

State of Maine
Master Score Sheet

RFA# 202203023						
Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation						
Bidder Name:		City of Sanford – Goodall Brook	Cobboosee Watershed District – Torsey Pond	Hancock Co. SWCD – Branch Lake	Oxford Co. SWCD – Hogan/Whitney	
Proposed Cost:		\$61,870	\$80,391	\$112,477	\$77,910	
Scoring Sections		Points Available				
Section I: Applicant Qualifications Experience		15	10	13	11	12
Section II: Relative Value of Waterbody		10	5	5	9	4
Section III: Water Quality Problem		10	8	4	3	6
Section IV: Nature Extent Severity NPS Prob.		10	7	3	8	5
Section V: Feasibility of Success		25	14	10	14	14
Section VI: Cost Effectiveness		25	12	14	6	14
Section VII: Comprehensive Plan		5	0	0	0.4	2
TOTAL		<u>100</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>51.4</u>	<u>57</u>
Bidder Name:		Seven Lakes Alliance – Long Pond	Seven Lakes Alliance - Messalonskee	Town of Brunswick – Mare Brook	Town of Saco - Goosefare	
Proposed Cost:		\$112,550	\$111,884	\$149,849	\$147,740	
Scoring Sections		Points Available				
Section I: Applicant Qualifications Experience		15	8	9	12	12
Section II: Relative Value of Waterbody		10	7	7	7	7
Section III: Water Quality Problem		10	8	7	7	8
Section IV: Nature Extent Severity NPS Prob.		10	8	8	7	7
Section V: Feasibility of Success		25	14	16	19	19
Section VI: Cost Effectiveness		25	18	17	18	18
Section VII: Comprehensive Plan		5	1.3	3	0	3.5
TOTAL		<u>100</u>	<u>64.3</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>74.5</u>



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

Matthew Hill
Public Works Director
City of Sanford
156 School St.
Sanford, ME 04073

September 7, 2022

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Matthew:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alex Wong", written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

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).



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

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

September 7, 2022

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Bill:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alex Wong', written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

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).



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

Mark Whiting
Hancock Co. SWCD
474 Bucksport Rd.
Ellsworth, ME 04605

September 7, 2022

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Mark:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alex Wong", written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

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).



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

Michelle Windsor

September 7, 2022

Oxford Co. SWCD
17 Olson Rd., Ste. 3
South Paris, ME 04281

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Michelle:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alex Wong", written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

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).



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

Charlie Baeder
Seven Lakes Alliance, Conservation Program Director
PO Box 250
Belgrade Lakes, ME 04918

September 7, 2022

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Charlie:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alex Wong', written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

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).



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

Charlie Baeder
Seven Lakes Alliance, Conservation Program Director
PO Box 250
Belgrade Lakes, ME 04918

September 7, 2022

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Charlie:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alex Wong', written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

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).



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

Heather Huntt
Cumberland Co. SWCD
35 Main St., Ste. 3
Windham, ME 04062

September 7, 2022

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Heather:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alex Wong", written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

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).



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



MELANIE LOYZIM
COMMISSIONER

Joseph Laverriere, PE
City of Saco
15 Phillips Spring Rd.
Saco, ME 04072

September 7, 2022

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202203023, Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Implementation

Dear Joe:

This letter references 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 applicant(s):

Bidder	Application Title
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Belgrade Regional Conservation Alliance, Inc., dba 7 Lakes Alliance	Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Town of Brunswick	Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I
Cobbossee Watershed District	Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project
Hancock Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I
Oxford Co. Soil & Water Conservation District	Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II
City of Saco	Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV
City of Sanford	Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

The applicants listed above received the evaluation team’s highest rankings. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned applicant 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

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alex Wong", written in a cursive style.

Alex Wong
NPS Program Coordinator, Bureau of Water Quality

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Kristin Feindel (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	10
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	7
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	14
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	12
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	0
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>56</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	10

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.

P - City has good track record, projects completed

N - YCSWCD capacity in question because of staff turnover

N – Missing PM and Consultants description

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5

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

P - Good access for UIS, has potential for increased use.

N - Lacking in description for extent of public use.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8

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.**

P - Impaired in at least on sampling location, task sampling seems appropriate, seems to have a good understanding of stressors.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	7

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.**

P - Tasks seemed well suited for goals

N – Tasks need more detail.

P – urban impaired stream

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	14

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.

N – Twombly Rd TBF - Is this a missed opportunity for the road? Only 1 TBF?

P - Continued dedication to the project.

N - Outreach materials really should use currently developed material.

P/N – There is water quality monitoring data, but more info on results/interpretation would be good.

N – general monitoring is ineligible for funding

N - No letters of support.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	12

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.**

Is the match for the treebox filter legit? Is this a quality source if the project was going to happen anyway. Good value for UIS work. Subgrant costs for Task 1&4 seemed a little high.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan Score	5	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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Sanford	N	0%	0.0

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Kristin Feindel (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	13
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	4
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	3
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	10
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	14
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	0
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>49</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	13

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.

P/N - CWD has good track record, staff are responsive and knowledgeable, but short-handed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5

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

P/N – public boat launch, but it’s not great.

N - Relative value diminished based on so many other better lakes around.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	4

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.**

N - Not impaired, clarity getting better.

N – Listing reason is not Ag, but sediment chemistry.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	3

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.**

N – Historical Ag land use was offered as major issue but wasn't addressed in any of the tasks.

N - Unclear if residential properties were surveyed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	10

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.

P – partnership with FOWCL.

N - Task 4 identifies more candidate sites than provided in the candidate site list.

N – Match documented in the tasks does not align with match documented in the candidate site list.

N – Sites 301, 102, 308, 303 include read as if they include regular maintenance activities – these are not eligible for funding

N – Site 501 requires further review

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	14

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.**

N - Match doesn't add up between listed tasks and candidate site list. Unclear if budget is correct. Match source/quality weak.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Cobboosee Watershed District (Torsey Pond)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Mount Vernon	N	0%	0.0
Readfield	N	0%	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Alex Wong (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP), Kristin Feindel (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	11
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	9
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	3
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	8
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	14
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	6
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	0.4
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>51.4</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	11

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.

Notes:

N - Past performance of the District is a concern. Capacity of new leadership is unknown/untested with regards to implementation.

P - Branch Lake Watershed Association – strong

N - High number of volunteer hours/match in the budget for the BLA – with that amount should have some mention in the Qualifications & Experience.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	9

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

Notes:

- P - Public water supply
- P - 2 public boat launches
- P - Bangor YMCA summer camp
- P - cold water fishery

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	3

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.**

Notes:

P - Good understanding with survey and plan being just completed.

N - Didn't mention sediment chemistry.

N - Lake is in really good shape, threat to WQ isn't high.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	8

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.**

Notes:

P - NPS problems identified well in previous watershed survey.

N - Some confusion over the residential sites – details weren't in the candidate site list

P/N - Seems to be targeted primarily at road sites.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	14

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.

Notes:

N - Septics not talked about, development wasn't targeted.

N - Task 3 & 4 lacked detail, lumped together in the candidate site list

P – Letters of support

N - Road sites 1-101, 1-102, 10-10 need review – as written sites seem like maintenance issues, and therefore not fundable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	6

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.**

Notes:

- N - Project admin, E&O costs seem high
- N - Budget table, Cost descriptions in the Tasks, Match in candidate sites all misaligned / not adding up correctly. Need to double check estimates and calculations.
- N - Residential BMP's cost seem high.
- N - Admin personnel singled out in Section 3, but not covered in budget table.
- N - Indirect calculation needs to be revisited

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Hancock Co. SWCD

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Comp Plan	5	.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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Dedham	N	0%	0.4
Ellsworth	N	0%	
Orland	N	8%	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Amanda Pratt (DEP), Kristin Feindel (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	12
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	4
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	6
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	5
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	14
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	14
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	2
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>57</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	12

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.

P – Past performance of OCSWCD is good, many positives, lake association is strong.

P/N – Good quals for consultant, assuming consultant will take a lead role, but as of yet unknown who that might be.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	4

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

N - No real public access – boat launch at campground for Hogan is not free, no public access at all for Whitney.

N – Hogan is on milfoil list

N – No evidence of endangered/threatened species

P – high value inland wading bird and waterfowl

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	6

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.**

P – Work plan addresses reducing external sources of phosphorus

N - Unclear on how internal cycling determination was made.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	5

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.**

P/N - Watershed survey is 5 yrs old, only identified residential and roads. Issues seemed relatively modest.
N – from Phase 1 experience, topography includes very steep banks could be source of NPS (erosion). These were not included.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	14

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.

N - 3 sites at Duns Camps have possible NRPA permitting issues

N - After school program – is in Norway, not in the watershed of Hogan and Whitney ponds.

P – strong lake association – will help execute project

N – Several town road sites proposed. Phase 1 experienced issues with similar Town road sites.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	14

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.**

N - \$5,000 in match from "Local Charitable Organizations". Not clear what these sources are, and if this match has been secured.

N – Just above minimum match requirement.

N - Mileage costs seem high

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Oxford Co. SWCD (Hogan-Whitney Pond, Phase II)

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Comp Plan	5	2

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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Mechanic Falls	Y	27%	2.0
Oxford	N	0%	
Poland	Y	12%	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Kristen Feindel (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	8
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	8
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	14
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	18
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	1.3
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>64.3</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	8

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.

N – Project Manager is known to be retiring, effect on project unknown. Application indicates consultant to be hired, but costs not included in the budget table.

N – Unclear what role Stuart Cole will fulfill with the administration of this project

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7

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

P- Public access – boat launch, beach

P – inland wading bird/waterfowl habitat, deer wintering, rare wildlife habitat, cold water and warm water fishery

N - Center of Belgrade/Rt. 27 impacts?

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8

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.**

P - Impaired, SDD has declined by more than a meter, blooming intermittently.

P/N -Sediment chemistry indicates susceptibility to internal loading, but watershed mgt plan indicates internal loading not significant.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	8

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.**

P - Good summary of sources, future risk from climate change mentioned, reviewed watershed survey results.

N - Didn't expand much on Ag issues, yet plan states it wants to reduce.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	14

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.

N – Task 3 and 4 descriptions and candidate site list would benefit from more detail, 12 road projects seems ambitious.

P - Had letters of support.

N - \$45k of match coming from Mt. Vernon which is dependent upon public vote. No mention of alternative funding if voters reject spending.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	18

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.**

P/N - Overall diversity and quality is ok, 53% match. 74% is going to construction. \$53k in salary/fringe seems high.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association – Long Pond Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	5	1.3

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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Belgrade	Y	25%	1.3
Mount Vernon	N	0%	
New Sharon	N	0%	
Rome	N	0%	
Vienna	N	0%	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Kristin Feindel (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	9
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	7
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	8
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	16
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	17
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	3
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>67</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	9

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.

N – Expecting staff turnover, but impact not addressed.

P – Consultant qualifications mentioned and is included in the budget.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7

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

P - Last in the chain of Belgrades, larger, documented use, economic value, borders more towns. There are fishing tournaments.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	7

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.**

P - Threatened for sediment chemistry, there is anoxia which might cause problems.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	8

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.**

P - Development pressures both residential and commercial, Ag, and roads. Did watershed survey finds lots of sites.

N - Mentioned 41 barriers to fish sites, but didn't tie it into climate change or NPS.

N – Septic study is old.

N - Didn't include Ag BMPs in this phase.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	16

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.

N - Tasks weren't well developed, hard to assess. More info on the workshops needed. 7LA has 2 applications this round, and 3 current. See Section 1 for concerns about staffing turnover.

N - Mt. Vernon needs to vote on match funding. Unknown impact if they don't vote it in.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	17

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.**

N - Admin costs seem high due to YCC hours. Large amount of "other" match – E&O tasks seem off – may not be eligible for printing regular newsletters.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: 7 Lakes Association –Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	3

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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Augusta	N	0%	3.0
Belgrade	Y	42%	
Manchester	Y	8%	
Mount Vernon	N	0%	
Oakland	Y	9%	
Readfield	N	0%	
Sidney	N	0%	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Kristin Feindel (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	12
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	7
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	7
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	19
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	18
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	0
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>70</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	12

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.

Notes:

P/N - Town has history working on the watershed plan, but staff has turned over and are untested. Town has capacity. CCSWCD is a strong partner.

N - The watershed committee is formed – shows dedication to process. But this wasn't highlighted

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7

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

Notes:

P - Good access from trails and neighborhoods, Coffin pond has access, cold water fishery, compared to other urban streams, is known and used.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	7

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.**

Notes:

P - Good understanding via stressor analysis, is an urban impaired stream, was part of ICTMDL.

N - Didn't talk about biomonitoring data or statutory status – there are 7 sites, 4 don't meet, 3 meet some of the times. Data seems a little old.

N - They did pre-planning study with Coastal Community funds, but didn't include findings

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	7

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.**

Notes:

N/P - NPS sites in watershed to reduce IC impact is a little weak, lots of focus on in-stream stressors, not a lot of connectivity, but implementation is focusing on smaller hydrologic impact areas waiting on H&H for main stem.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	19

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.

Notes:

P - Seems likely as part of the entire process to restore or protect

N - Could have done more on E&O

P - Sequences make sense with leveraging the H&H study

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	18

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.**

P - Large amount of town cash match but is the majority, costs seem realistic

N - seems that non-town match may be a little underestimated as Thornton Oaks was supposed to be doing all the construction.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/29/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Brunswick	N	0%	0.0

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Maine DEP

Name of RFA Coordinator: Alex Wong

Names of Evaluators: Kristin Feindel (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Greg Beane (DEP)

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
• Match at least 40%	X	
• Eligible Recipient	X	
• NPS Priority Watershed	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u>	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	15	12
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	7
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	19
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	18
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	3.5
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>74.5</u>

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	Points Available	Points Awarded
Section I. Preliminary Information	15	12

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.

Notes:

P - It's the city has demonstrated capacity; work in previous phases has been great; past projects done on time.

N – Staffing at YCSWCD and this project was unclear.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	7

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

Notes:

P- Hiking access, potential for increased public use with habitat improvements, drains to the beach,

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8

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.**

Notes:

P - Impaired, appears to know issues by sub-watershed. Toxics an issue in upper watershed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

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

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section IV. Nature, Extent, and Severity of NPS Problems	10	7

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.**

Notes:

P – System well studied

N - Confusion regarding which issues occurred in which watershed. Would have been nice to have land use breakdown.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section V. Feasibility of Success	25	19

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.

Notes:

P - City shows continued dedication, this is Phase 4,

N - Riprap in Bear Brook not allowed, need to revisit, alternatives may increase cost. Site E35 – seems like activities listed should be included in the Stream Smart crossing and therefore not included as a project. Need to revisit.

N - Stream cleanup should be better defined. Since this activity has happened in previous phases, ET wonders if “clean up” is removing the right things, and either expand focus of cleanup or change sites.

N - Monitoring data – what are results/interpretation?

N - E&O is weak.

N - Could leverage the Steering Committee better for partners

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	18

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.**

Notes:

N – more detail needed for gravel wetland retrofit – ex. Wetland needs to be lined or in clay soils for chloride issues.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects: Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/28/22

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section VII. Comp Plan	5	3.5

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

Town(s)	Consistent Comp Plan	% of Watershed with Consistent Plan	Total Points
Old Orchard Beach	N	0%	3.5
Saco	Y	71%	

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook, Phase 3

DATE: 6/10/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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:
*Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:
P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting*

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- 1. Application Qualifications**
 - Relevant experience P – successfully managed previous phases
 - 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. P – YCSWCD strong. Q – new PM is not announced yet. What are the quals for this person? Will they be point on this 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. N – consultants will be hired, but quals not listed.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use
- Extent of use

P – urban impaired stream, watershed almost 25% impervious,

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 – P- potential for improved habitat.

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook, Phase 3

DATE: 6/10/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

- Other P – flows into Bauneg Beg Lake and eventually into Salmon Falls River

Water Quality Problem

1. **Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**
P – clear knowledge of impairment/stressors and good plan to address
2. **Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.** P - Clearly not in attainment at one DEP sampling location.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.**

P – work plan is completing WBP actions, clear understanding of stressors and actions needed to mitigate.

Feasibility for Success

1. **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.** P – 2 items, one is a tree box filter, the other in-stream work similar to previous successful restoration work.
2. **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.** Q – wasn't clear if substrate being unsuitable for biomonitoring was due to NPS impact and historic alterations, or if it was natural – as a result of being a low-gradient coastal stream. If the former, then there's a good chance that it can be restored. If the latter, then, probably not.

3. Consideration

- Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody. P -monitoring of in-stream work to assess
- Effective well-sequenced tasks
- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government N – no letters of support from HS? Is that because it's all town?
- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts
- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

Cost Effectiveness

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Goodall Brook City of Sanford

DATE: 6/16/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P Both City and YCSWCD have been part of Phase I and II; city seems to have good capacity
P/N YCSWCD transitioning to new project manager – should be ready to go when grant starts up; but are not included in quals section (I assume Missy is not going to be actively involved)
N Quals section does not mention geomorphologist referenced in partners & budget table.

Overall, quals are good but will get docked points for not mentioning consultant qualifications & including in the correct section of the application.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P/N network of public trails in “watershed” – but are they along the brook?
P stocked brook trout, mention endangered/threatened wildlife species
N Doesn't mention extent of public use or potential for future use.

Brook is in the heart of downtown Sanford; some flows underground. Doesn't seem to be much public interest or knowledge of the brook and doesn't have much public value beyond potential habitat. I don't think the water quality of the brook has much impact on the eventual drinking water source (Salmon Falls River)

Water Quality Problem

N Application does not mention that it's an urban impaired stream
P Impervious cover TMDL – 24% impervious watershed
P Two Biomonitoring sites sampled twice – one non-attainment both times, one met or exceeded class both times.
P Issues include stream alteration, poor habitat, low dissolved oxygen, elevated nutrients, and bacteria Q
Any chloride issues?

Workplan demonstrates an understanding of the issues facing the brook, although does not mention chloride (even though this is a sampling parameter in task 5). Overall concise and hits most of the important items but missing a couple key details.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P Imperviousness (24%), dense residential development, baseball stadium, roads, city hall, businesses P
Historical channel alteration, piping

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Goodall Brook City of Sanford

DATE: 6/16/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

N Summary of watershed assessments/NPS sources lacked detail and results from previous assessments.

P Inadequate buffers and outfalls also noted as NPS issues.

Could have done a better job and characterizing the extent and severity of NPS issues – clear that much of it has to do with urban stormwater and historical alteration and is fairly widespread in watershed, but could have given more detail, particularly on any “hot spots”.

Feasibility for Success

Q Is the tree box filter a good/appropriate project that will lead to measurable improvement? It's part of a bigger road reconstruction project, but the application did not give enough information for me to make a good judgement call on it. Also, Candidate Site List Description sounds like it's referring to a different site altogether (detention pond)? Pollutant reductions mentioned in environmental outcome section are very low. Are we missing an opportunity to do more here than one measly tree box filter, given that they're spending \$2.3 mil on the road project?

N No letters of support

P Only two projects, so should be able to complete within grant period – not sure if the town owns the land where both projects are occurring

Q Not sure if some of the task 4 projects are in really good alignment with WBMP goals or line up with issues well – for example sustainable lawn care workshop and stream clean up (is this eligible for funding?)

Q I always question water quality monitoring tasks because they are supposed to be only for BMP effectiveness monitoring. Were the BMPs installed in phase I and II designed/expected to improve the parameters they are testing (DO, temp, conductivity, bacteria)? If not, I question whether it makes sense to measure them. Also, task mentions that the results will be used to detect the presence of sewer pipe issues, which is not really what this sort of funding is supposed to be used for.

Project should be completed in time allotted, but some concern over lack of public participation and the eligibility/efficacy of some tasks/aspects targeting the most important issues contributing to the water quality impairment.

Cost Effectiveness

P 57% match

Q Concern over using 1 construction project as the majority of the project's match, and how well this site aligns with goals of WBMP/restoration – may not be best use of money (using a project that will happen anyway that may not have a significant impact on stream as match).

N Only 37% of grant funds are being used for construction

N I thought some of the subgrant costs seemed high – particularly task 1 and 4.

Q Task 5 sewer district match seemed low.

Q Did not use the new volunteer rate, so donated services could be higher (only 130 hours, so not a huge difference to the total amount)

N Numbers didn't add up correctly

Overall \$143,000 grant for only two construction projects and some education and outreach and water quality monitoring. I don't think this is good value for money, particularly given the pollutant reductions that were estimated. I think the chop and drop and pet waste outreach is good, but the rest of it I don't feel as confident about.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/2/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Excellent, Sanford has successfully managed two previous 319 grant projects on Goodall Brook. City staff, especially the city engineer, are experienced with 319 grant projects and York County SWCD will manage the project as sub-grantee. **P+**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

Fair overall, it appears to provide some outdoor opportunity (green space) in a relatively urbanized environment, walking trails, stocked brook trout habitat and its importance as part of the Bauneg Beg watershed. I feel this brings up the philosophical question regarding the importance of urban streams that are in close proximity to population centers where people can enjoy nature close at hand opposed to a pristine stream located in the north (much less accessible) woods. **I**

Water Quality Problem

On 303d list as impaired for macroinvertebrates and habitat (does not meet class B criteria), also, does not meet criteria for DO and bacteria.

Highest rating for water quality problems. **P+**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Goodall suffers from typical urbanized stream problems, high level of IC (has ICTMDL) (what%?) and historically has been altered which has destroyed habitat. It appears there is a wide array of pollutants (nutrients, bacteria and sediment) getting into the brook from NPS sites associated with IC and urban development. **P**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Sanford – Goodall Brook

DATE: 6/2/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

Good, I think the partnership of the City of Sanford and York County SWCD is strong and I feel the instream restoration work will address one of the main stressors on the brook – habitat. **P**

Cost Effectiveness

Hard to determine given the high cost of in stream construction work but I give the proposal high marks for having a very high level of match (57%) which indicated strong support from the city. **P**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Sanford

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

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 under the scoring criteria below:

P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- + Relevant experience – experienced grantee
- + 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

- +/- While subgrantee entity is experienced, project manager will be new and possibly inexperienced

3. Consultant Qualifications

- N/A

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- + Availability (access) of use – park access
- + Extent of use – right next to park

2. Types of Uses

- + Public recreational opportunities
- + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
- + Potential for increased public use and improved habitat

Water Quality Problem

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
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Sanford

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Goodall Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase III

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.

Feasibility for Success

1. + Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.
2. Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.
 - + City shows continued dedication towards goal of stream restoration, since is Phase III
3. Considerations
 - Note: For outreach materials (signs and brochures) work off of currently available materials – there are a lot of good ones and no need to reinvent
 - Note: For stream clean up, make sure includes educational component of what 'debris that should be removed' is, and make sure does not include wood in stream.
 - ? What has the monitoring data showed so far? Is it useful? Is it getting into EGAD and/or should it be?
 - + 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 – Phase III
 - + Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

Cost Effectiveness

- **Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**
 - - One tree box filter does not seem sufficient to pre-treat stormwater from 9.1 acres of IC
 - + Total grant cost not high, though not many BMPs
- **Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes**
 - - \$50K for a tree box filter seems high
 - + instream work cost seems reasonable
- **Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.**
 - + overall match seems strong from City

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Cobbossee Watershed District – Torsey Pond

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

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
- P – CWD has lots and lots of successful experience and is well qualified to do this project.

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. P – FOCW to do outreach and YCC coordination

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. N/A

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use P- public boat launch
- Extent of use

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply NA
- Public recreational opportunities P-Public boat launch
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits P – 3 fish species on 2005 Comprehensive Wildlife conservation strategy.
- Commercial benefits N-no economic input for visiting
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – N – not mentioned
- Other

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Cobbossee Watershed District – Torsey Pond

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Water Quality Problem

1. **Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**
P – watershed survey done, new protection plan; N – neither survey nor protection plan accounted for
Ag – which looks to be livestock and hay fields from the aerial
2. **Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.** N – WQ has been very stable for years.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. **Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.** P – addressing NPS sites identified in 2020 protection plan. N – not clear about the severity of the sites being addressed.
2. **Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.** N – work plan acknowledges that Ag is not included, yet doesn't suggest ways to get that information or data. Could working with NRCS or the SWCD get the info needed?

Feasibility for Success

1. **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.** P – yes – straightforward reduction of P and Sediment.
2. **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.** P – yes – reducing Sediment and P will protect the lake.
3. **Consideration**
 - Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody. N – no Ag, selection process for grant sites unclear.
 - Effective well-sequenced tasks P – seems like the tasks can be scheduled easily
 - Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government Q – how can payment from towns to CWD be considered personnel match
 - Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts P – extension of planning grant
 - Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody. N – community support not evident.

Cost Effectiveness

1. **Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time) P**
2. **Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes P**
3. **Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.** Q – most match coming from 1 landowner, and through town payments to CWD?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Cobbossee Watershed District – Torsey Pond

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Budget table issues – Tasks and Table 2 don't align. This is what is reported in the Tasks

Task	Grant Cost					Match Cost					Task Total
	SF	Construction	Subgrant	Supplies	Grant total	SF	Construction	Subgrant	DS-labor	Match total	
\$ 1.00	\$ 3,840.00				\$ 3,840.00	\$ 2,857.00				\$ 2,857.00	\$ 6,697.00
\$ 2.00	\$ 1,316.00		\$ 282.00		\$ 1,598.00	\$ 224.00		\$ 282.00	\$ 383.00	\$ 889.00	\$ 2,487.00
\$ 3.00	\$ 2,384.00		\$ 2,723.00		\$ 5,107.00	\$ 570.00		\$ 1,097.00		\$ 1,667.00	\$ 6,774.00
\$ 4.00	\$ 6,750.00	\$ 50,000.00			\$ 56,750.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 33,500.00			\$ 37,500.00	\$ 94,250.00
\$ 5.00	\$ 6,800.00				\$ 6,800.00		\$ 4,000.00	\$ 1,400.00		\$ 5,400.00	\$ 12,200.00
\$ 6.00	\$ 1,850.00		\$ 2,926.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 5,276.00	\$ 456.00		\$ 4,340.00		\$ 4,796.00	\$ 10,072.00
\$ 7.00	\$ 1,020.00				\$ 1,020.00	\$ 632.00				\$ 632.00	\$ 1,652.00
totals	\$ 23,960.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 5,931.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 80,391.00	\$ 8,739.00	\$ 37,500.00	\$ 7,119.00	\$ 383.00	\$ 53,741.00	\$ 134,132.00

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Torsey Pond – Cobbossee Watershed District

DATE: 6/23/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P Lots of prior experience with 319 grants

N Both Bill and Wendy may retire sometime in the near future

P FOCW subgrant

Adequate qualifications but does not specifically mention administrative capacity. Some concern over possibility that Bill and/or Wendy may retire before project is completed.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P Public boat launch

P Used for fishing, three high priority fish species

P Bald eagle breeding area

N Does not quantify use by the public, not a drinking water source

N Lots of nearby lakes that are used more by the public

Overall, this section of the application lacked detail. Does not mention public recreation at all besides fishing, little to no indication of use or value to the state/public

Water Quality Problem

P/N Above average water quality, not impaired. Slight improving clarity trend and no algae blooms

N Outdated information on NPS priority list reasoning- not agriculture threat; now listed due to being sensitive (sediment chemistry) – not directly mentioned in application (3.64 Al:Fe and 61.95 Al:P)

P Some bottom anoxia, limits habitat for coldwater fish

Pond is not impaired (and is improving), water quality summary was adequate, although NPS priority listing reason for the pond was incorrect.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P 5% developed, mainly residential and some agriculture; private gravel roads

P/N Discusses watershed survey results, but survey did not cover most residential properties, and the application did not indicate that these were assessed at all (i.e., by shoreline survey or other means). 23 sites identified, 5 of which were high priority. 90% of sites were related to private/public roads.

N No mention of agriculture

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Torsey Pond – Cobbossee Watershed District

DATE: 6/23/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Nature of NPS problems appears to be mostly road issues, although not clear that any other assessments were done. Extent – only 23 sites documented, severity – 5 high priority sites.

Feasibility for Success

N Task 4 – only 7 sites in candidate site list, task mentions 15.

N Some candidate sites only list adding gravel and crowning, this sounds like maintenance

N Project partners list towns as ‘possibly’ assisting in mitigation of town roads – need to have more certainty than that

N One very poor letter of support with no context.

N Concerned about site 501 (highest cost site). Looks like it could be an intermittent stream channel? It’s all in the woods – where is the water actually coming from? Does not appear to be the type of site we normally fund (not related to development, possibly a natural channel.)

N Task 5 mentions riprap on shorelines, which we will not fund

N I felt task 6, education, was lacking. Not much attempt to engage adults in the watershed, no annual meeting presentations, no in-kind time/involvement from the lake association at all

N Nothing to address agriculture in the watershed

Change “personnel services” to “Salary & Fringe”

The application lacked a lot of detail, which made it difficult to assess feasibility. Several of the sites do not seem eligible/good candidates for grant funding. 8 proposed sites are not even listed as candidate sites. Little indication that matching funds have been secured – only one letter of support for project I’m not sure should be funded. No mention of climate change; no culvert projects listed. Lack of stakeholder involvement/little indication of community support.

Cost Effectiveness

N 40% match – bare minimum (Donated services will be slightly higher with new volunteer rate, but increase in match will be minimal due to only 15 hours of match)

P 62% of grant funds to construction

N Math doesn’t add up for construction if doing 15 (or the proposed 7) sites – might change workplan to 7 sites rather than 15

P Task costs seemed reasonable

Overall cost is reasonable, although match is not strong (would have liked to see more commitment from towns/landowners and possible cash match from lake association).

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: CWD – Torsey Pond

DATE: 6/9/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Very Good, Bill Monagle has been successfully completing 319 grant projects since the early 1990's, no issues. **P**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

Fairly low when you consider that it's a many surrounded by many other ponds and has limited public access, the public boat launch is quite small and not user friendly . Its main value may be that it has good water quality and a coldwater fishery whereas most other lakes in the region are impaired and are warmwater fisheries. **N**

Water Quality Problem

The pond is not impaired nor has it had a documented algae bloom, furthermore the water clarity trend (good) is steady and improving slightly. Apparently Torsey Pond is on the NPS priority list because of the effects of historical agriculture leading to the chance of internally recycling. This is a good opportunity for protection. **Q**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

There have been a couple of surveys done of the watershed which documented a modest number of relatively medium to low priority NPS sites primarily associated with dirt camp roads. The proposal describes these sites as not a pressing issue. **N**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: CWD – Torsey Pond

DATE: 6/9/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

Very good, as it appears the proposed mitigation activities will address a large percentage of the NPS issues in the watershed, I also like the involvement of FOCW regarding their education & outreach efforts. **It is estimated the project will keep 20 pounds of phosphorous out of the pond every year, I'd like to discuss this number with the group (Q) but overall this section is P**

Cost Effectiveness

OK, everything seems reasonable although they are pledging to the minimum match requirement. **P**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Cobbossee Watershed District

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project

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 under the scoring criteria below:
P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting*

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

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

- N/A

3. Consultant Qualifications

- N/A

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- + Availability (access) of use – public boat launch
- + Extent of use - fishing

2. Types of Uses

- + Public recreational opportunities
- + Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
- + Cold water fishery

Water Quality Problem

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Cobbossee Watershed District

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Torsey Pond Watershed Protection Project

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

- -/+ water quality does not appear to be declining or threatened, but there is hypolimnetic anoxia

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. -/+ Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed

- ? Does agriculture need to be included/addressed? Unsure how much of NPS contributor currently is

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

Feasibility for Success

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

2. -/+ Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.

3. Considerations

- Note: Ensure BMPs are not just camp road maintenance (e.g. adding gravel and crowning) that does not meet grant BMP guidance.
- + 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.

Cost Effectiveness

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

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

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hancock Co. SWCD – Branch Lake

DATE: 6/7/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience P – lots of experience
- Financial, administrative. P – SWCD has capacity
- Technical qualifications P – SWCD has capacity
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe
- Past performance on relevant projects P – appears past projects have all been completed within the grant period.

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. P – consultant to be hired, adequate qualifications listed.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use P- lots of documented access – public boat launches and beaches, 50-site commercial campground, state park
- Extent of use N – no quantitative measure

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply P - yes
- Public recreational opportunities P -yes
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits P- yes
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits P – cold and warm water fishery, Atlantic Salmon critical habitat, possible alewife.
- Commercial benefits N – no quantitative impact
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – N – not addressed

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hancock Co. SWCD – Branch Lake

DATE: 6/7/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

- Other

Water Quality Problem

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

P – watershed survey and protection plan recently done

2. Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future. N – seems like great water quality, with much of the watershed protected. Ellsworth Water Department has a filtration waiver from the Safe Drinking Water Act, meaning that water quality is high and enough of the watershed is protected from development.

P – good candidate for protection

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed. P – watershed survey and protection plan recently done

2. Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems. P – straight forward – reduce sedimentation, reduce external P load.

Feasibility for Success

1. Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed. P – quite likely. N – Plan calls for 10 residential sites and 12 road sites between Tasks 3 and 4. But the table lists 12 road sites, 10 undescribed residential sites and an additional 3 driveway sites. Just a little unclear on scope.

2. Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected. P- quite likely

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 Q – have any of the other local grant programs been applied as match, or will be applied to other projects not covered by this grant?
- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody. P – City of Ellsworth is very invested in protection of water quality to protect their filtration waiver.

Cost Effectiveness

N – Section XI Budget tables does not align with totals from individual Tasks. Clip below is what I came up with from the information provided in the Tasks.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hancock Co. SWCD – Branch Lake

DATE: 6/7/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Task	Grant							Match				Total Cost	
	SF	Contract	Construction	travel	supplies	indirect	Other	SF	DS	construction	other		total match
1	\$ 3,478.00	\$ 6,109.00		\$ 23.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 3,778.00		\$ 13,413.00	\$ 1,495.00	\$ 723.00		\$ 2,218.00	\$ 15,631.00
2	\$ 1,040.00	\$ 3,120.00						\$ 4,160.00		\$ 1,927.00		\$ 1,927.00	\$ 6,087.00
3	\$ 9,036.00	\$ 1,326.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 225.00	\$ 50.00			\$ 25,637.00		\$ 1,044.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,044.00	\$ 41,681.00
4	\$ 17,070.00	\$ 2,730.00	\$ 39,000.00	\$ 405.00	\$ 75.00			\$ 59,280.00		\$ 3,908.00	\$ 59,000.00	\$ 62,908.00	\$ 122,188.00
5	\$ 4,212.00	\$ 3,364.00		\$ 68.00	\$ 10.00		\$ 656.00	\$ 8,310.00	\$ 535.00	\$ 12,930.00		\$ 4,358.00	\$ 26,133.00
6	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 390.00						\$ 1,690.00				\$ -	\$ 1,690.00
Totals	\$ 36,136.00	\$ 17,039.00	\$ 54,000.00	\$ 721.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 3,778.00	\$ 656.00	\$ 112,490.00	\$ 2,030.00	\$ 20,532.00	\$ 74,000.00	\$ 4,358.00	\$ 100,920.00

1. **Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)** P - seems reasonable
2. **Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes** P - seems reasonable, thought project admin costs seem a little high.
3. **Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.** P – diverse match from several partners, with letters of commitment

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Branch Lake Hancock County SWCD

DATE: 6/15/2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P/N HCSWCD has previous 319 experience – but they have had issues successfully executing projects in the recent past

P Using consultant for project management

P Good job listing quals and experience for staff and consultant

N Given the large role that volunteers will play in the project (hours-wise, anyway) would have been nice to see some quals listed for them.

Overall, description of quals and experience is good. I recall HCSWCD not being able to complete/apply for grants around 2019 when they had some staffing issues, but it appears that things have improved. Interested to hear inside scoop from Greg.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P Public water supply for Ellsworth

P Two public boat launches

P Used for recreation, state park, camping

P Atlantic salmon habitat; coldwater fishery

P Inland wading bird and waterfowl habitat, two significant vernal pools, deer wintering areas

N Didn't mention any endangered/threatened plants or wildlife (other than the salmon)

N Did not get a good idea of the extent of use from the workplan.

Ticks a lot of the right boxes, extra points for being a public water supply. There are other recreational opportunities in the area, which may reduce its value recreationally. Did not provide numbers to quantify recreational use.

Water Quality Problem

N There isn't really a water quality problem to speak of, since the water quality is so good.

N Did not mention sediment chemistry – our records show Al:Fe = 1 and Al:P = 213

Overall, good though brief summary of water quality data and listing reasons. Will lose points due to lack of water quality issues.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P 200 developed properties on shoreline; development threat

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Branch Lake Hancock County SWCD

DATE: 6/15/2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

P Priorities include improving culverts and ditches at stream crossings, improving buffers and increasing lakesmart visits.

P Watershed survey – 184 sites; residential/private road sites most prevalent; 58% of high impact sites on roads

P Habitat survey/watershed survey finds some overlapping sites

P Source water protection plan in 2004 found potential contaminant sources to be shoreline development, septic systems, boat launches/public beaches

The workplan provides an adequate description of the nature of the NPS problems and an understanding of actions needed. Extent appears to be largely limited to shoreline and roads; severity – 184 sites is on the high side for a watershed survey (however it sounded like there may have been some less-well-trained tech leaders for that survey).

Feasibility for Success

N No attempt at addressing issues from development threat or septic systems

N Task 3 and 4 lack detail – need to briefly describe sites and how chosen (at least mention impact rating in candidate site list).

P Letters of commitment from lake association, towns of Ellsworth & Dedham, road association, Harriman Pond landowners

N Candidate site list – a couple of the private road sites sound like maintenance issues, not sure if they are eligible

Overall, a pretty straight-forward, cookie-cutter project. Not much imagination or creativity. Seems like there is buy in with landowners for most sites in candidate list, so should be able to carry out workplan as proposed (unless projects are excluded due to ineligibility). Support of town, district, and lake association(s). Some issues with lack of detail in the proposal which led to questions about eligibility and priority of sites.

Cost Effectiveness

N Task 1 & 5 are too expensive. Some of the salary estimates seem high (tasks 3 and 4). 556 hours for tech lead (with much of the project management outsourced to a consultant) seems like too much time. N Not sure if donated services # of hours is realistic, overall but particularly for task 5

N Did not include admin assistant time in Part 1 table

P 47% match

P/N 48% of grant funds to construction – like to see at least 50%

N Task 3 – Candidate site list (10 sites) mentions basic BMPs like infiltration steps/trenches, buffers, ECM, but task budget is \$3,000 in construction per site – way too high. Candidate site list lists \$10k grant/\$10k match, which differs from task budget estimate but is still too high at \$2,000 per site.

Total cost is \$213,000 which seems high for 10 small residential sites and 12 road sites where the most expensive site is \$17,000. Tech lead and donated services # of hours both seem very overestimated. Good match, but that might be because hours are overestimated. Less than ideal grant to construction ratio – overall not great value for the money.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hancock County SWCD – Branch Lake

DATE: 6/2/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Hancock County SWCD has completed many 319 grant projects but that was during Megan Facciolo's tenure (she was very adept at coordinating 319 grant projects). However present District staff have successfully managed a couple of recent projects in partnership with a consultant which they intend to employ for this project. **P**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

Branch Lake is the drinking water supply for the Town of Ellsworth as well as being to home to YMCA's Camp Jordan. It is a hub of water-based activities in the region which is facilitated by two public boat ramps and a state park/beach. **P**

Water Quality Problem

Branch Lake enjoys exceptional water quality and in on DEP's NPS Priority List due to its status as a drinking water supply. It is under heavy development pressure but appears to be maintaining its excellent 8 meter secchi-disk clarity. **N**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

NPS issues at Branch Lake consists primarily of runoff from dirt camp roads and residential camp lots including driveways. The issues aren't severe as most of the highest priority sites were addressed in two previous 319 grant projects although a consideration is that no work has been done on Harriman Pond in the past. Didn't list previous (2) 319 grant projects? **N**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hancock County SWCD – Branch Lake

DATE: 6/2/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

Good, the District has some experience coordinating 319 grant projects, there is a motivated group of volunteers behind this effort and they will hire the services of a consultant to coordinate the project. **P**

Cost Effectiveness

Project will fix a relatively few but expensive road sites, that's OK but some of these are on town roads which begs the question of whether the town should be doing some of this work on their roads instead of relying on this grant project. Decent match commitment at 47% **Q**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hancock County SWCD

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I

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 under the scoring criteria below:

P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- + Appear to have considered need for different strengths by assembling team

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

- N/A

3. Consultant Qualifications

- + Qualifications listed sound appropriate

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- + Availability (access) of use – 2 public boat launches
- + Extent of use – includes state park

2. Types of Uses

- + Public drinking water supply
- + Public recreational opportunities
- + Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
- + Cold water fishery and critical Atlantic salmon habitat

Water Quality Problem

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hancock County SWCD

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Branch Lake Watershed Protection Project, Phase I

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

- -/+ water quality does not appear threatened, but quality and value make protection vital

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.**

Feasibility for Success

1. **+ Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**
2. **+ Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**

3. Considerations

- + 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.

Cost Effectiveness

1. **+ Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**
2. **+ Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) reasonable for the expected outcomes**
3. **+ Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services**
 - Note: Branch Lake Assoc in-kind match of \$19K seems high.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Oxford Co. SWCD – Hogan-Whitney Ponds

DATE: 6/15/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. **Application Qualifications P** – OCSWCD has experience with Phase 1, closed out on time.
 - 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. P – looking to hire a contractor, quals included.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use N – no public access on Whitney, only on Hogan. Unsure if that boat launch is actually public because it's at the 2 Lakes Camping Area, which is privately owned.
- Extent of use Q – all private?

2. Types of Uses

P - All recreational – potential exists to decrease nutrient and sediment input.

- Drinking water supply
- Public recreational opportunities
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits P – inland waterfowl and wading bird habitat.
- Commercial benefits
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat –
- Other

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Oxford Co. SWCD – Hogan-Whitney Ponds

DATE: 6/15/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Water Quality Problem

1. **Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**
P – pretty densely populated shoreline. N – seems to have some Ag in the upper watershed and plan says large timber harvests over the past couple of years that isn't accounted for in this plan or in previous plans.
2. **Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.** P – anoxia in Hogan Pond has potential for internal P cycling.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. **Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.** P- watershed survey identified NPS sites (unsure if forestry and Ag were adequately captured during survey and therefore not id'd). N – plan only lists the 15 NPS sites, and not the 15 residential sites.
2. **Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.** P – for those issues identified, plan adequately addresses. I – breaking out “grant program” – what is this? Seems like it's NPS projects on residential lots. This isn't broken out like this in other grants. Is this more of just a marketing approach?

Feasibility for Success

1. **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.** P – pretty straightforward NPS projects listed.
2. **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.** P – prevention of P load will help protect the lakes
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 P – second phase
 - Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody. P- letters of support

Cost Effectiveness

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** Q – Project admin costs are much lower than other applications this year. Is this realistic?
3. **Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services.**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Oxford Co. SWCD – Hogan-Whitney Ponds

DATE: 6/15/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hogan & Whitney Ponds - Oxford County Soil and Water Conservation District

DATE: 6/13/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P Michele has experience with Phase I and other 319 projects

P Good to have engineer on staff and using a consultant will be good to keep Michele's workload manageable

Good past performance; only concern is that usually Michele has Jeff Stern or a very involved lake association as support – glad she included a consultant, but most of the consultants that have 319 experience are stretched thin and not local, so there may be less attention paid to this project/it will be a different dynamic.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P Recreational use, warmwater fishery

N No public access to Whitney, but is connected to Hogan which does have public access (Two Lakes camping area – not a state launch)

N No endangered/threatened plants or animals

P Inland waterfowl and wading bird habitat; milfoil infestation

Lack of public access is an issue – no state launch. Oxford is near several other well known lakes; Hogan and Whitney are smaller and less open to the public. Did not demonstrate unique habitat and not a drinking water source.

Water Quality Problem

P Threatened due to sensitivity to additional P inputs

P Hogan - Below average water quality; Whitney – average WQ. No sediment chem data available.

P Anoxia in both lakes, worse in Hogan Pond

Good water quality summary; lakes are threatened; no indication of declining water quality or imminent threats to current status.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P Watershed survey 2017 -95 sites: 61 residential, 13 private roads, 11 town roads, 6 beach sites

P Scattered residential (175 residences near shoreline) and agricultural land uses, gravel roads, steep paved roads, campgrounds, Oxford Casino, forestry

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Hogan & Whitney Ponds - Oxford County Soil and Water Conservation District

DATE: 6/13/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Nature of NPS problems is well understood, but a discussion of extent and severity are somewhat lacking. Should have talked about the very steep shoreline. Did mention roads close to the ponds.

Feasibility for Success

P/N Consultant will be important to the success of the project. Jeff Stern is unlikely to bid as he has indicated he'd like to retire.

P Phase I was successful and lake association was a good partner

P Good letters of support from town, HWWPA, After school center, Campground

Q/N Mentions obtaining grant funding (\$5k) from "Local and National Charitable Organizations" to use for match but doesn't name any or talk about specific applications. This makes for a weak form of match – what will be done if funds are not obtained?

N Dunns' Camp sites are match only because they didn't want to accept gov't money. Were hard to work with/nail down in phase I and didn't always do things properly. They have 3 sites in the current proposal. (No letter of support)

N Three candidate sites mention retaining walls. I assume these are not on the direct shoreline. Even so, may be difficult to get a permit for these sites.

Q/N Hogan & Whitney have a lot of very steep shoreline areas that are challenging to fix. Not sure if enough \$ is budgeted to the residential sites listed in the candidate site list (3 shoreline); or whether feasible/fundable BMPs are available to address these sites.

Q Why is there a grant mileage cost for virtual meetings (task 2)?

Q Why are "anticipated 2023 outputs" included for each task? Not necessary, better to just highlight deliverables. (Confusing esp. for task 6)

Q Do we care that the after school program in task 6 isn't in the watershed or even that close to the ponds (it's in Norway)?

P Overall straightforward proposal, if somewhat ambitious (15 sites + 30 TA visits + 15 RMGs)

Good letters of support and local commitment. Some uncertainty about the quality/availability of match and the feasibility of a few of the candidate sites. Concern about getting the project done in the time allotted given number of sites and dependence on town to get projects done (was an issue in Phase I).

Cost Effectiveness

P/N 42% match is close to the minimum. 51% of grant funds being used for construction is okay

Q Could not match up match to tasks in all cases – should be clearer what is being used for each cost category.

N As mentioned above, question about whether \$5k grant funds from local charitable orgs will come through or not.

Q Task 5 mentions 15 RMGs at \$750 grant/match each, but budget of \$10,000 g/m does not cover if they all come in at \$750

Q Is 2000 miles reasonable for HWWPA/volunteer travel match? Maybe if they are coming from New Jersey? Would this count?

P Budget seems reasonable for the tasks outlined.

Budget seems reasonable for the proposed tasks, but match is close to the minimum of 40% and some of the match is questionable (\$5k from unknown charity & 2000 miles of travel match). Task 5 (RMGs) seemed expensive yet also potentially underfunded.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County SWCD – Hogan & Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, II

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Excellent - OCSWCD / Michele Windsor / Ross Cudlitz have a lot of experience successfully completing 319 grant funded projects, moreover they will hire a consultant to coordinate the project. **P+**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

Fair, warmwater fishery with limited public access (no boat launch on Whitney) but ponds each have campgrounds. Nothing stands out about these ponds as far as relative value but they contribute to the local quality of life. Need to discuss value with group - **Q**

Water Quality Problem

Both ponds have average to below average water quality and are on the NPS Priority List as threatened due to sensitivity to NPS pollution. The ponds have low to moderate potential to internally recycle phosphorous. **P**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

A 2017 watershed survey revealed 95 NPS sites the majority of which were residential (buffers) followed by road sites (private & Town). No agriculture mentioned or IC issues. **N**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County SWCD – Hogan & Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, II

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

Well, excellent if the project truly prevents 34 pounds of phosphorous from reaching the ponds annually but I'm skeptical of this number. Realistically, I feel that the grantee is well qualified and has successfully coordinated 319 grant projects in the past and this proposal appears to describe a good combination of fixing issues at road and residential sites as well as having a good education & outreach component. I am also impressed by the local letters of support. **P**

Cost Effectiveness

OK, match is just above the minimum at 42% otherwise its hard to judge as this proposal includes a high percentage of site which require engineering and coincidentally high cost to implement. **Q**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County SWCD

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II

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 under the scoring criteria below:

P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- + Relevant experience – experienced grantee
- + 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

- N/A

3. Consultant Qualifications

- + Qualifications listed sound appropriate

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

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

2. Types of Uses

- + Public recreational opportunities
- + Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits

Water Quality Problem

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
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County SWCD

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Hogan-Whitney Ponds Watershed Protection Project, Phase II

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.**

Feasibility for Success

1. + **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**
2. + **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**
3. **Considerations**
 - ? Clarify who "project partners" are to provide technical assistance. Looks like they will be paid with grant funds. Should make sure are qualified to provide technical assistance.
 - + 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.

Cost Effectiveness

1. + **Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**
2. + **Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) reasonable for the expected outcomes**
 - + Overall grant cost not high
3. + **Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services – just enough match percentage**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/2/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience
P – long and diverse project history,
I – Director is retiring before project contract will be signed, but current Director will stay on part time;
- Financial, administrative.
Q – what effect will position turnover have on this? To what extent do other office staff have on keeping track of grant financials?
- Technical qualifications
N – qualifications of new Director unknown.
P – current Director will stay on part time.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe
P – 8 projects in Access Database since 2014, only 2 needed contract extensions
- 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. NA

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. P – consultant quals sought seem adequate; N - capacity of consultant to do project coordination unknown.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use P – public boat launch, beach
- Extent of use N – only qualitative description of extent of use

2. Types of Uses

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/2/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

- Drinking water supply NA
- Public recreational opportunities P – public boat launch, beach
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits N – conservation land mentioned generically, but no specifics.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits P – rare wildlife (snake) in riparian zone; N – mentions rare plants, but no examples. Stocked cold water fishery,
- Commercial benefits N – mentioned but no quantitative data
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat –
- Other

Water Quality Problem

1. **Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.** Q – IR impairment = trophic trend, DO, *Gloeotrichia*. Application says Aquatic life - trophic trend. Aquatic Life?
2. **Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.** Q – [TP] is going down, Chl *a* is no trend, secchi is a little worse over 20 years, but stable over the last 10.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. **Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.** P – clear that external load is an issue. For the north basin 59% is from Great Pond, and then for the south basin, 62% of that is from the north basin. (Great Pond Phase 1 currently funded, not mentioned in plan).
2. **Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.** P – phases considered, preliminary P reduction calculated. P – ordinance work mentioned as program of 7 Lakes, ordinance work supported in Task 6.

Feasibility for Success

1. **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.** P – straightforward BMP installation should result in decreased P loading
2. **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.** P - straightforward BMP installation should result in decreased P loading
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 P – participation by 3 out of 5 towns
 - Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts P – Great Pond Phase 1 is current
 - Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

Cost Effectiveness

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase 1

DATE: 6/2/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

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

Q – Task 6 seems a little low for all the proposed work. Ordinance review/gap analysis will take a while.

Q – Consultant costs for project admin not factored in to the cost table. Are we to assume that these costs are not directly project related, and are external to the proposal?

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

Overall thoughts – good proposal. Seems pretty straight forward with NPS sites identified via watershed survey. BMP costs seem reasonable given recent increases in cost for materials and labor. Great Pond is concurrent, so we should be seeing reductions from that project too. Only thing that gives me concern is that transition in staff prior to any work being done.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Long Pond – 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 6/9/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P 7 Lakes has managed several previous 319 grants

P/N Staff turnover/retirements/hiring brings uncertainty, but Charlie will be involved for at least some of the transition part time. Don't know quals of person actually doing the project management.

N Does not list quals for Stuart Cole

N Talks about using consultants "as needed" but does not budget this into the grant and does not mention quals

N Does not list the quals of the finance manager or demonstrate capacity beyond a statement that they have capacity.

Concern about the number of current grants 7 Lakes holds and the fact that there will be a staff transition next year – good that they are attempting to provide support but will be big shoes to fill. Several projects have come down to the wire in the past. Application did not mention quals for Erosion Control/LakeSmart coordinator or finance manager. Not sure why they mentioned using a consultant 'as needed' but did not include this in the budget.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

-6th in the chain of 7 Belgrade Lakes

P/N While there are other lakes nearby, this is an important area/lake economically and would affect region if water quality continued to decline

P Residential and commercial development

P Public boat ramp with 1000s of visitors annually; recreation, tourism

P/N – mentions IWWH, DWA habitat and eastern ribbon snake, but also generalizes "habitat for rare plant and animal species of special concern"

Lots of nearby lakes, but they are all connected so water quality needs to be maintained in all of them. Economically valuable, public access. Not a drinking water supply. Some habitat mentioned.

Water Quality Problem

P Loss of coldwater salmon fishery

P Impaired – water quality has declined by more than 1 meter

P TP 8.3, Secchi 6.2/6.0, Chla 4.6/4.2

N Does not mention Al:Fe and Al:P ratio – these are 1.50 and 32.3 (somewhat susceptible to increased P recycling from sediments).

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Long Pond – 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 6/9/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

P Low DO, increase in duration and volume of anoxia, internal load a small contributor to overall TP (4%/1%)

Impaired lake, good summary of water quality information. Impairment is not severe; short term trends show that transparency is stable. Did leave out sediment chemistry data.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P Ag 5% of watershed, development 7%; 24% of land is conserved

P 710 buildings in watershed, 86 miles of roads (59% gravel), commercial development

P Watershed survey – 148 sites – residential, roads, driveways, lack of buffers

P 194 parcels on at risk soils for septic system short-circuiting

P/N Some P load from ag – mentioned briefly but not expanded upon

P Future risk from development and climate change

Good summary of NPS sources, hints at extent and severity (148 sites – 16 high impact, 61 medium, 71 low; most were residential sites in the north basin).

Feasibility for Success

N Task descriptions lacked detail to determine if they are appropriate and feasible.

P Letters for support from Towns, BLA, and two road associations (form letters)

P/N Overall appears to be a straightforward/cookie cutter project. May be able to complete in 2 years, although 12 road projects is somewhat ambitious given staff transition and existing projects.

N Nothing to address septic or agriculture, which were mentioned as NPS sources in the application (says these will be addressed in Ph II-IV but would be nice to lay some groundwork).

P/N Candidate site list looks ok for the most part but note that there are no survey site numbers (are these affiliated with sites identified in the watershed survey?), one site mentions plunge pools in streams, one mentions paying for engineering for a culvert replacement, but funding the replacement with other grants (is this permissible?), and two entries mention shoreline stabilization but do not elaborate on what kind (we don't fund riprap).

N Includes some very high-cost road sites, including \$90,000 worth of road improvements in Mt Vernon.

Letter of support indicates that the town can only supply this match if voters approve it in June 2023 – what will happen if the voters reject the proposal?

Lack of detail in grant tasks makes it difficult to assess feasibility. Overall seems to lack imagination or out of the box thinking. 12 road projects, some of them large, may be difficult to complete in the 2 year grant period, especially if bringing new staff up to speed and juggling existing projects as well. Concern about some of the candidate sites not being fundable (stream plunge pool, engineering but no construction, shoreline stabilization). Lack of certainty regarding availability of Mt Vernon match.

Cost Effectiveness

P 53% match, 74% grant funds to construction

N Match sources are minimal – says 7 lakes cash but should be in-kind. Only cash match is from construction.

P/N \$239,048 is a large ask, over \$53,000 in salary/fringe – includes YCC crew, but still high

Good amount of match and high grant % for construction, but overall a very expensive proposal with only three sources of match: landowners, 7 lakes in-kind, and a small amount of BLA in kind. Would look better if you broke out all the construction match sources (list towns, road associations separately)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Long Pond

DATE: 6/8/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

7 Lakes and Charlie Baeder, project coordinator, have successfully coordinated a large number of 319 grant implementation projects over the last 14 years, sometimes project deliverables are submitted a little late but the work gets done (well). Overall, no issues with 7 Lakes in this regard. **P**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

This is up for discussion – one detriment to its value (in my opinion) is that it is surrounded by many other lakes which waters down it's relative value (ha, ha). Seriously, there are many camps located around its shoreline and it's a big part of the Belgrade Lakes. It doesn't appear to have a lot of good public access for such a large body of water. **Q**

Water Quality Problem

Long Pond is impaired for aquatic life and trophic trend (water clarity has declined by 1 meter over the last 50 years). There is some phosphorous recycling going on in both basins but it's described as being a small portion of the total phosphorous load. **P**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Studies have shown that the majority of NPS pollution is coming from residential sites that have inadequate buffers. Also, Long Pond is the 6th in the chain of 7 Belgrade Lakes and a large portion of its phosphorous comes from the upper lakes which are considered the indirect watershed. **P**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Long Pond

DATE: 6/8/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

OK, but the heart of the project as described in Task #3 “BMP installation at road NPS sites” is vague:

“7 Lakes will develop and manage road construction projects that will install BMPs on 12 town and private roads. Non-road NPS sites that were identified in the 2020 Watershed Survey or in more recent surveys will also be addressed. NPS sites and grant funding will be prioritized based on the severity of a site's impact on water quality.”

How many BMP's? and weren't sites already prioritized in the 2022 WMP? I like the use of YCC to fix 18 residential sites and the way phosphorous loading is described in the project outcome section of the proposal. **P**

Cost Effectiveness

Costs seem reasonable, nothing stands out and the match commitment is strong at 53% - no problems. **P**

Shouldn't this project be phase 5?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- +/- Relevant experience – transitioning to new staff so unknown
- + Financial, administrative
- +/- Technical qualifications – transitioning to new staff so unknown
- + Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe
- Past performance on relevant projects
- + Considered difficulty of staff transition so plan to hire consultant to assist

2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance

- N/A

3. Consultant Qualifications

- + Appears will look for appropriate qualifications

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- + Availability (access) of use – public boat launch
- + Extent of use - extensive

2. Types of Uses

- + Public recreational opportunities
- + Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
- + Historic cold water fishery

Water Quality Problem

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Long Pond Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I

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

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.

Feasibility for Success

1. + Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.
 - ? Will having 2 new 319 projects be too much for the transitioning staff?
2. + Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.
3. **Considerations**
 - Note: Is this really Phase I? Previous 319-funding work has occurred (should be phase V?).
 - + 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.

Cost Effectiveness

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Plan, Phase 1

DATE: 6/3/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience
P – long and diverse project history,
I – Director is retiring before project contract will be signed, but current Director will stay on part time;
- Financial, administrative.
Q – what effect will position turnover have on this? To what extent do other office staff have on keeping track of grant financials?
- Technical qualifications
N – qualifications of new Director unknown.
P – current Director will stay on part time.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe
P – 8 projects in Access Database since 2014, only 2 needed contract extensions
- 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. NA

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. P – consultant quals sought seem adequate; N - capacity of consultant to do project coordination unknown.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use – P –4 public boat launches, N – public park in Oakland with beach access not mentioned.
- Extent of use

2. Types of Uses

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Plan, Phase 1

DATE: 6/3/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

- Drinking water supply NA
- Public recreational opportunities P- many opportunities – boating access and public park in Oakland (that wasn't mentioned)
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits P – amount of conserved land in the area
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits P – significant IWWH, species listed.
- Commercial benefits N-no quantitative measure of benefit – only qualitative about tax base benefit to businesses.
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – N– seems to be quite a bit of access and use now, no sure if that will increase with improved habitat.
- Other

Water Quality Problem

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

P – not impaired, but last in line of a chain of impaired lakes; [DO] trending down + sediment chemistry is potential trigger for internal cycling, Chl-a trending up, but SDT and TP staying stable. P/N – lots of past work to understand issues, but there has been lots of past work already.

2. Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future. P – trends with Chl-a and DO may lead to reduced SDT and increased TP.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed. P – watershed survey last year

2. Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems. P – addresses the needs identified in watershed survey

Feasibility for Success

1. Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed. P – pretty straightforward NPS mitigation to reduce erosion and P.

2. Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected. : P – pretty likely that reducing P input will help protect the lake.

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 P – Mt. Vernon and Oakland are on the SC, and are providing match...but both towns are not the largest in the
- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts : P – Long Pond is submitted with this round, and Great Pond is in Phase 1.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance – Messalonskee Lake Watershed Protection Plan, Phase 1

DATE: 6/3/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody. P – letters of support provided from FOM and Towns.

Cost Effectiveness

- 1. Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time) P-** projects seem reasonably priced and achievable
- 2. Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) are reasonable for the expected outcomes P –** make sense
- 3. Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services. P-** match from towns and non-profits.

Overall thoughts – good application, easy to reach and measure goals. Given use and trends, seems like a good protection project. This application seems to lean more heavily on consultant services that Long Pond. My biggest concern is who the consultant will be and if that consultant has that bandwidth to do this additional work.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Messalonskee Lake – 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 6/22/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P 7 Lakes has managed several previous 319 grants

P/N Staff turnover/retirements/hiring brings uncertainty, but Charlie will be involved for at least some of the transition part time. Don't know quals of person actually doing the project management.

N Does not list quals for Stuart Cole

P This project will use a consultant for project management (quals were mentioned)

N Does not list the quals of the finance manager or demonstrate capacity beyond a statement that they have capacity.

Q Should FOM be in quals given that there is paid staff match?

Concern about the number of current grants 7 Lakes holds and the fact that there will be a staff transition next year – good that they are attempting to provide support but will be big shoes to fill. Several projects have come down to the wire in the past. Application did not mention quals for Erosion Control/LakeSmart coordinator or finance manager. Good that they will use a consultant to help with the workload on this one.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P/N 7th in the chain of Belgrade lakes – proximity to other lakes does take away from value

P Close to Augusta and Waterville; regional draw for recreation

P 3 public boat launches

P 650 shoreline properties

P Fishing/hockey tournaments; commercial/economic benefit from local businesses and property taxes P

Wetland at south end has significant inland waterfowl and wading bird habitat

P Habitat for endangered/threatened species – black tern, least bittern, American coot, scarlet bluet.

P Coldwater fish habitat, but some challenges that are not NPS related

Overall, application gives a good overview of waterbody value. Not used for drinking water, but good description of recreational, economic, and habitat uses and value (although quantification of use would be helpful - # of boat inspections perhaps?). Somewhat less valuable due to proximity of other lakes, although Messalonskee is a little bit separate from the other 6 lakes and closer to I-95.

Water Quality Problem

P/N Threatened (due to sediment chemistry), not impaired, most at risk from new development

N Did not mention Al:Fe and Al:P values (0.3 and 2.8)

P Average water quality, significant increasing trend in chl-a

P occasional anoxia in deep waters (not clear if this is getting worse over time or not)

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Messalonskee Lake – 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: 6/22/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Good, succinct summary of water quality data. Will not get full points because it is not an impaired waterbody.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P 650 shoreline properties on lake & Belgrade stream (75%+ shoreline lots developed/74% used year-round)

P Commercial development (esp. North end in Oakland)

P Agriculture 7% of watershed land area

P 125 miles of roads, including private gravel roads

P Watershed survey – 247 sites, mostly residential/driveway/road near shoreline; 23 high impact (7 private roads). 122 buffer/other sites

P/N 41 potential fish passage barriers – didn't mention, but some could be climate change issues; how many of these were also NPS sites?

P/N Old study suggests 60% of septic systems were constructed prior to 1974 (would be nice to have an updated number)

Watershed survey summary gives an adequate description of nature/extent/severity of issues, and watershed description adds detail about land uses and extent of roads/agriculture.

Feasibility for Success

N Task descriptions are too brief. Task 4 – need description of BMPs and sites; justification/reasoning behind sites chosen. Task 5 – need more description on what the workshops will entail.

N Not sure that grant will be able to be completed within the 2-year time frame due to number of concurrent 7 Lakes projects and ambitious goals for # of projects in this grant (18 BMP sites)

P Tasks appear to be appropriate, a basic lake application

P/N Need more information on sites (such as impact level; some don't have site #s in candidate site list), but candidate sites do look like appropriate/fundable sites. May need to check against previous Messalonskee grant projects though.

P letters of support from FOM, 2 towns, road associations

Good buy in from two towns with road projects and road associations, although Mt Vernon has to vote on appropriation of funds. Project should result in protection of water quality. Some tasks were not fleshed out enough to get a good sense of the proposed projects/activities.

Cost Effectiveness

P 53% match

P 64% of grant funds to construction

N High project admin cost

N Task 3 seems expensive for what it is, although it is mostly match.

N Task 5 – large amount of 'other' match – I would argue that printing and mailing newsletters is not acceptable match unless the newsletters focus primarily on grant outreach. Same for the annual meetings – since these are not solely grant related meetings. Also, there is match for FOM staff time; wondering if this should be reported in a different way, like as "donated services"?

-\$300 lakesmart printing/supplies match should be coded to supplies, not other.

Good overall match and grant funds to construction. Some costs seemed a little high and some issues with cost categories/match applicability.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance - Messalonskee Lake

DATE: 6/3/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

7 Lakes and Charlie Baeder, project coordinator, have successfully coordinated a large number of 319 grant implementation projects over the last 14 years, sometimes project deliverables are submitted a little late but the work gets done (well). Overall, no issues with 7 Lakes in this regard. **P**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

Fairly high, the lake provides a lot of recreational opportunity for the Augusta/Waterville area and I think it's highest value might be as waterfowl/wading bird habitat. I think its value may be mitigated somewhat by the fact it is one of 7 in a chain of lakes. **Q**

Water Quality Problem

Messalonskee has significant issues although it's not technically impaired it is seen as threatened on DEP's NPS priority watersheds list and at risk from development. One problem is that it is at the tail end of a chain of seven lakes many of which are impaired so input from these lakes is troublesome. The lake has low DO at depth and is considered at risk to internally recycle phosphorous. **P**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

A 2021 watershed survey identified 247 NPS sites across 13 different land use types – wow, that is a lot but then it's a fairly large, developed, watershed. I feel the application doesn't specify the nature and severity of NPS problems it only mentions that a majority of sites are residential and located at the shoreline. **N**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance - Messalonskee Lake

DATE: 6/3/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

Good, 7 Lakes is experienced with 319 grant projects and they will partner with a consultant to manage the project. Involvement of the YCC crew is a positive and this application appears to have a strong education & outreach component through the media, workshops and Lakesmart. How come only 2 of 7 towns in the watershed are contributing match? This doesn't indicate strong local support. **P**

Cost Effectiveness

OK, this is an expensive project but they are doing a lot, nothing jumps out at me except \$8,000 for postage and mailing for 2,200 newsletters? This seems too high but overall, no issues with the financials described in the application. **P**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase I

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 under the scoring criteria below:
P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting*

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- 1. Application Qualifications**
 - +/- Relevant experience – transitioning to new staff so unknown
 - + Financial, administrative
 - +/- Technical qualifications – transitioning to new staff so unknown
 - + Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe
 - Past performance on relevant projects
 - + Considered difficulty of staff transition so plan to hire consultant to assist
- 2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance**
 - N/A
- 3. Consultant Qualifications**
 - + Appears will look for appropriate qualifications

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- 1. Degree to which the public currently uses and values the waterbody**
 - + Availability (access) of use – state boat launches
 - + Extent of use - extensive
- 2. Types of Uses**
 - + Public recreational opportunities
 - + Scenic and aesthetic benefits
 - + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
 - + Cold water fishery

Water Quality Problem

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: 7 Lakes Alliance

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Messalonskee Lake Protection Project, Phase I

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

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.**

Feasibility for Success

1. + **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.**
2. + **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.**

3. Considerations

- Note: Is this really Phase I? Previous 319-funding work has occurred.
- + 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.

Cost Effectiveness

1. **Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)**
 - + High number of sites to be addressed
2. **Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) reasonable for the expected outcomes**
 - - High project management/salary cost
3. + **Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services**
 - ? Total cost of FOM newsletters (\$8K) allowable as match?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook IV

DATE: 6/7/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualification

- Relevant experience P – completed 2 other phases, and planning process
- Financial, administrative. P – have capacity and track record
- Technical qualifications P – City Engineer is point of contract/manager
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe P – other 2 projects + plan completed on time
- Past performance on relevant projects P – other 2 projects + plan completed on time

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. P – YCSWCD is sub. N – lists involvement of new PM, but doesn't give any quals or experience. Says that this staff is hired, but doesn't name.

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.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use P – beaches/lower watershed highly accessible, Rachel Carson
- Extent of use

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply NA
- Public recreational opportunities – P- hiking, golf course, beaches all in lower watershed
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits P – high value tidal waterfowl/wading bird habitat, Rachel Carson, Saltmarsh Sparrow, piping plover, least tern; endangered butterfly in headwaters.
- Commercial benefits N – no metrics provided
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – N – no metrics provided

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook IV

DATE: 6/7/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

- Other

Water Quality Problem

1. **Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**
P stressor well identified
2. **Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.** P – not attaining class -E.coli, macroinvertebrates, bacteria, aquatic life.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. **Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed.** P – stressors well documented
2. **Work plan's understanding of what actions are needed to address the NPS sources and problems.** P – most stressors addressed with this plan. N – bacteria and toxics are identified as a stressor, but not addressed adequately in this plan. Q – wetlands/marsh starting at the Saco Heath all the way down to Rachel Carson be source of bacteria?

Feasibility for Success

1. **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.** P/N – does address water nutrients, habitat and flow volume in some areas, but doesn't address toxics or bacteria.
2. **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.** P/N will help alleviate some stress, but not all.
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 P- continuation of work identified in the watershed based restoration plan.
 - Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody. P – City appears committed, N – many partners listed, only 1 with letter of commitment.

Cost Effectiveness

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook IV

DATE: 6/7/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Goosefare Brook – City of Saco

DATE: 6/21/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P city of Saco has been involved with previous grants

P subgrant to York County soil and water conservation district

P project coordinator is engineer for project

P/N No mention of financial and administrative capacity however town should have this

Overall good qualifications and experience. Good that they are working with YCSWCD. I don't have direct experience or knowledge of their past performance.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P Application does mention waterfowl and wading bird habitat and habitat for saltmarsh sparrow, piping plover, least tern and hessel's hairstreak.

N Not much indication of use beyond beaches at the outlet of the stream. Does not mention level of recreational use. Access only at beach and Country Club. No mention of potential for increased public use and improved habitat

Does not make a good case for the value of the waterbody. Recreation does not occur on the brook itself as far as I can tell from the application. Good mention of habitat benefits but not much else.

Water Quality Problem

P Impairment is due to aquatic life use, bacteria and toxics.

P/N I could have used more information on bacteria levels – "numerous exceedances" mentioned but no numbers

P Good discussion of toxics and dissolved oxygen

P/N I found the discussion of chloride a little confusing because it didn't mention which subwatersheds had high levels of chloride, but good use of numbers.

Overall, good demonstration of understanding of water quality conditions. Severity of impairment somewhat hard to determine although several issues apparent. The brook has met Class B in the past which suggests water quality could be improved. Only some areas have high chloride levels and dissolved oxygen issues. Lack of discussion about bacteria levels makes it hard to determine how widespread the impairment is.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

N no mention of percentage of land use types or level of impervious cover in the watershed

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Goosefare Brook – City of Saco

DATE: 6/21/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

P/N 16 subwatersheds were assessed in the watershed-based management plan; 5 of these have good water quality and low impervious cover. “Stressors” identified include bacteria, chloride, habitat, toxics and nutrients (not sure that nutrients/bacteria are considered stressors). Discussion of number of problems identified 4 habitat and toxics but no indication for bacteria chloride and nutrients

P/N For the most part, the nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems is discussed, although it would be good to have the subwatersheds on the map or have some description of which subwatersheds are affected by each stressor.

Overall, the application does a good job discussing the nature of the NPS issues (i.e., stressors), the extent of NPS issues (# of subwatersheds affected) and the severity (number of problems and priority rankings). More could have been done to identify the location of each subwatershed and the stressors that affect each.

Feasibility for Success

P One letter of support from OOB Campground

N Currently have two grant phases active for this waterbody. Both should be closed out by the time this one starts, although if an extension is needed for phase III, it would be happening concurrently with phase IV.

P/N Project seems to have a lot of good partners, but I worry that they don't actually have a big of role to play in the project due to weak education and outreach task.

to monitor for chloride if the purpose of the monitoring is to measure BMP effectiveness?

Q Need to make sure that none of the projects our counting toward MS4 permit requirements

P Projects should be able to be completed in time frame due to use of compensation fee utilization plan money for match from the town and not a lot of moving parts or landowners to deal with. Only one large BMP installation project otherwise just bank/channel stabilization projects.

P/N It's great that they are upgrading a stream crossing but I do wonder why that isn't being included as part of this grant. It could be that it is an MS4 project. I also wonder if it is appropriate to do channel stabilization so close to where this crossing is being put in because the culvert being installed could change the morphology of the channel here and the channel may stabilize on its own, although I am not familiar with the site. It would be worth looking into whether this is a good site for this type of project once the stream crossing is installed.

P Great opportunity to do some living shoreline or nature-based channel stabilization, although I do wonder about the ability to get permits for that type of project - may need individual permit, or could be done under PBR “restoration of natural areas”? Not sure if that would apply or not.

P/N Task 4 – water quality monitoring – Wondering if any BMPs that address chloride were installed in previous phases and if not, why is it appropriate

N Task 5 education and outreach is very lacking, no detail is given about the cleanup day, not sure this is eligible or fits in well since it will not be addressing any stressors or water quality impacts. Need to provide detail on what this is and give a justification for it.

P Task 6 – I like the idea for this task – although if these are intended to be for new development, they would not be “retrofits” – so I'm a little confused on whether this is intended for existing properties or new development. (They mention using new permit applications to determine candidate sites)

P/N not sure we will see significant improvement from this individual project given that they say that several future phases are needed to fulfill the WBMP.

P/N no direct mention of how the project will tackle impacts from climate change although flood control is mentioned for the gravel wetlands project

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Goosefare Brook – City of Saco

DATE: 6/21/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Overall I think there's a high likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed. the project will improve water quality and further the goals of the WBMP. However, the education and outreach task is very weak and the grantee is not leveraging the steering committee enough.

Cost Effectiveness

P Project task costs look good to me

P 55% match is good. Good that they are leveraging CFUP money would like to see the volunteer and kind match broken out or see other match from project partners

P 85% of grant funds will be used for construction which is very good

P donated services used old volunteer rate so the amount will actually be higher

P/N Cost comparisons are skewed somewhat by the fact that one BMP project is going to be \$250,000 which is the majority of the project cost. I don't have the expertise to determine whether this project is going to have a large enough impact on the brook to justify the cost. More detail would be good. Was this identified in the WBMP? There were a couple sites listed at DPW, but this appears to be a different site

Cost effectiveness is high given % of match and % grant funds to construction, but we should verify whether the major project (gravel wetland) is going to have a good water quality return for the money given the high price tag.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/9/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Excellent, the city and it's point of contact have a proven track record of successfully completing grant projects and they are partnering with York County SWCD who are very experienced in 319 grant project management. **P**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

Fair, it appears the brook doesn't provide direct recreation such as boating but contains a portion of the Rachel Carson wildlife refuge, provides significant waterfowl/wading bird habitat and has a large influence on Old Orchard Beach and tourism. **P**

Water Quality Problem

We have a lot of data on Goosefare Brook and it is impaired for bacteria, aquatic life and toxic metals. The water quality of the brook seems to have declined significantly since 2000. The stressors are varied and go beyond what we typically see in this type of stream due to the toxic metals. **P**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Issues are varied and extensive – chloride, bacteria from septic systems and pet waste, toxics and nutrients. It appears that these pollutants occur in most of the sub watersheds of Goosefare Brook so the issues are complex in scope. **P**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/9/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

Not sure about this, the City of Saco and York County SWCD will competently execute the project and accomplish all tasks in the workplan but it's questionable because the proposed BMP's only address soil erosion and impervious cover while bacteria and toxic metals aren't addressed. There is also the question of whether a phase IV project provides as much benefit as earlier phases. **Q**

Cost Effectiveness

This is a good topic of discussion for the group - \$250K (grant & match) for the gravel wetland at Saco Industrial Park? The entire project costs \$330K and, as mentioned above, doesn't address two of the main stressors on the brook. **Q**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV

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 under the scoring criteria below:
P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting*

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- + Relevant experience – experienced grantee
- + 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

- +/- While subgrantee entity is experienced, project manager will be new and possibly inexperienced

3. Consultant Qualifications

- N/A

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- + Availability (access) of use – hiking trail access, Country Club
- + Extent of use – trail access

2. Types of Uses

- + Public recreational opportunities
- + Scenic and aesthetic benefits – tidal portions and headwaters
- + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
- + Potential for increased public use and improved habitat

Water Quality Problem

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

- Details macroinvertebrate survey results over time, as well as bacteria, toxics, DO and chloride (SPC) sampling

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV

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

- Impaired for aquatic life use, bacteria, toxic metals

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

1. **+ Nature, extent, and severity of NPS problems in the watershed** – extensive, detailed studies have been done

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

Feasibility for Success

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

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

- + City shows continued dedication towards goal of stream restoration, since is Phase IV

3. Considerations

- Note: While riprap on ditches (Sites E40, E41, E43, and E44) is likely appropriate, it should not be anticipated for the Bear Brook channel site. Other instream options should be explored for this site, and would likely greatly increase the site cost.
- Note: The OOB Campground road crossing site (E35) stream smart work (outside of this project) sounds great. Given that work will like modify the area, stabilizing the area with rip-rap may not be the best thing to do. Prefer planning on the nature-based techniques to help further support stream recovery after the culvert crossing work.
- Note: For stream clean up, make sure includes educational component of what 'debris that should be removed' is, and make sure does not include wood in stream. Also, since has been done several years now, make sure there is enough area to clean to be of benefit and/or expand the area to include ditches or area that drains to the brook.
- ? What has the monitoring data showed so far? Is it useful? Is it getting into EGAD and/or should it be?
- + 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.

Cost Effectiveness

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

- -/+ Detention Pond Retrofit expensive, but hopefully will have significant benefit. Make sure it is lined or in clay soil to prevent chloride contamination

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Goosefare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase IV

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 – large amount of CFUP funds

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Town of Brunswick – Mare Brook

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience P -just completed Mare Brook plan, it was a good plan. P – CCSWCD as sub-grantee.
- Financial, administrative.
- Technical qualifications P – Town has 2 staff dedicated to the project, plus CCSWCD staff, though specific roles for CCWCD weren't listed.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe P
- Past performance on relevant projects P – just completed watershed-based plan, and CCSWD has lots of project 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. P see comments above

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.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Availability (access) of use
- Extent of use

P - 2 miles of public access, runs through conservation land, Coffin Pond,,shellfishery

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply NA
- Public recreational opportunities Y
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits Y

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Town of Brunswick – Mare Brook

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

- Commercial benefits Y
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat –
- Other
P – brook trout, sea run trout, softshell clams, ice skating,

Water Quality Problem

1. **Extent to which the work plan exhibits an informed understanding of water quality conditions.**
P – basic monitoring, identification of stressors using stressor guide, developed projects to address stressors; 3 phases to anticipated.
2. **Severity of the water quality impairment or indication that the waterbody may not attain its water quality standards in the future.** P – impaired Class B

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.** P – H&H consultant hired for next phases.

Feasibility for Success

1. **Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.** P – had good milestone for impairment in 2026. N - but it requires monitoring and there wasn't any monitoring task. How will this goal be measured?
2. **Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.** Q - .75 mile stretch of the stream is underground at the airport. This is a long stretch – WQ improve enough to overcome this physical barrier for fish?
3. **Consideration**
 - Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.
 - Effective well-sequenced tasks Q – if and H&H study is needed to understand sequencing, why do these not need to be part of that effort?
 - Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
 - Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts P – just did WBP
 - Extent of community support to restore or protect the water body.

Cost Effectiveness

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.** P/N - Almost all the match is coming from the town in cash and in-kind.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Town of Brunswick – Mare Brook

DATE: 6/6/22

EVALUATOR NAME: Alex Wong

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Brunswick – Mare Brook

DATE: 6/8/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. 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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

The Town of Brunswick has excellent capacity and they will partner on the project with Cumberland County SWCD who has a lot of experience coordinating 319 grant projects. No issues - **P**

Relative Value of the Waterbody

It's an Urban Impaired Stream with a healthy population of brook trout – a true anomaly... the brook provides recreational opportunity in the form of fishing and ice skating on it's impoundments. I think Mare Brook is important in that it offers wildlife based recreational opportunity in an urban environment and it impacts a nearby mudflat used for harvesting clams. **P**

Water Quality Problem

Mare Brook is a class B stream which is impaired for macroinvertebrates and habitat and has an ICTMDL but at 18% IC isn't exceptionally high. Temperature and conductivity don't seem to be an issue. Legacy pollutants from the decommissioned Naval Air Station are an issue. **P**

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Suffers from a wide array of historical (chemical) pollutants from the naval air station, also, the watershed is 18% IC so is subject to pollutants associated with IC over 10%. NPS stressors are significant but issues with habitat and connectivity appear to play a large role in its impairment. **Q**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: City of Brunswick – Mare Brook

DATE: 6/8/22

EVALUATOR NAME: G. Beane

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Feasibility for Success

Great, this strong partnership is guided by the recent watershed management plan and will focus on high priority sites described as action items in the plan. **P**

Cost Effectiveness

OK, expensive project due to high proportion of engineered stormwater BMP's , barely exceeds minimum match requirement but just the same Brunswick is committing a lot of match to this project. **Q**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Mare Brook – Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/14/2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

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:

Type or write down notes under the scoring criteria below:

P= positive; N = Negative; Q= Question, I= Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P/N Town of Brunswick previous experience w/ 604b grant, although project manager is very new and doesn't have direct experience

P CCSWCD subgrant – Heather was involved in WBMP development, good knowledge of project and 319 grant management experience

P Good that they are using CCSWCD engineer

Overall, I think this is strong due to Brunswick's commitment to Mare Brook and CCSWCD's knowledge and experience. Although PM is new, it sounds like Mare Brook will be a major focus of her job. Good sized town that should have the capacity to manage the project, especially with aid from CCSWCD.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P Public recreational access (no info on extent of use)

P Native brook trout population/habitat

P Fishing/ice skating, potential for increased use if WQ is improved

P Drains to shellfish growing area (2,500 bushels clams – what is the \$ value?)

Overall, good for an urban impaired stream or any small stream – presented some good justifications for the importance of the stream (recreation, habitat, economic benefit), but I would have liked to see more quantification of extent of use (amount of recreational use, size of fish run etc)

Water Quality Problem

P Urban Impaired Stream – urban stormwater & IC issues

P impaired due to macroinvertebrates and habitat; legacy pollutants

P Impervious Cover TMDL

P some DO issues, but not severe, no chloride issues, temperature not an issue as most stations

N Class B - has it ever met class? No discussion of Biomonitoring data [There are 7 biomonitoring (macroinvertebrate) sites on Mare Brook or its tributaries. Four sites have never attained class, 3 meet sometimes – one, site 143 (near Harpswell Road, between residential area and airport), has met about half the time, the other two have only met class 1-2 times. Determination either C or NA for most sampling events.]

N Most recent data presented is 2015-2016 – anything newer than that? Nothing collected during WBMP project to share?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Mare Brook – Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/14/2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Well-presented but would have liked to see them include biomonitoring data and talk about statutory class and include more recent data (or an explanation that 2015-2016 is the most recent data available). I did not get a good picture of the severity of the impairment.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P/N transportation, commercial use, single family residences, urban open space, athletic fields, airport – more specifics on extent/location of significant IC would be good here

P 61% “urban” land use, 18% impervious

P Stream stressor analysis identified proximate stressors as physical habitat alterations (6/6 sections), low recruitment potential for macroinvertebrate and fish populations (4/6 sections), toxicity threats, increased stormwater velocity, high stream temperatures, and low DO.

P Targeting methods to improve stream hydrology

Good description of stream stressors. Obvious that a lot of thought and planning went into strategizing/prioritizing in the WBMP and they understand the actions needed to address the impairment. Did not feel like I got a great picture of what the IC is and how it contributes stormwater to the brook. Other than the airport, what are the other significant areas contributing to the amount of IC in the watershed?

Feasibility for Success

P Plan is to replace 3 culverts and 1 outfall.

Q Is 6 SC meetings too much? Might be better to use that time/money for something else?

P Letters of support from CCSWCD, retirement community, and Brunswick Sewer District

N I thought Task 4, Education and Outreach, was somewhat lacking. Town Council presentation, website/ social media posts, one local newspaper article. I think the town could do more to advertise the work they’re doing to residents.

P Four BMP installation sites should be manageable in the 2-year timeframe. It sounds like landowners are on board to support the projects.

N Lack of community involvement and engagement – which is odd because it seemed like there was a lot during the WBMP development, I guess it’s because it’s all lumped in as “steering committee members” or “community members” – they should list out all the organizations in section VII so that this is more obvious.

Feasibility is high in terms of ability to complete the project as written and on schedule. Good first step toward addressing issues identified in WBMP. Increasing culvert sizing addresses climate change impacts. Clear priority for the town. I think there is good community involvement, but this could have been highlighted better in the workplan. E&O task was weak.

Cost Effectiveness

P/N 42% match – close to minimum

P 76% of grant funds will be used for construction

P Cost estimates seem realistic as far as I can tell

N Task 2 steering committee is high at almost \$10k. Scale back # meetings?

P/N Town is providing all the construction match – good that it is guaranteed but not great in terms of community involvement and buy-in.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Mare Brook – Town of Brunswick

DATE: 6/14/2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Good return for investment. Costs seem reasonable, although tasks 1 & 2 seem a little high maybe. Match is okay but is almost all from the town. Would have liked to see cash match from additional sources being leveraged.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Town of Brunswick

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I

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 under the scoring criteria below:

P or + = positive; N or - = Negative; Q or ? = Question, I = Interesting

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

1. Application Qualifications

- -/+ Relevant experience – While Town has been grantee, Town contacts are new
- + Financial, administrative
- -/+ Technical qualifications - While Town has been grantee, Town contacts are new
- + Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe
- -/+ Past performance on relevant projects - While Town has been grantee, Town contacts are new

2. Subgrantee Qualification and Past Performance

- + Experienced subgrantee

3. Consultant Qualifications

- N/A

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- + Availability (access) of use – trail and neighborhood access
- + Extent of use

2. Types of Uses

- + Public recreational opportunities
- + Scenic and aesthetic benefits
- + Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits
- + Cold water fishery

Water Quality Problem

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

BIDDER NAME: Town of Brunswick

DATE: June 23, 2022

EVALUATOR NAME: Kristin Feindel

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

PROJECT TITLE: Mare Brook Watershed Restoration Project, Phase I

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

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

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.

Feasibility for Success

1. + Likelihood that the project will be successfully completed as proposed.
2. + Likelihood that the waterbody can be successfully restored or protected.

3. Considerations

- Note: Given high interest in community, education and outreach task could be more extensive to capitalize on interest
- + 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.

Cost Effectiveness

1. Degree to which the project represents a good return for the investment (money, time)
 - - High overall grant cost
2. + Are project work and cost estimates (tasks & budget) reasonable for the expected outcomes
3. Amount and quality of proposed matching funds or services
 - + large amount of town cash match



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Melanie Loyzim
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

I, (print name at right) _____ Gregory E. Beane _____ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFA) 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 RFA.

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 RFA nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

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

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

Gregory E. Beane

5/24/2022

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Melanie Loyzim
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

I, (print name at right) Kristin Feindel
accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFA) 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 RFA.

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 RFA nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

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

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

Kristin Feindel 5/31/22
Signature Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Melanie Loyzim
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

I, (print name at right) Amanda Pratt
accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFA) 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 RFA.

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 RFA nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

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

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

Amanda Pratt

5/31/22

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Melanie Loyzim
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFA #: 202203023

RFA TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation


I, (print name at right) Alexander Wong accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFA) 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 RFA.

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 RFA nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

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

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

Signature  Date 6/3/22