

State of Maine RFP / Proposal Master Score Sheet

Instructions: Please complete the Master Score Sheet below, providing all of the requested information for the RFP, and for each bidder that submitted a proposal in response to the RFP. Please submit this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

SCORESHEET FOR RFP# 201704082 : 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration									
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Town of Old Orchard Beach		Blue Hills Heritage Trust		(Insert Bidder's name)		(Insert Bidder's name)	
COST:		Cost:	\$40,000	Cost:	\$8640.00	Cost:	(Insert Bid \$)	Cost:	(Insert Bid \$)
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section A: Cost and Budget	25	25		15					
Section B: Wetlands Restoration	25	23		10					
Section C: Habitat Considerations	10	10		2					
Section D: Water Quality	25	20		20					
Section E: Culturally and Economically Important Sustainable Plants	5	3		1					
Section F: Technical Expertise	5	5		5					
Section G: Wetland Protection	5	5		3					
TOTAL	100	91		56					
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		(Insert Bidder's name)		(Insert Bidder's name)		(Insert Bidder's name)		(Insert Bidder's name)	
COST:		Cost:	(Insert Bid \$)	Cost:	(Insert Bid \$)	Cost:	(Insert Bid \$)	Cost:	(Insert Bid \$)
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS								
(Note: Revise sections as needed to match your RFP.)	AVAIL.								
Section I: (Insert title of section)	(xx)								
Section II: (Insert title of section)	(xx)								
Section III: Cost Proposal (change if different)	(xx)								



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



PAUL R. LEPAGE
GOVERNOR

PAUL MERCER
COMMISSIONER

August 18, 2017

Kimbark G. Smith
Town of Old Orchard Beach
1 Portland Avenue
Old Orchard Beach, Maine 04064

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201704082
2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration

Dear Kimbark Smith,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders

- Town of Old Orchard Beach, \$40,000
- Blue Hills Heritage Trust, \$8,640

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



PAUL R. LEPAGE
GOVERNOR

PAUL MERCER
COMMISSIONER

August 18, 2017

Hans M. Carlson
Blue Hills Heritage Trust
PO Box 222
Blue Hill, Maine 04614

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 201704082
2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration

Dear Mr. Carlson,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection for 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract awards to the following bidders

- Town of Old Orchard Beach, \$40,000
- Blue Hills Heritage Trust, \$8,640

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Bill Longfellow
Director of Innovation and Assistance
Department of Environmental Protection
(207) 287-2821
William.longfellow@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Blue Hill Heritage Trust
DATE: July 19, 2017

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Bill Longfellow
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Maria Lentine-Eggett, Beth Callahan, Bill Longfellow

SUMMARY PAGE

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>		Pass:	Fail:
<p>◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)</p>			
◆			
◆			
◆			
		<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score: (Edit sections below to match evaluation criteria within RFP.)			
Section I. Cost and Budget	(Max: 25 Points)	15	
Section II. Wetland Restoration	(Max: 25 Points)	10	
Section III: Habitat Considerations	(Max: 10 Points)	2	
Section IV: Water Quality	(Max: 25 Points)	20	
Section V: Culturally & Economically Important Sustainable Plants (Max: 5 Pts)		1	
Section VI: Technical Expertise	(Max: 5 Points)	3	
Section VII: Wetlands Protection	(Max: 5 Points)	5	
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	56	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Blue Hill Heritage Trust
DATE: July 19, 2017

**EVALUATION OF SECTION I
Cost and Budget**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• \$95,000 requested,• information on the future use of roads would be helpful to know,• how many culverts would be needed to “restore” the wetland function• Not having the engineering design that was mentioned left the review team not quite knowing how many culverts would be added to the roads thus comparable to the funds requested. |
|--|

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II
Wetlands Restoration**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 10

Evaluation Team Comments:

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A completed natural resources inventory would be very advantageous to this application. It would be helpful to know the resources and their respective values on the property and the impact of restoration activities. The application is weak on explaining what is actually “going on at the site”.• Wetlands are known by their hydrology, soils, and plants. If anyone of these three is missing, there is no wetland. It was obvious to the review team that the roads crossing the wetlands greatly impacted wetland hydrology and the team wasn’t sure if the inclusion of 1 or maybe 2 culverts for each crossing would restore hydrology. The RFP describes the requirement of this criteria as “<i>The project must provide protection and/or restoration of impacted wetlands, enhancements to existing wetlands, or the creation of new wetlands from upland. Provide an overview of the project and describe how the project restores, enhances, and/or creates wetlands. Describe the resource types restored and the degree to which the project replaces the functions and values of impacted resources. Detail the current condition of the property and the proposed condition following the restoration project.</i>” The team questioned if the addition of one or two culverts to Crossing 1 and one culvert to Crossing 2, albeit they are described as “bottomless box culverts” (Sect. IV, A), would <i>restore</i> the hydrology that was impacted by the construction of the road.• The narrative provided in this section says “By re-engineering two of the problem crossings, and removing the third, we hope to restore nearly full wetland function on the property. This will restore proper hydrologic movement...” This very simple explanation is all that is offered in this section for an “overview of the project” to be done. The review team would have like to know more about what was going to be done to ‘re-engineer’ the roads and why it would ‘restore proper hydrologic movement’. There was no further supportive information on why and more importantly, how this would restore hydraulic capacity.• In the cover letter, it was stated “...wetlands were crossed by logging roads. Three of these are particularly problematic...having a negative impact on water quality and affecting habitat...” (from 3rd paragraph) Then, 3 sentences later it states “Lack of these crossings will also hamper proper management of the forest, [sic] and slow recovery of the whole wetland complex.” The review team agreed that the roads built on the wetland would be detrimental the wetland function. Why |
|--|

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Blue Hill Heritage Trust
DATE: July 19, 2017

would only these three roads need to be addressed? What about the other roads, are they properly engineered? What impact will there be for fixing these two and removing one while there are many other roads? The review team also asked why the lack of these crossings would slow wetland recovery. How and why? This type of information would have been helpful for the review team to get a better sense of the importance of this project.

- The team was in favor of funding the removal of the one crossing but not the work to be done on the two crossings that would remain. It was felt that a bad precedent would be set if this project was fully funded for the reasons stated above and in other sections of this consensus form.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Habitat Considerations**

Total Points Available: (10) Score: 2

Evaluation Team Comments:

- There was not enough information specific to this site, we'd like to have evidence of actual use by the species mentioned. The larger studies have been referenced, but on site intelligence and observation would be helpful.
- The wetlands in Surry Forest "are home to significant species..."
- Maine Distinct Population Segment (DPS) model predicts an abundance of Atlantic salmon rearing habitat. This is predicted, not actually happening there today.
- Project comprises five macrogroups and their associated habitats as defined by Maine's 2015 Wildlife Action Plan. "All will be enhanced by this project" it states in the application. "How?" was the review teams question, please tell me how. The claim is made but there was no supportive information which would have been helpful.
- The application speaks of the rehabilitation of the buffer zones as being beneficial to habitat in the wetland. This may be true, but it would have been helpful to include a more robust explanation for why this is true. What mechanisms specifically take place when buffer is improved? There were a lot of habitat described and claims of a much improved conditions once the project was completed, but not much explanation to bridge the gap between the two states which would have been nice to complete the picture.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Blue Hill Heritage Trust
DATE: July 19, 2017

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV
Water Quality**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

Evaluation Team Comments:

- The removal of road three will help with improving water quality.
- Restoration of buffer areas will help with improving water quality.
- Stabilizing the two roadways will help with improving water quality. All three of these items are beneficial to water quality, but with the exception of the roadways, it would be helpful to have more explanation of how they improve water quality than what was presented. The problem with two of the many roads across the wetland were shared and photographs were submitted.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Culturally and Economically Important Sustainable Plants (5)**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 1

Evaluation Team Comments:

There were no culturally or economically important plants in an existing wetland mentioned. Balsam fir, which occurs "in the areas surrounding wetlands", was discussed at great length. The review team concluded that this section was at best addressed tangentially, at worst, not at all. A simple statement indicating whether there are any plants of this nature in the wetland or could be in the wetland was absent.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Technical Expertise**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 3

Evaluation Team Comments:

CES has been or will be used for this project. Blue Hills Heritage Trust seems to have adequate experience in land conservation. Hans Carlson will be acting as project manager for this endeavor. It would have been helpful to get a better sense of the CES designed project. It would have been helpful to have the full natural resources inventory done as mentioned in Section II. It would have been helpful to have a more robust description of how the roads were to be "re-engineered". These are all technical details that were not fully communicated or included in this application. Full score not achieved for these

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Blue Hill Heritage Trust
DATE: July 19, 2017

reasons. The 'technical' part of the 'technical expertise' was not fully communicated. There is little doubt that the Blue Hills Heritage Trust and associated parties could have the expertise, but their expertise in the preparation of this document was seen to be lacking in several areas, indirectly attesting to their level of technical expertise.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Wetland Protection**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 5

Evaluation Team Comments:

Conservation easement will be and is the tool utilized here. Fully satisfied.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Town of Old Orchard Beach
DATE: July 19, 2017

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Environmental Protection
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Bill Longfellow
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Maria Lentine-Eggett, Beth Callahan, Bill Longfellow

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		Pass:	Fail:
◆ (List all pass/fail criteria of the RFP, if any. This section must be completed by RFP Coordinator before proposals are given to review team for evaluation. If a proposal fails any of the pass/fail criteria, the proposal is to be rejected and, therefore, not given to a review team for review.)			
◆			
◆			
◆			
		Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score: (Edit sections below to match evaluation criteria within RFP.)			
Section I. Cost and Budget	(Max: 25 Points)	25	
Section II. Wetland Restoration	(Max: 25 Points)	23	
Section III: Habitat Considerations	(Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section IV: Water Quality	(Max: 25 Points)	20	
Section V: Culturally & Economically Important Sustainable Plants (Max: 5 Pts)		3	
Section VI: Technical Expertise	(Max: 5 Points)	5	
Section VII: Wetlands Protection	(Max: 5 Points)	5	
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	91	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Town of Old Orchard Beach
DATE: July 19, 2017

**EVALUATION OF SECTION I
Cost and Budget**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 25

Evaluation Team Comments:

For the work being proposed, this was a very reasonable amount requested. The budget for the work was presented well and quite detailed. The use of volunteers for part of the project was encouraging, further expanding the amount of project that could be accomplished. Thought this was a very economical approach. For the amount requested, it appears that they will accomplish much.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II
Wetlands Restoration**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 23

Evaluation Team Comments:

Removal of invasive species will allow native and other plant species to have a better chance to recolonize. A question we had was, has the gate issue that was referenced in the cover letter been resolved? Will the gate's function impact the success of this plan? The explanation of how phragmites is lowering wetland function was very well described. Loss of habitat, intertidal streams, flood water attenuation, nutrient retention, wildlife habitat, aesthetic and visual qualities, small pools or "aquatic nurseries" are being lost. Good explanation of the impact of phragmites invasion. The benefits of removal of this invasive was well described and thorough. The wetland function that would most likely be restored was well described and cohesive. It made sense both logically and biologically.

Two points subtracted due to desire for more information on the amount of plants for replanting and if there is a monitoring plan for the newly installed plants. Otherwise, good job.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Town of Old Orchard Beach
DATE: July 19, 2017

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Habitat Considerations**

Total Points Available: (10) Score: 10

Evaluation Team Comments:

Very good description of the bio-activity and ecology of this wetland and the diversity of wildlife present. Ex: small pools being a refuge for small species and a breeding ground for food for migratory birds. Without these pools, which phragmites is causing to disappear, there will be no food source for migratory birds. Therefore, with more phragmites takeover, fewer birds may be present. An animal will nest near a food source; no food, no nesting.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV
Water Quality**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

Evaluation Team Comments:

A more diverse mix of plant material will utilize and therefore remove a broader nutrient profile. Phragmites is limited in what nutrients it captures and converts. There will be better water movement, better nutrient removal, less dead plant material in the wetland (phragmites stalks are continually building up on the 'floor')
20 of 25 awarded because effect will be to local water quality primarily.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Culturally and Economically Important Sustainable Plants (5)**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 3

Evaluation Team Comments:

Effort made, but this really is a hard one to meet in this case. Review team didn't feel there was much cultural or economically significant there to list.
3 of 5 points awarded due to attempt to meet criteria, but location and function limit fully meeting this criteria.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
BIDDER: Town of Old Orchard Beach
DATE: July 19, 2017

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Technical Expertise**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 5

Evaluation Team Comments:

Stantec's experience was impressive. "Fantastic" one reviewer said. Old Orchard Beach also has a record of success in attaining grants and managing resource conservation. The list of projects that Stantec has worked on was very helpful and fully supported the statements. Stantec had worked on an adjacent project.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Wetland Protection**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 5

Evaluation Team Comments:

The three work areas referenced in this application are part of a Conservation Easement. The review Team felt this fully satisfied the criteria for the section.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
 RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
 BIDDER NAME: Blue Hill Heritage Trust
 DATE: July 18, 2017
 EVALUATOR NAME: Beth Callahan
 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 RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<p>1. Cost & Budget Information (Maximum of 25 Points) Relevant section: Part IV.A of the application (see Appendix 1). Provide a brief description of the proposed project, including the requested amount of funds from this grant. Provide information on the estimated total costs and schedule for the proposed project.</p>
<p>\$95,000 requested for:</p>
<p>2 FWW crossing replacements, 1 FWW crossing removal</p>
<p>Budget outlined.</p>
<p>2. Wetlands Restoration (Maximum of 25 points) Relevant section: Part IV.B of the application (see Appendix 1). The project must provide protection and/or restoration of impacted wetlands, enhancements to existing wetlands, or the creation of new wetlands from upland. Provide an overview of the project and describe how the project restores, enhances, and/or creates wetlands. Describe the resource types restored and the degree to which the project replaces the functions and values of impacted resources. Detail the current condition of the property and the proposed condition following the restoration project.</p>
<p>2 crossings to be replaced with box culverts to improve hydrologic function, crossing removal will restore wetland functions.</p>
<p>No specific wetland functions described. No comparison of functions given.</p>
<p>3. Habitat Considerations (Maximum of 10 points) Relevant section: Part IV.C of the application (see Appendix 1). Describe how the project will provide or improve the habitat for wildlife species, including birds, fish and amphibians.</p>
<p>Proposal includes broad overview of wildlife species and habitats in overall parcel, not specific to the wetlands at the crossings.</p>
<p>Project will reduce habitat-species stressors. Unclear how crossing replacement will do that.</p>
<p>Project will provide restoration & conservation of habitats relied on by wildlife. Unclear how?</p>
<p>4. Water Quality (Maximum of 25 points) Relevant section: Part IV.D of the application (see Appendix 1). Discuss how the restoration will improve water quality. Describe how the project will benefit flood control, storm water management or facilitate water quality improvement within the watershed.</p>
<p>Crossing replacement and removal will improve flow of water. Proposal states that current crossings allow sediment to travel and contaminate local & coastal wetlands.</p>
<p>- Skeptical that sediment can travel several miles from FWW at this site through several tributaries</p>

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082

RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration

BIDDER NAME: Blue Hill Heritage Trust

DATE: July 18, 2017

EVALUATOR NAME: Beth Callahan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

to settle out in the ocean.
5. Culturally and Economically Important Sustainable Plants (5)
Parcel contains balsam fir. This is not a FWW species. No description of sustainable plants in existing wetland or through completion of the project.
6. Technical Expertise (5)
Bidder has land conservation experience. Some restoration experience.
7. Wetlands Protection (5)
Parcel currently in permanent preservation.
Blue Hill Heritage Trust is a Maine business as defined by the RFP.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
 RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
 BIDDER NAME: **Town of Old Orchard Beach**
 DATE: **July 18, 2017**
 EVALUATOR NAME: **Beth Callahan**
 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 RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<p>1. Cost & Budget Information (Maximum of 25 Points) Relevant section: Part IV.A of the application (see Appendix 1). Provide a brief description of the proposed project, including the requested amount of funds from this grant. Provide information on the estimated total costs and schedule for the proposed project. \$40,000 requested for: 2 yrs of Phragmites removal in 3 areas (32,300 sf), design & implement planting plan Budget and timeframe outlined.</p>
<p>2. Wetlands Restoration (Maximum of 25 points) Relevant section: Part IV.B of the application (see Appendix 1). The project must provide protection and/or restoration of impacted wetlands, enhancements to existing wetlands, or the creation of new wetlands from upland. Provide an overview of the project and describe how the project restores, enhances, and/or creates wetlands. Describe the resource types restored and the degree to which the project replaces the functions and values of impacted resources. Detail the current condition of the property and the proposed condition following the restoration project. Purpose is to eradicate <i>Phragmites</i> spp., an invasive non-native plant species Phragmites removal with supplemental planting in will restore tidal marsh functions and enhance flood storage and nutrient removal. Existing vs. proposed functions compared.</p>
<p>3. Habitat Considerations (Maximum of 10 points) Relevant section: Part IV.C of the application (see Appendix 1). Describe how the project will provide or improve the habitat for wildlife species, including birds, fish and amphibians. Phragmites is a poor food source. Supplemental native vegetation will provide a greater food supply for birds and encourage more use. Phragmites removal will create open areas in substrate for inhabitation by benthic organisms.</p>
<p>4. Water Quality (Maximum of 25 points) Relevant section: Part IV.D of the application (see Appendix 1). Discuss how the restoration will improve water quality. Describe how the project will benefit flood control, storm water management or facilitate water quality improvement within the watershed.</p>

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082

RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration

BIDDER NAME: Town of Old Orchard Beach

DATE: July 18, 2017

EVALUATOR NAME: Beth Callahan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

Phragmites removal will improve water flow. Native vegetation will improve pollutant uptake.
5. Culturally and Economically Important Sustainable Plants
Not a primary goal of proposal, but Phragmites removal open habitat for less common salt marsh species.
6. Technical Expertise
Municipality has a conservation commission. Stantec Consulting is on retainer to oversee the project. List of conservation lands included.
7. Wetlands Protection
Project sites currently preserved in perpetuity via a conservation easement.
The Town of Old Orchard Beach is NOT a Maine business as defined by the RFP.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
 RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
 BIDDER NAME: Blue Hills Heritage Trust
 DATE: July 18, 2017
 EVALUATOR NAME: Bill Longfellow
 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 RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<p>1. Cost & Budget Information (Maximum of 25 Points) Relevant section: Part IV.A of the application (see Appendix 1). Provide a brief description of the proposed project, including the requested amount of funds from this grant. Provide information on the estimated total costs and schedule for the proposed project. \$95,000, remediate two and remove a third wetland crossings, \$175,000 – 225,000 project. "when final engineering plans and funding are in place, the project will go out to bid..." CES is consultant</p>
<p>Upgrade two roads crossing wetlands, installing open bottom cement culverts on these two roads, and rebuilding the roads to minimize erosion. Remove the third.</p>
<p>2. Wetlands Restoration (Maximum of 25 points) Relevant section: Part IV.B of the application (see Appendix 1). The project must provide protection and/or restoration of impacted wetlands, enhancements to existing wetlands, or the creation of new wetlands from upland. Provide an overview of the project and describe how the project restores, enhances, and/or creates wetlands. Describe the resource types restored and the degree to which the project replaces the functions and values of impacted resources. Detail the current condition of the property and the proposed condition following the restoration project.</p>
<p>Surry Forest, 700 A of wetland and 1400 A of uplands, by the remediation of two road and the removal of the third, "nearly full wetland function hoped to be restored. P. 3 They say activities will "positively affect our property..."</p>
<p>3. Habitat Considerations (Maximum of 10 points) Relevant section: Part IV.C of the application (see Appendix 1). Describe how the project will provide or improve the habitat for wildlife species, including birds, fish and amphibians.</p>
<p>Unclear</p>
<p>4. Water Quality (Maximum of 25 points) Relevant section: Part IV.D of the application (see Appendix 1). Discuss how the restoration will improve water quality. Describe how the project will benefit flood control, storm water management or facilitate water quality improvement within the watershed.</p>
<p>Crossings are impeding flow and this is a problem. We are going to fix that, wait a minute, no we</p>

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082

RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration

BIDDER NAME: Blue Hills Heritage Trust

DATE: July 18, 2017

EVALUATOR NAME: Bill Longfellow

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

aren't.
5. Culturally and Economically Important Sustainable Plants (5)
Balsam fir is good for wreaths. Garbage explanation.
6. Technical Expertise (5)
CES involved, yet it seems the executive director is acting a GC.
7. Wetlands Protection (5)
Conservation easements and management plans in place.
Are you a Maine business as defined by this RFP? NO

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082
 RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration
 BIDDER NAME: Old Orchard Beach
 DATE: July 18, 2017
 EVALUATOR NAME: Bill Longfellow
 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 RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<p>1. Cost & Budget Information (Maximum of 25 Points) Relevant section: Part IV.A of the application (see Appendix 1). Provide a brief description of the proposed project, including the requested amount of funds from this grant. Provide information on the estimated total costs and schedule for the proposed project. Requesting \$40,000, budget given.</p>
<p>2. Wetlands Restoration (Maximum of 25 points) Relevant section: Part IV.B of the application (see Appendix 1). The project must provide protection and/or restoration of impacted wetlands, enhancements to existing wetlands, or the creation of new wetlands from upland. Provide an overview of the project and describe how the project restores, enhances, and/or creates wetlands. Describe the resource types restored and the degree to which the project replaces the functions and values of impacted resources. Detail the current condition of the property and the proposed condition following the restoration project. Removal of phragmites australis (invasive specie) in 32,000 ft 2 of 3 salt marshes in the Ocean Park section of OOB., will help restore wetland function, will replant with native species, partnering with Stantec, Herbicide application to control phragmites for three years, Functional restoration and enhancement of tidal marshes, good thorough explanation Function being lost is floodwater attenuation, sediment retention, nutrient retention and transformation, production export, wildlife habitat and food, shoreline stabilization, aesthetics/visual quality.</p>
<p>3. Habitat Considerations (Maximum of 10 points) Relevant section: Part IV.C of the application (see Appendix 1). Describe how the project will provide or improve the habitat for wildlife species, including birds, fish and amphibians. Phragmites poor food source, stands are not typically used for shelter and nesting by wildlife, dense stands can eliminate small intertidal channels, removing valuable habitat for amphibians, fish, and frogs. Large animal species also have trouble moving through the dense stands of p. australis.</p>

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 201704082

RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration

BIDDER NAME: Old Orchard Beach

DATE: July 18, 2017

EVALUATOR NAME: Bill Longfellow

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

4. Water Quality (Maximum of 25 points)

Relevant section: Part IV.D of the application (see Appendix 1).

Discuss how the restoration will improve water quality. Describe how the project will benefit flood control, storm water management or facilitate water quality improvement within the watershed.

A diverse mix of species is able to extract more nutrients and pollutants from the water.

5. Culturally and Economically Important Sustainable Plants

Not specifically included, but the removal of Phragmites would certainly allow those types of plants to be more successful. 2 examples given. Spiderwort and false foxglove.

6. Technical Expertise

OOB has a history of projects to enhance wetlands. Stantec will also be part of the project. List of projects Stantec has been involved with is included.

7. Wetlands Protection

Agreement in place to protect the wetlands into perpetuity.

Are you a Maine business as defined by this RFP? NO

STATE OF MAINE INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 201704082

RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetland Restoration

BIDDER NAME: Blue Hill Heritage Trust

DATE: 07/17/21017

EVALUATOR NAME: Maria Eggett

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Environmental Protection

<p>Habitat Considerations (Maximum of 10 points)</p> <p>Relevant section: Part IV.C of the application (see Appendix 1).</p> <p>Describe how the project will provide or improve the habitat for wildlife species, including birds, fish and amphibians.</p> <p>Generally wetlands provide habitat for wildlife. For this project, a full natural resource inventory has Not yet been completed. Applicant anticipates improving coastal bird habitat. Restoring/maintaining Wetlands has potential to enhance or maintain/restore wildlife habitat as a function. However, it is Difficult to assess in the absence of site specific details about the habitat and current or historic use by Wildlife.</p>
--

<p>Water Quality (Maximum of 25 points)</p> <p>Relevant section: Part IV.D of the application (see Appendix 1).</p> <p>Discuss how the restoration will improve water quality. Describe how the project will benefit flood control, storm water management or facilitate water quality improvement within the watershed.</p> <p>Buffers around all wetlands. Details on allowed activities in the buffer would be helpful. Stream crossing restoration will improve hydrology and reduce sedimentation. Pictures provided show active erosion and unstabilized soils on all three crossings. While water quality in the immediate area would likely be improved, the proposal mentions improvements to coastal waters as well. The Connection to the coastal waters (specific stream?) is not clear.</p>
--



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

Paul R. LePage
Governor

Paul Mercer
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetlands Restoration

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

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

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

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

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

Maria Eggert
Signature

7/18/17
Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

Paul R. LePage
Governor

Paul Mercer
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetlands Restoration

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

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

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

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

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

Beth Callahan

Signature

7/14/17

Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

Paul R. LePage
Governor

Paul Mercer
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 201704082
RFP TITLE: 2017 Grants for Wetlands Restoration

I, (print name at right) Bill Longfellow

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

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

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

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

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

Bill Longfellow
Signature

July 19, 2017
Date