most at risk of development  
Less developed than many nearby lakes  
Steep shoreline in places  
“the principal nonpoint sources of phosphorus pollution to Wilson Pond include upstream lakes (Dexter & Berry Ponds) – 30%; Development – 26%; Agriculture – 21%; Other, or Non-developed – 15%; and, Atmospheric Deposition – 8%”

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** (reviewed by evaluator) 5/4/2020

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Amanda Pratt

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

TMDL estimated 90 kg/P per year from internal recycling

Last watershed survey was 2005 – did not provide a summary of results

### Feasibility for Success

**N:** No letters of commitment

**Q:** Is this a substantial update? The proposal does not explain how the update will be different from the original plan. There is a focus on septics and internal recycling, but it doesn't specifically state that these are new.

Tex-Tech, the dam operator, does not seem to be involved – may not be necessary, but would be good to have them on the steering committee, perhaps.

**P:** Participation from towns, FOCW, and local lake association

**P:** Previous experience with monitoring & calculating internal loading  
Agriculture seems neglected. NRCS?

Workplan Tasks:

Watershed assessment – watershed survey & septic system survey

Pollutant load reduction – use survey results & model my watershed land use + water quality data to come up with load reduction estimates

Internal Load – enhanced monitoring, calculation of internal load. SAP, Secondary Data QA guide.

Education & Outreach

### Cost Effectiveness

26.8% match

No cash match – all in-kind

\$30k overall cost is low.

**P:** Overall costs for each task are low

**Q:** Subgrant to FOCW- Why is the subgrant paying for YCC? Is this for the watershed survey? It is not specified in the application.

Match listed in Part 2 of budget is higher than what is listed in Part 3 (match column was added up incorrectly)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

DATE: 4/27/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Greg Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Table with 7 rows containing evaluation comments. Row 1: Legend (P = positive, M = minus, Q = question). Row 2: Applicant Qualifications and Experience (P). Row 3: Relative Value of the Waterbody (P). Row 4: Water Quality Problem (Q). Row 5: Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (M). Row 6: Feasibility for Success (Q). Row 7: Cost Effectiveness (Q).

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cumberland County SWCD – Black Brook

**DATE:** 4/28/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Greg Beane

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Environmental Protection

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

<p><b>P = Positive M = minus Q = Question</b></p>
<p><b>Applicant Qualifications and Experience –</b> Very good, CCSWCD/Heather Huntt has a long track record of successfully coordinating both CWA 604b and 319 grant projects. It's encouraging that the Town of Windham has created the position of Environmental and Sustainability Coordinator and it appears that along with PRLT they will form a strong partnership with CCSWCD. <b>P</b></p>
<p><b>Relative Value of the Waterbody –</b> Only fair based on it's relatively low recreational use, from the description it doesn't appear to provide fishing or boating opportunity, etc. I recognize the value of the stream corridor in a densely developed part of the state and its value in the Presumpscot River watershed. <b>M</b></p>
<p><b>Water Quality Problem -</b> Black Brook has water quality issues due to high levels of bacteria and low levels of dissolved oxygen. The proposal describes that the brook only meets state bacteria guidelines 11% of time and DO standards 50% of the time, very poor. <b>P</b></p>
<p><b>Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems -</b> It appears there is a large amount of agricultural runoff in the watershed which typically carry high levels of nutrients and bacteria. The watershed is 27% agricultural land, which is significant and offers a difficult challenge regarding meeting it's classification. <b>P</b></p>
<p><b>Feasibility for Success –</b> High, the partnerships appear solid and I think Tasks 3 and 4 are important, especially pollutant load modeling. I'm a little disappointed to see that the grantee proposes only a basic stream walk to augment the desk top survey instead of doing a Rapid Geomorphic Survey. Noted: a current Town Councilor owns land the brook flows through which can only help with odds of project success. <b>Q</b></p>
<p><b>Cost Effectiveness –</b> Excellent, expenses seem reasonable and the grantee proposes to fund over 50% of total project cost via match. Grantee personnel expenses are particularly good. <b>P</b></p>

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: Waldo County SWCD – Unity Pond

DATE: 4/28/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Greg Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Table with 7 rows of evaluator comments. Row 1: Legend (P = Positive, M = Minus, Q = question). Row 2: Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair, the District only has had only a few grant projects with DEP, the last in 2008. It doesn't appear that current staff, who will be coordinating the project, have CWA 604b or 319 grant experience although they are qualified to carry out the project. M. Row 3: Relative Value of the Waterbody - High value due to its proximity to the Town of Unity and the college. It seems to have a lot of public access with two beaches and two boat launches, the pond offers swimming, fishing, boating... The description and watershed map show it has high wildlife value due, in part, to the marshy inlet and outlet. P. Row 4: Water Quality Problem - Severe, pond has annual algal blooms, is internally recycling phosphorus and Secchi disk transparency only averages around 2 meters. Also, it appears water quality, which is historically poor, is trending downwards. P. Row 5: Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - By Maine standards there is a large amount of agriculture in the watershed which produces nutrient laden runoff. The proposal mentions that it is suspected that septic systems are a problem especially in wetland areas around the pond. Also, there is the unknown effect of the Sandy Stream backwash during the right water conditions. How are new NPS inputs affecting the pond vs. internal recycling? - good question for discussion. Q. Row 6: Feasibility for Success - Good, although the District has limited experience with CWA grants they will be utilizing a consultant and will be partnering with Unity College. I like the fact that they will be analyzing internal recycling. P. Row 7: Cost Effectiveness - Pretty good, costs for all Tasks and personnel expenses seem reasonable. Match is OK and comes from a wide range of partners indicating a broad base of project support. P.

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cobboosee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 4/29/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Greg Beane

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Environmental Protection

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

<b>P = positive M = minus Q = questionable</b>
<b>Applicant Qualifications and Experience</b> – Excellent, CWD has decades of experience administering CWA grants and they have enjoyed stability in their staff with the project leader having been there for 28 years, above reproach. <b>P</b>
<b>Relative Value of the Waterbody</b> – Fair, I think its value is watered down a bit (pardon the pun) as it's located in a region of Maine which has a lot of lakes and ponds, also, I get the sense that it only offers modest recreational value. <b>M</b>
<b>Water Quality Problem</b> - Wilson Pond has serious water quality issues and suffers from algal blooms and a declining trophic trend beginning in the early 90's. It is non-attaining and on Maine's 303d list and it is believed that the pond is internally recycling phosphorous. <b>P</b>
<b>Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems</b> – As described in the proposal – “the principal nonpoint sources of phosphorus pollution to Wilson Pond include upstream lakes (Dexter & Berry Ponds) – 30%; Development – 26%; Agriculture – 21%; Other, or Non-developed – 15%; and, Atmospheric Deposition – 8%.” The TMDL also reported that based on the CWD's 2006 water quality data, an estimated 90 KgP/yr being contributed from internal recycling from pond sediments. This description breaks down the sources of NPS pollution but doesn't describe the nature of NPS issues, however, it illustrates the wide range of issues in the watershed. <b>Q</b>
<b>Feasibility for Success</b> – Very good, CWD's experience combined with their partnership with FOCW ensures the proposed project will be successfully executed. The proposal addresses all the known stressors of the pond and the information summarized in the Watershed Based Plan will be useful. <b>P</b>
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b> - Good, personnel costs appear reasonable, fair match commitment, none from towns but they support CWD on an annual basis. Good overall. <b>P</b>











**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cumberland County SWCD

**DATE:** 5/5/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Wendy Garland

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

- P CCSWCD has successfully carried out numerous DEP grant projects. Has the administrative/fiscal/technical capacity for the project. Recent planning project for Highland Lake in Windham has been successful – should provide staff with relevant experience and would rely on many of the same partners. District's connection to agricultural community will provide helpful for the project. Heather Huntt is seasoned project manager. District hasn't worked on bacteria impaired for other plans, but have no concerns about ability to run a successful project. Several other staff at the District have been involved with 319 projects if there is staff turnover.
- P Strong project team that includes Town and PRLT. Town – Gretchen Anderson is strong team member that was an active contributor to Highland Lake project. PRLT has been monitoring water quality in the watershed for many years.

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

- P Access at Black Brook Preserve (105 acres), which includes two miles of trails, 600 feet of bog bridges and multiple recreational uses. Located in the center of Town – high visibility.
- P Wildlife – observed deer, beaver, coyote, fox, porcupines, raccoons, etc.
- P Two farms (350 acres) protected with ag easements through Maine Farmland Trust. Town Comp Plans goal to preserve rural character and scenic views of ag landscape.
- P Fairly good public value for a small stream in a suburban area.
- ? Fisheries or stream habitat value?

**Water Quality Problem**

- P Application noted DEP and PRLT monitoring data for stream. Impaired for DO and bacteria (Class B) for headwaters and outlet sampling stations. 10 year trend shows increasing bacteria levels for headwater station. Lower station shows samples met 11% of the time for bacteria and 50% of the time for DO in 2019.
- N Very little data provided, although long term data sets available through DEP and PRLT. FB also did monitoring for the land trust in 2015-2016 (well-attended presentation about results). What are the values measured? How severe is the impairment?
  - Looked at past DEP/VRMP data. Habitat Assessment survey scored 167 points out of 200. Upper Pleasant River reference stream scored 171. Concluded habitat was not a major issue, but needs confirmation. Photos show low gradient, clay substrate.
  - Bacteria sampling in 2014 and 2015 at four stations with six sampling events. Middle station at Webb Road met bacteria standards in 2014 – located below forested area. Geomeans for 2014 and 2015 ranged from 61 – 206 MPN.
  - PRLT data from 2019 showed DO met 88% of the time at the lowest station and 50% of the time at the upper station. Long terms - Temp (13-19 C) and SpC (200-400 us/cm) data. Bacteria data is well above criteria (~200 MPN/ml).

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: Cumberland County SWCD

DATE: 5/5/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

### Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- P Draft TMDL included a watershed source assessment that noted 10 sites associated with agriculture, lack of buffers and also erosion and development.
- N Application did not elaborate on other potential NPS sources or the potential to restore water quality. Would have been helpful to comment on land uses and local knowledge about potential sources, especially since the draft TMDL's NPS scoping was a very modest effort.

### Feasibility for Success

- P Several pieces in place to contribute to a successful project: Town Environmental Coordinator, natural resource committee, land trust, Town councilor owns farm in watershed, public interest in the stream.
- P Good idea to conduct stream walk first to supplement existing data and knowledge – and then select sites for additional monitoring. Overall, tasks are clear and well sequenced.
- P Builds on several years of monitoring and partner interests.
- ? Monitoring should be pulled out of Task 3 into separate task. Also needs to mention QAPP/SAP/Secondary Data analysis. Not clear in task 3 about methods to identify sites during stream walk. This is an important task for plan. Not clear if scope is broad enough to generate information for the action plan.
- ? Unclear whether stream can be restored. Bacteria and DO issues can be challenging.
- ? Might need more time to talk to landowners since small number will be key to plan implementation.

### Cost Effectiveness

- P Task 1, 4 and 6 - appear reasonable. Task 2 – may appear high \$4,622 grant and \$7,667, but likely accurate based on recent experience in Windham with Highland Lake meetings and high involvement.
- P Grant cost \$17,862 seems reasonable and a good investment to develop plan for a small impaired stream with good value and community interest. DEP will need to have strong involvement to answer questions that arise but not budgeted for.
- P Strong match from Town - \$17,072 (\$10,000 cash, and \$7,072 staff support). Good support from landowners, volunteers and PRLT as well. Overall, 54.3% match.
- ? Task 3 and 6 – Is there enough time for staff? Task 3 – only \$4,065 salary for stream walk/survey/monitoring. Task 6 - only \$4,767 salary.
- ? Indirect costs high, but when folded into salary/fringe = \$91/hour. Reasonable.

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/5/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Wendy Garland

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

- P CWD has long history of water quality monitoring and successful DEP grant projects. Good administrative capacity. Bill Monagle would serve as project manager and has run many successful grant projects. Three staff people that have been with CWD for many years, so good depth in case of staff turnover. Very familiar with Wilson Pond and its watershed.
- P Project team includes FOCW. FOCW played a helpful role with the Annabessacook plan update project.

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

- P Access and Recreation - 120 seasonal camps and homes on lake. Two public access points: state boat launch and public beach owned by N. Monmouth Community Club. Recreational uses includes boating and passive uses such as canoeing, kayaking, fishing, swimming, birding.
- P Wildlife/habitat – cold and warmwater fishery with 8 native fishes, 6 introduced and pike. IFW stocks brown and brook trout annually. GBH habitat and inland wading bird/waterfowl habitat on Wilson and Berry Ponds.
- P Flows into Annabessacook Lake, which is impaired so efforts would provide benefits there as well.
- Overall, moderately high value although not a regional destination lake.

**Water Quality Problem**

- P Impaired due to declining trophic trend. Monitored closely by CWD for 40+ years. In last 25 years, average and minimum SDT has declined by about a meter. 2018 – worst bloom to date. Good presentation and understanding of water quality problem. Lake doesn't experience noxious annual blooms, so good opportunity to address before further decline.

**Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

- P 2007 TMDL estimated sources as 30% Berry/Dexter Ponds, 26% development, 21% agriculture, 15% other/nondeveloped, and 8% atmospheric. Estimated internal loading contribution, but need to further examine current extent of internal loading.
- N No information reported on the 2005 watershed survey findings. How many sites? What specific land uses (town road, private road, residential etc.)? Looked up project and found 81 sites identified with 2/3 on town and private roads.
- P Phase I and II projects fixed numerous sites on private roads (40 NPS sites on 9 roads) and shoreline stabilization (900 feet).
- P Good opportunity to address downward trend and remove from impaired list.

**Feasibility for Success**

- P Very clearly laid out tasks that can be successfully accomplished and lead to an informed plan for the lake.
- P Leverages several past efforts to understand lake water quality and address NPS sources.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** Cobbossee Watershed District – Wilson Pond

**DATE:** 5/5/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Wendy Garland

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

**P** Decent probability that efforts may lead to removal of the lake from the impaired list.

### **Cost Effectiveness**

**P** Costs for all tasks appear reasonable. CWD staff rates are very reasonable for the quality of services provided.

**P** \$22,692 is a good investment in a plan that has a good chance of leading to a NPS success story (delisting).

**N** Relatively low local match 26.8%. Most of the match is from CWD – although indirectly provided by member towns. \$2,689 remaining match from local volunteers and FOCW. Not clear whether the lake association or Towns are committed or interested in the project.



**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** WCSWCD – Unity Pond

**DATE:** 5/5/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Wendy Garland

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

- P Project includes a strong and diverse team. WCSWCD, FOWL, Unity College, Rick Kersbergen (Extension) have all been involved in Unity Pond studies and watershed efforts for many years. Will hire a consultant with experience developing nine-element plans to coordinate many tasks and write the plan.
- N No information provided about financial/administrative capacity of WCSWCD. Also, WCSWCD has not applied for or received any 319/604b grants for over a decade. Small organization, but limited role in the project. So limited risk if staff turnover.
- N Qualifications not provided on Unity Pond professors involved with the project studies.
- ? Will consultant have expertise with evaluation of options for addressing the internal loading? Should involve limnologist with that specific experience.

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

- P Heavy recreational use. Two public beaches and two public boat launches. Three boat launches to Sandy Stream. Unity College's Field of Dreams located on Unity Pond and includes carry in access, paths, playground and ball fields/tennis courts.
- ? Is pond used mainly by locals or is it a regional draw?
- P 286 developed shoreline seasonal and year-round homes. ~500 year round residents.
- P Wildlife and habitat – High value. Warm/cold water fishery with 20 species. Several wading bird and waterfowl habitat areas; 4 square miles deer wintering year; GBH and bald eagles; several rare/threatened plant species. Carlton Bog drains to lake and is managed as wildlife refuge – home to black terns (endangered) and several rare plant and animals. Extensive wetlands of significance – Unity Wetlands.

**Water Quality Problem**

- P Lake water quality problem is well understood with severe impairment. Proposal demonstrates understanding of the issue, including the potential backflushing of Sandy Stream.
- P 38 years of data over past 42 years. Impaired water quality with persistent algal blooms. Blooms start in June in coves and lakewide by late July (except 2019) until fall. DEP sediment analysis showed Al:Fe and Al:P ratios promote internal release of P when anoxic. Likely internal loading is driving blooms. Minimum annual SDT < 1.5 since 1990. TP bottom grabs – average 79 ppb. Chl a 22 ppb compared to 4.5 ppb prior to 1986.

**Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems**

- P Watershed is 7% agriculture. In the 1970s 420 farms averaging 200 acres in size. Farming decline since then but remaining farms are higher intensity and production operations.
- P Numerous studies and watershed surveys have been conducted over the years. Roads and shoreline properties mentioned. In 2019, 54 roads surveyed with 20 roads identified with issues.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: WCSWCD – Unity Pond

DATE: 5/5/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

N Application listed the many assessments, but did not describe the numbers of sites identified or priorities identified in the surveys. Did not describe types of work necessary to address NPS issues.

### Feasibility for Success

P Many projects conducted in the watershed over the past two+ decades, focused on roads, shorefront properties and agriculture. FOWL has had a septic grants program since 2007 – with funding for ~11 systems (not clear if to help with pumping or replacement). NRCS NWQI program from 2014-2019 contracted \$1.27 million in BMPs in watershed. LakeSmart also started in 2015. Project would help leverage these past and ongoing efforts.

P Project includes all the key tasks needed to develop a strong plan.

P Several partners involved in Unity – college, towns, FOWL, WCSWCD. Letters indicate relatively strong community support.

P Project could likely be completed as laid out.

- Septic system upgrades are not eligible task – cannot be in planning project as match or grant. What is the purpose of the septic brochure – education and/or information-gathering? The latter should be a focus to be included in the project.
- Need to make sure ag sites are identified and addressed. Involve NRCS in the project. Only six hours listed for Rick K. for ag survey. Given watershed size, seems like it would take much longer. Given the large role of ag as NPS sources, this should be a larger task.
- ? Given complexities of the lake and watershed, is it realistic to only hold two TAC meetings? Given likely cost to implement the plan and the lack of local funding capacity, should more SC meetings be held to make sure a realistic funding plan is developed?
- ? Grant work has not taken place since 2008. Local area/partners lack capacity to oversee and carry out involved projects. Is there local funding to support implementation? Will partners have capacity and resources to implement plan?
- ? Likelihood of restoring the lake is unclear given the severity of the impairment, size and land uses in the watershed and unknowns about Sandy River.

### Cost Effectiveness

P Overall project costs and tasks are reasonable. Good investment to develop a long-overdue updated plan for Unity Pond.

P Overall match 30.9% - after removing \$1,000 for septic upgrades. Match amount and quality good. Provided from several sources, including volunteers, FOWL cash and in-kind, Unity College, Extension and Towns. Cash match \$5800 from FOWL and \$3200 from towns.

N Task 6 budget appears to be too low to adequately survey and document NPS sites. Large watershed and lots of ag. \$2200 budgeted for tech leaders, more likely needed to cover all the sectors. Could decrease grant funds for Task 5 to cover – since DEP could do the septic analysis.

N Task 3 - very little information provided about grant and match costs.

- Funding for FOWL brochure printing and postage wouldn't be considered a subgrant.

**STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/4/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Wendy Garland

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**Applicant Qualifications and Experience**

**P** YCSWCD has carried out numerous watershed implementation projects and been involved with several watershed planning projects. Current staff are involved with the Kennebunk River WBP project. Jen Harris has been project manager for Kennebunk River project and at YCSWCD for one year. Jen is very conscientious and has strong contacts at UNE. Current projects are going well and are on track for the most part.

**N** Appears that most project hours are for 'Grant Coordinator' – Is that Melissa? If so, she has not played a direct role on past grant projects and does not have experience with water quality monitoring and watershed plans.

**P** Project team includes Wells Reserve (should be subgrant), CCSWCD Engineer (should be subgrant) and Consultant to create a well-rounded team. Wells Reserve - Jacob Aman has monitoring experience and Annie Cox is part of the Kennebunk River WBP project as well. Bios were not updated (from a past proposal). CCSWCD Engineer has extensive DEP grant experience. Good idea to hire consultant to write plan. Will seek consultant with experience writing plans and with bacteria.

**?** YCSWCD only has two staff and lots of other active and proposed projects. Is there enough capacity to carry out project, especially in the event of staff turnover?

**Relative Value of the Waterbody**

**P** Overall – relatively high value for residents/tourists for scenery, recreation, shell fishing and habitat. However, most visitors go to adjacent beaches and resources.

**P** Estimated \$500,000 value to shellfish harvest from Biddeford Poll. 10 commercial licenses and 240 recreational licenses annually. Numerous businesses in the watershed that cater to tourists and local residents.

**P** Recreation - fishing (including striped bass), boating, swimming, kayaking, bird watching and beach-going (? See below). Marina provides 130 moorings for recreational and commercial vessels. Yacht and sailing clubs.

**P** Habitat value – estuary and inland marsh for rare saltmarsh sparrow and rare plant communities. Extensive wetlands on north and west side of pool are owned by USFWS as national wildlife refuge (not mentioned in application).

**N** Public Access – Application lists three beaches in the watershed, but it appears that these are all adjacent to (not in) the watershed. Is East Point Sanctuary in the watershed? Where is the public access to the actual Biddeford Pool? Appears to be via Vines Landing Park (not mentioned in application), which provides boat access, parking and views. Also, Park in the Pines on Hills Beach is a Town park on the pool. Not mentioned in application – but it has park benches and carry in

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

RFP TITLE: GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BIDDER NAME: York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

DATE: 5/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

access. Extensive scenic views of the pool offered from surrounding roads (not mentioned in proposal).

### Water Quality Problem

- P Not listed as impaired in DEP IR. Elevated fecals. DEP monitoring in October 2019 indicated bird source of bacteria – but not the ideal time to test. Closures to harvesting since 2017 with length of closure extended from 9/30 to 10/30 and now to 11/30. Some information available but more needed.
- N Proposal not entirely clear or demonstrating understanding of available data. How high are the fecal numbers? – no info provided about severity of the bacteria issue. “DMR and MHB monitoring for 16 years at five sites at beach, but not in the pool itself”. However, DMR monitoring maps show six monitoring sites in the pool and data. Two sites green, two with moderately high values and two sites black with elevated fecals. Also, not clear why proposal provides ocean-side beach monitoring information.

### Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- P Some work conducted to date in watershed to understand sources. DEP sample showed potential wildlife source. Sanitary survey started in 2019 (?) and identified septics, stormwater, boats, waterfowl and pet waste as potential sources.
- N Does not mention past UNE work on septics issue.
- N Section IVb provides little information about activities completed to date. Unclear statement about the 2013 and 2019 shoreline surveys. Who did them and what were results? Provides plan for future assessment more than providing information about likely NPS issues.

### Feasibility for Success

- P Although work plan would need lots of work, could likely be carried out successfully with strong DEP involvement and strong partner interest.
- ? Bacteria issues are challenging to figure out. Will plan identify action items to address sources or just more studies needed? Would need to really focus on targeted monitoring, analysis and solutions.
- N Task 3 - Watershed Data Mgmt, Inventory & Assessment – Many components included and not very clearly laid out. Should be broken into 2+ tasks. Watershed survey is important but would need to be carefully considered in order to provide useful information related to bacteria. Septic survey database is mentioned in just one sentence – what will it entail? GIS mapping lumped with drifter study. Will drifter study have a QAPP? “Engineer guidance” not elaborated upon/mentioned in subtask 3c – watershed survey.
- ? Task 4 – Water Quality Monitoring – York County SWCD QAPP is for freshwater streams, but includes bacteria monitoring so probably wouldn’t need a whole new QAPP.
- N Not sure the parameters listed are the important ones (e.g., SpC not important in tidal areas, E.coli not used by DMR). ‘Bracket sampling’ would indicate that multiple locations would be monitoring in each tributary to narrow sources. However, this is not consistent with the description of six vents in five locations in the tributaries. No info provided about the outfall inventory or about the water quality parameters monitored in #4c.
- P Good approaches to monitoring including bracket sampling, recurring blitz, outfall monitoring.
- P Several important components included in work plan including TAC, SC, database, watershed survey, septics database, drifter study, stressor ID,
- P Strong involvement from many partners, including the City, UNE, Wells Reserve, Saco Watershed Collaborative and Biddeford Shellfish Committee. City cash match - \$8,000.

## STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202002031

**RFP TITLE:** GRANTS FOR NONPOINT SOURCE PROJECTS WATERSHED-BASED PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**BIDDER NAME:** York County SWCD – Biddeford Pool

**DATE:** 5/4/20

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Wendy Garland

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DEP

### **Cost Effectiveness**

- P Task Costs - #1 \$5523, #2 \$6008, #5 and #7 reasonable. Although DNA costs are \$100+/sample Task 4.
- P Match Strong - 43% match, includes \$8,000 from City.
- P \$50,000 cost to develop a plan for an important resource is reasonable and good investment for the return.
- N Not clear how many hours match from other sources. Only \$277 from Saco Watershed Collaborative?
- N Task 3 - \$24,599 – Would be helpful to see subtask breakdowns to gage cost effectiveness. Engineering - What will they provide for \$3,000 grant funds? Not specified. How will \$7,000 be used for drifter study – to pay UNE interns/equipment (needs breakdown)?
- N Task 6 – Does not appear adequate, especially if loading numbers needed. Only ~70 hours budgeted - \$4,810. Only 117 hours allocated for consultant overall.
- N Donated Services Labor – not clearly laid out in budget tables. How many hours and by who?
- N Budget Tables do not follow instructions, clearly lay out costs or match other parts of application.
- N What are the specific supplies and materials in Part 2 budget?
- N Wells Reserve travel rate \$.55/mile higher than State rate of \$.45/mile. Travel footnote does not match amount listed in table.
- N No monitoring supply costs listed in Task 4.



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Gerald D. Reid  
Commissioner

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**  
**RFP #: 202002031**  
**RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects**  
**Watershed-based Plan Development**

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

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

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

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

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

Tom Miragliuolo  
Signature

5/4/2020  
Date



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Gerald D. Reid  
Commissioner

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**  
**RFP #: 202002031**  
**RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects**  
**Watershed-based Plan Development**

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

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

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

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

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

*Addie Halligan*

Signature

4/24/2020

Date



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Gerald D. Reid  
Commissioner

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**  
**RFP #: 202002031**  
**RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects**  
**Watershed-based Plan Development**

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

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

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

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

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

*Amanda Pratt*

4/24/2020

Signature

Date





STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Gerald D. Reid  
Commissioner

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**  
**RFP #: 202002031**  
**RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects**  
**Watershed-based Plan Development**

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

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

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

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

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

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Gregory E. Beane".

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

4/27/20  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Gerald D. Reid  
Commissioner

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**  
**RFP #: 202002031**  
**RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects**  
**Watershed-based Plan Development**

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

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

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

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

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

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland".

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date 4/22/20