

State of Maine
RFA / Proposal Master Score Sheet

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

SCORESHEET FOR RFA#202003056: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation									
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Biddeford Thatcher Brook		Boothbay Region Water District – Adams/Knickerbocker		CCSWCD Highland Lake		CCSWCD Pleasant River	
COST:		Cost:	\$106,102	Cost:	\$42,940	Cost:	\$102,317.85	Cost:	\$63,421.27
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I: Qualifications Experience	15	7		9		14		9	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5		10		6		8	
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	9		7		8		4	
Section IV. Nature Extent Severity NPS	10	9		7		9		6	
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	19		19		13		13	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	18		22		13		14	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	0		5		5		2	
Total	100	67		79		68		56	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		Eastbrook Abrams Pond		Lewiston Hart Brook		Midcoast Conservancy Damariscotta Lake		OCSWCD Lake Anasagunticook	
COST:		Cost:	\$68,349	Cost:	\$150,000	Cost:	\$78,236.15	Cost:	\$51,655
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Qualifications Experience	15	7		7		6		12	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5		2		9		9	
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8		7		6		7	
Section IV. Nature Extent Severity NPS	10	6		6		6		8	
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	14		7		11		19	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	15		9		13		20	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	0		5		1		0	
Total	100	55		43		52		75	

SCORESHEET FOR RFP#202003056: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects Watershed-based Plan Implementation

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		OCSWCD Pennesseewasee		Portland Water District Sebago Lake		Saco Goosefare Brook		Watchic Lake Assoc. Watchic Lake	
COST:		Cost:	\$77,282	Cost:	\$79,035.07	Cost:	\$69,028	Cost:	\$75,632
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Qualifications Experience	15	11		11		8		8	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	8		10		8		6	
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	6		7		9		6	
Section IV. Nature Extent Severity NPS	10	7		6		9		6	
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	17		13		18		14	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	20		13		21		14	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	5		1		3		0	
Total	100	74		61		76		54	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:		YCSWCD Long Pond		YCSWCD Mousam Lake		YCSWCD Square Pond			
COST:		Cost:	\$70,610	Cost:	\$65,994	Cost:	\$93,661	Cost:	
EVALUATION ITEM	POINTS AVAIL.								
Section I. Qualifications Experience	15	7		7		7			
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	10	5		8		7			
Section III. Water Quality Problem	10	8		7		7			
Section IV. Nature Extent Severity NPS	10	7		7		7			
Section V. Feasibility for Success	25	13		16		18			
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	25	11		15		17			
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	5	0		0		0			
Total	100	51		60		63			

Award Justification Statement
RFA# 202003056
Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects
Watershed-Based Plan Implementation

I. Summary

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

Fifteen applications were received and reviewed to determine if each proposal was acceptable. All 15 applications were found to be acceptable. Based on the applications, amount of funding requested and funding available, the team recommended funding all 15 applications. Applications were shared with the funding agency, US EPA, and they supported DEP's findings and recommendation to fund all 15 projects. Due to EPA's funding limitations for protection projects, however, the lowest scoring protection project (Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake) will receive only partial funding (see table below).

Points	Applicant	Waterbody	Protection	Restoration
79	Boothbay Water District	Adams Knickerbocker	\$42,940.00	
76	Saco	Goosefare Brook		\$69,028.00
75	OCSWCD	Anasagunticook	\$51,655.00	
74	OCSWCD	Pennesseewassee	\$77,282.00	
68	CCSWCD	Highland Lake	\$102,317.85	
67	Biddeford	Thatcher Brook		\$106,102.00
63	YCSWCD	Square Pond	\$93,661.00	
60	YCSWCD	Mousam Lake	\$65,994.00	
61	Portland Water District	Sebago Lake	\$79,035.07	
56	CCSWCD	Pleasant River		\$63,421.27
55	Eastbrook	Abrams Pond	\$68,349.00	
54	Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake	\$75,632.00	
52	Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake	\$78,236.15*	
51	YCSWCD	Long Pond		\$70,610.00
43	Lewiston	Hart Brook		\$150,000.00
	Totals		\$735,102.07	\$459,161.27

*Project will not receive full grant request.

II. Evaluation Process

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

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

The ET participated in a pre-review meeting on 5/20/20 to review the RFA materials and ET process. ET member conducted independent reviews of the applications and took notes on the applications received. Tom Miragliuolo calculated the Comprehensive Plan scores for each application. The group held day-long meetings on 6/10/20 and 6/11/20 via MS Teams to score the applications using a consensus decision-making process. Wendy Garland served as the RFA Coordinator/Lead Evaluator and took notes on the team consensus evaluation.

III. Qualifications & Experience

Applications that scored highest on the Qualifications and Experience criteria had staff with recent and extensive experience with similar NPS grants projects. They also had organizational capacity and/or well-rounded teams that would allow for project success even in the event of staff turnover.

IV. Proposed Services

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

- the importance and uses of the water body to local residents, the larger public and wildlife;
- an informed understanding of the water quality problem;
- a significant portion of the project is directed to install Best Management Practices that are described clearly, cost-effective and target important NPS sources in the watershed;
- project is part of a long-term effort that will make a significant impact on water quality and/or implementing the watershed-based plan;
- strong local support and a well-rounded team of staff and partners participating in the project; and
- consistent comprehensive plans in watershed towns.

V. Cost Proposal

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

Applicant	Waterbody	Grant	Match	Total
Biddeford	Thatcher Brook	\$106,102.00	\$76,901.00	\$183,003.00
CCSWCD	Pleasant River	\$63,421.27	\$60,321.45	\$123,742.72
Lewiston	Hart Brook	\$150,000.00	\$157,256.00	\$307,256.00
Saco	Goosefare Brook	\$69,028.00	\$49,232.00	\$118,260.00
YCSWCD	Long Pond	\$70,610.00	\$47,100.00	\$117,710.00
CCSWCD	Highland Lake	\$102,317.85	\$70,932.40	\$173,250.25

Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Knickerbocker	\$42,940.00	\$34,376.00	\$77,316.00
Eastbrook	Abrams Pond	\$68,349.00	\$46,106.00	\$114,455.00
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake	\$78,236.15	\$53,771.55	\$132,007.70
OCSWCD	Pennesseewassee	\$77,282.00	\$57,678.00	\$134,960.00
OCSWCD	Anasagunticook	\$51,655.00	\$34,844.00	\$86,499.00
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake	\$79,035.07	\$93,107.16	\$172,142.23
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake	\$75,632.00	\$50,561.00	\$126,193.00
YCSWCD	Mousam Lake	\$65,994.00	\$52,387.00	\$118,381.00
YCSWCD	Square Pond	\$93,661.00	\$66,499.00	\$160,160.00

VI. Conclusion

All applications outlined projects that support the DEP's Nonpoint Source program and will benefit Maine waterbodies. The four highest scoring projects stood out in several ways.

- Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds, Boothbay Region Water District** – This application scored very well because of the demonstrated importance of this public drinking water supply; clear explanation of the pond's threatened water quality; excellent track record for the previous grant projects; strong cost-effectiveness since 100% of grant funds will be used to address a high impact erosion problem; clear commitment by the Town to address the candidate site; both watershed towns have consistent comprehensive plans; and BRWD's demonstrated commitment to ongoing watershed protection efforts.
- Goosefare Brook, City of Saco** – This application scored well because the stream and coastal beaches at the mouth of the stream have high recreational and wildlife values; the project team, particularly the City of Saco, have been excellent project managers for previous phases; the water quality and NPS issues were described very clearly and thoroughly; the project involved several partners that demonstrated commitment and strong match to the project; and several sites with clear water quality benefits were listed that will continue momentum towards restoration.
- Lake Anasagunticook, OCSWCD and Pennesseewassee Lake, OCSWCD** – These projects also scored very well. These projects were quite similar and shared the following strengths: very experienced, well-rounded project teams; water bodies have high value (Lake Anasagunticook as public drinking water supply and Pennesseewassee as a large lake with high recreational and economic value); projects would tackle a large number of important NPS sites; and project partners demonstrated commitments and match.

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: Tmilligan@biddefordmaine.org
Cc: [Halligan, Addie](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:09:18 PM
Attachments: [Biddeford Thatcher.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III.

Addie Halligan will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Tom Milligan
City of Biddeford
205 Main Street
Biddeford, ME 04005

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Tom:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [Sue Mello](#)
Cc: [Halligan, Addie](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:03:58 PM
Attachments: [BRWD Adams Knickerbocker.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III.

Addie Halligan will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Sue Mello
Boothbay Region Water District
184 Adams Pond Road
Boothbay, ME 04537

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Sue:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [Heather Hunt](#)
Cc: [Pratt, Amanda](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:08:45 PM
Attachments: [CCSWCD Highland.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV.

Amanda Pratt will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

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

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Heather:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [Heather Hunt](#)
Cc: [Halligan, Addie](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:09:18 PM
Attachments: [CCSWCD Pleasant River.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II.

Addie Halligan will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

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

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Heather:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: jacurtis@myfairpoint.net
Cc: [Beane, Greg E](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:08:28 PM
Attachments: [Eastbrook Abrams Pond.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II.

Greg Beane will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Julie Curtis
Town of Eastbrook
959 Eastbrook Road
Eastbrook, ME 04634

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Ms. Curtis:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: JKuchinski@lewistonmaine.gov
Cc: [Feindel, Kristin B](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:08:14 PM
Attachments: [Lewiston Hart Brook.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II.

Kristin Feindel will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

John Kuchinski
City of Lewiston
103 Adams Ave.
Lewiston, ME 04240

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear John:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [Cara O'Donnell](#)
Cc: [Beane, Greg E](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:04:39 PM
Attachments: [MC Damariscotta.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II. Please note that due to funding limitations, we will not be able to fully fund this project. However, we look forward to working with you to adjust the work plan to effectively target and address important NPS sources in the watershed.

Greg Beane will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Cara O'Donnell
Midcoast Conservancy
290 US Route 1
Edgecomb, ME 04556

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Cara:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [Oxford County SWCD](#)
Cc: [Pratt, Amanda](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:04:49 PM
Attachments: [Oxford County SWCD Pennesseewassee.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I.

Amanda Pratt will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Michele Windsor
Oxford County SWCD
17 Olson Road, Suite 3
South Paris, ME 04281

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Michele:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [Oxford County SWCD](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:08:13 PM
Attachments: [Oxford County SWCD Anasagunticook .pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II.

I will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Michele Windsor
Oxford County SWCD
17 Olson Road, Suite 3
South Paris, ME 04281

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Michele:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: phunt@pwd.org
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:05:49 PM
Attachments: [PWD Sebago Lake.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV.

I will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Paul Hunt
Portland Water District
225 Douglass Street
Portland, ME 04104

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Paul:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [jlaverriere \(JLaverriere@samaine.org\)](mailto:jlaverriere@samaine.org)
Cc: [Halligan, Addie](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:07:58 PM
Attachments: [Saco Goosefare.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III.

Addie Halligan will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Joe Laverriere
City of Saco
351 North Street, DPW
Saco, ME 04072

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Joe:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: [Paul McNulty](#)
Cc: [Halligan, Addie](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:06:19 PM
Attachments: [Watchic Lake Association Watchic.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I.

Addie Halligan will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Paul McNulty
Watchic Lake Association
P.O. Box 319
Standish, ME 04084

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Paul:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: jharris@yorkswcd.org
Cc: [Halligan, Addie](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:06:43 PM
Attachments: [York County SWCD Square Pond.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Square Pond Protection Project Phase I.

Addie Halligan will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Jen Harris
York County SWCD
21 Bradeen Street, Suite 104
Springvale, ME 04083

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Jen:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: jharris@yorkswcd.org
Cc: [Pratt, Amanda](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:07:03 PM
Attachments: [York County SWCD Mousam Lake.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III.

Amanda Pratt will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Jen Harris
York County SWCD
21 Bradeen Street, Suite 104
Springvale, ME 04083

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Jen:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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).

From: [Garland, Wendy](#)
To: jharris@yorkswcd.org
Cc: [Pratt, Amanda](#)
Subject: Notice Conditional Contract Award, Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 1:07:19 PM
Attachments: [York County SWCD Long Pond.pdf](#)

Thank you for submitting an application to Maine DEP's Request for Applications - Grants for NPS Pollution Control Projects, Watershed-based Plan Implementation (RFA#202003056). Attached, please find a copy of the 'Notice of Conditional Contract Awards' regarding this RFA.

Congratulations on the conditional award for your application, Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I.

Amanda Pratt will be serving as the project's assigned Agreement Administrator and will contact you soon to discuss/negotiate the final work plan for the contract. Please contact me if you have any questions in the meantime.

Wendy Garland

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

GERALD D. REID
COMMISSIONER

Jen Harris
York County SWCD
21 Bradeen Street, Suite 104
Springvale, ME 04083

July 1, 2020

RE: Notice of Conditional Contract Awards - RFA#202003056, Watershed-based Plan Implementation

Dear Jen:

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

Applicant	Application Title
Biddeford, City of	Thatcher Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Boothbay Region Water District	Adams Pond & Knickerbocker Lake Watershed Protection Phase III
Cumberland County SWCD	Pleasant River Restoration Project Phase II
Cumberland County SWCD	Highland Lake Watershed Protection Project Phase IV
Eastbrook, Town of	Abrams Pond Protection Project Phase II
Lewiston, City of	Hart Brook Restoration Project Phase II
Midcoast Conservancy	Damariscotta Lake Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Lake Anasagunticook Protection Project Phase II
Oxford County SWCD	Pennesseewassee Lake Protection Project Phase I
Portland Water District	Sebago Lake Protection Project Phase IV
Saco, City of	Goosefare Brook Restoration Project Phase III
Watchic Lake Association	Watchic Lake Protection Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Long Pond Protection (Restoration) Project Phase I
York County SWCD	Mousam Lake Protection Project Phase III
York County SWCD	Square Pond Protection Project Phase I

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

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

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6). This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for submitting an application to help improve and protect Maine's waters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wendy Garland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Wendy Garland
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 #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	7	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	5	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	9	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	9	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	19	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	18	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	67	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

Overall, fairly good qualifications and experience – both within City and YCSWCD.

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – City has carried out three DEP grant projects
- Financial, administrative – City has managed past grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.
- Technical qualifications – Tom Milligan has extensive experience with stormwater design and construction. Greg Tansley has been planner for many years as well.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone fairly well. However, communication with the City can be challenging at times. Also, project tasks are often somewhat behind schedule. For example, Phase I project was not completed until the very last day of the contract.

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.

YCSWCD – would serve as project manager. This arrangement has worked well with past phases. YCSWCD, who has carried out numerous DEP grant projects. Not clear if new YCSWCD project manager will have skills needed to manage the project.

CCSWCD – Chris Baldwin will provide engineering support. Good idea and will help round out project team.

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

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 5

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Application listed access at land trust property, Eastern Trail and Kohls/Walmart/Park and Ride. These places are ‘used’ exactly, but there are a few other places used by public but not in application.
- Extent of use – Some use by adjacent neighborhoods but not extensive use.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Limited although fishing observed.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Scenic falls not described in application.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Stocked annually for brook trout.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other – Priority for the City

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Impaired for bacteria, aquatic life and habitat. Extensive monitoring during WBP development. Application has accurate and very good summary of water quality problems.

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

Impaired but application doesn't describe severity.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good summary of past assessments, NPS issues and sites recommended in WBP.

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

Application clearly described sites needing to be addressed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 19

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Although Phase II is still ongoing, likely that project will be successfully completed as proposed. (Some question about the City's capacity if they are going concurrently.) Sites are well thought out with commitments from landowners already.

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

Project leverages past work to continue implementing plan. Good sites to address and aligns with plan.

3. Consideration

- Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.
- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Tasks are well laid out and sequenced for the most part. Just a few questions/concerns:

- a. What is the value of the water quality monitoring and are they collecting the right kind of data?
Maybe just use DEP loggers and have kids play with WRDB to analyze – maybe more educational value than one person taking a meter reading.
- b. Will consultant be hired to design and oversee instream project?
- c. What is the feasibility/likelihood of ordinance task being successful?

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Strong support and commitments laid out by City and partners.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts
- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 18

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good return overall. High % of grant allocated for construction (72%). Significant local match. Project admin cost is relatively high - \$5805.

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

Relatively reasonable costs for project tasks.

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

Extensive and diverse match sources with solid commitments. Landowners, Stormwater Compensation Fees (\$23k) and City.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 0

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Biddeford	N	0%	0
Arundel	N		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	9	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	10	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	19	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	22	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	5	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	79	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – BRWD has carried out two DEP grant projects.

- Financial, administrative – BRWD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.

- Technical qualifications – Project manager has many years of experience and is very effective. Foreman listed has extensive construction experience. Does Town DPW have experience in ESC and BMPs?

- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well. Not clear how the project would fare if there was staff turnover since past projects all done by Sue Mello.

- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone very well.

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

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

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 10

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Public access to both ponds
- Extent of use – Very important resource for the area.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – public drinking water supply for three towns and about 5,000 residences and businesses. Peaks in summer tourist season.
- Public recreational opportunities – Adams Pond closed for swimming but used for fishing etc. Knickerbocker Lake is an area destination for freshwater swimming, boating, fishing etc.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Not described.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Both ponds stocked with trout. Large habitat blocks in watershed.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Water quality described adequately.

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

Neither is impaired and both are stable. However, Knickerbocker is at risk due to sediment chemistry and DO depletion.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good description of NPS sites identified and problems.

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

Very good understanding of the watershed and needed actions. Acknowledged that there is room to improve ordinances.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 19

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Very likely that BRWD will successfully complete the project as proposed. Only one road site that the Town has committed to fixing.

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

Very good. This is the final proposed grant phase. BRWD will continue with protection efforts working with Towns and Comp Plan update.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks
Tasks are well laid out and sequenced.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
Strong commitment from Town on the road project.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts
Strong past efforts through DEP and other avenues.

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 22

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Excellent investment. All of the funds will be spent on construction. Modest grant request. Will address one final large NPS site.

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

Costs are reasonable.

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

Town provided commitment letter for their match.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __5__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Boothbay	Y	100%	5
Boothbay Harbor	Y		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	14	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	9	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	13	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	13	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	5	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	68	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 15 points **Score:** 14

Evaluation Team Comments:

Overall, very strong qualifications and experience. Strong and well-rounded team assembled.

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – CCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects. Project manager and engineer have worked on numerous, similar projects – including some with agricultural landowners.
- Financial, administrative – CCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.
- Technical qualifications – Project manager has many years of experience and is very effective. Lots of experience in their diverse staff.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone very well.

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

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

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – State carry in boat launch. No public motor boat launch limits use. Land trust properties on tribs.
- Extent of use – Close to Portland so gets use from Portland-area residents, 320 shorefront year round residents and 1100 watershed residents.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Recreational uses including swimming, fishing, boating and winter activities.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits –
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – 10 species fish, alewife run restored and now has 40-60,000 fish returning annually. Wildlife includes rare/protected species - box turtle, bat and plants
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other – Overall average Maine lake in terms of use, access and values.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good explanation of water quality. Extensive monitoring conducted for several decades and recent studies by DEP/USM to figure out recent blooms.

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

Still somewhat unclear if it will be relisted but blooms appear to be linked to alewife food web. Still important to reduce phosphorus loading to the lake.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Extensive surveys conducted in past few years in the watershed. Includes watershed erosion, stream crossings, agriculture and septics. Thorough analysis of the NPS issues at play in the watershed.

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 13

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Concerns noted below.

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
 - a. Overlook Road task is unclear. How important is it to fix? Is proposed work eligible and was it already undertaken in a past phase? Is paving eligible? Is enough \$ allocated?
 - b. Are 6 steering committee meetings necessary?
 - c. Will road collaborative be successful and provide lasting benefits?
 - d. What are specific elements that will be completed through E&O plan? Plan not yet created.
 - e. Has outreach been done to farms yet? How likely are they to be interested in doing work?
 - f. Perhaps combine tasks.
- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
Towns and lake association will be very involved.
- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts
Part of long term efforts in watershed.
- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

HLLT is a unique entity formed to focus on lake protection. Strong buy in from towns and residents.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 13

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good to focus on the highest priority sites.

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

Budget questions about the agriculture task and staff time is high for this task as well, especially if no follow through assured.

Staff costs are high for project.

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

Local match is only 40.9% and not sure about the quality (e.g., is town grant guaranteed?). HLA match is relatively low. However, if does come through contributions from Towns is quite high.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: 5

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Windham	Y	100%	5
Falmouth	Y		
Westbrook	Y		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	9	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	4	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	13	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	14	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	2	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	56	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

Overall, very strong qualifications and experience. Strong and well-rounded team assembled.

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – CCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects. Project manager and engineer have worked on numerous, similar projects – including some with agricultural landowners. However, ag quals not described.
- Financial, administrative – CCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.
- Technical qualifications – Project manager has many years of experience and is very effective. Lots of experience in their diverse staff.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone very well.

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

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

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Access to stream at several road crossings. At least a few have signs and parking to provide access for fishing.
- Extent of use – Destination for fly fishing in SME.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Popular for fly fishing.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Not described.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Stocked with brook and brown trout. Freshwater mussel, brook floater, is important species to IF&W.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 4

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Very little data provided in summary. Very general information provided. Not clear if data has been looked at or understood by applicant. No biomonitoring data provided. Relatively good amount of public data available.

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

Not discussed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

NPS issues described in general - 10% agriculture in watershed; brook floater decline (sedimentation?), new development pressure mentioned but not emphasized as threat.

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

Watershed survey in 2008 - provided good description of identified sites. Since it was an older survey, may not have current understanding of watershed. Also, old surveys didn't really look at stream stressors (e.g., farms). Not sure if hotspot survey was useful.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 13

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Not clear if there is buy-in from agricultural landowners and what projects will be done on the farms. Important to start tackling farms though.

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

Good likelihood that the stream can be restored since not severely impaired. Work with farms important to be able to restore.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

E&O task is weak.
Are road sites town or private?

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Towns appear to be very engaged. Good involvement by other partners DACF, PRLT, TU and NRCS.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 14

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good investment in restoring a 'low hanging fruit'. Good focus on construction (47% of grant) but not sure what would be getting for Task 3 – agriculture. What does “explore incentives” mean? Is 319 needed or is EQIP a better fit?

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

Tasks 1 Admin \$6392 and Task 5 PCR \$3381 relatively high.

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

\$10k from each Town very good. Cash and in kind match. Strong stakeholder interest.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Cumberland County SWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: ___ 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)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Windham	Y	45%	2
Gray	N	55%	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	7	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	5	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	14	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	15	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	55	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – Town has not been an applicant in the past, but they are willing to step up. Appear to have some experience with grants and enthusiastic.

- Financial, administrative – Town contacts appear to have strong financial and admin skills

- Technical qualifications – No technical quals. Would be relying on consultant described below.

- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe –

- Past performance on relevant projects – no track record on relevant projects, although lake association has strong involvement and support for Phase I 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.

Coop Extension – strong expertise with blueberry growers.

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.

Will be seeking consultant as project manager. Appropriate skills and experience listed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 5

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Town owns a shorefront parcel and land trust will be developing parcel with frontage and public access point to lake. Trail system being developed.
- Extent of use – Somewhat remote and used mainly by shoreline residents. Potential increase with development of conserved property.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – boating, fishing, swimming
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Not described
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – warmwater fishery known as ‘trophy bass’ pond, 2 loon pairs nested in 2017.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – As noted above when land trust property developed.
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good summary of water quality.

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

Previous blooms in late September. Sediment chemistry close to or above thresholds putting lake at higher risk. Signs of internal loading and shallow so some P release. Strong possibility of future non attainment.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Described erosion sites thoroughly and mentioned potential blueberries, septics. Would be good to know more and have assessed ag and septics more though.

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

Given unknowns above, not completely clear what actions are needed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 14

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

No letters from roads, but likely that sites will be addressed. Will blueberry farms participate in workshop?

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

Excellent sites laid out for project. No work on agriculture but good to get underway – will need to be addressed to protect pond.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Tasks are well laid out and sequenced.
Septics task needs reworking to be eligible.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Good involvement from partners.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Will build on Phase I project.

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

Lake association is strong and committed to lake efforts. Town is eager to help.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good investment overall in a modest project (\$68k) to address priority site on a lake on the edge. Only 39% of grant goes to construction, but funds will address important sites. More expensive for consultants to travel to this area – more remote lake – which increases project costs.

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

High project admin and overall staff costs.

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

Relatively low amounts of match from a few sources overall.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: ___0___

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Eastbrook	N	0%	0
Franklin	N		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	7	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	2	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	7	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	9	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	5	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	43	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – Lewiston has carried out several DEP grant projects.
- Financial, administrative – City has financial and administrative support to administer grants.
- Technical qualifications – Project staff have many years of experience as engineers.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Project manager is relatively new to City and has not worked on DEP grants. Application’s incompleteness does not reflect well on City’s ability to carry out according to work plan or DEP guidelines.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past City projects have gone very well.

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

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.

Plan to hire CES to provide project support. No specific qualifications provided for them, but CES is a large firm with strong reputation.

Need to find out about how they were selected to ensure that it aligns with program procurement guidelines.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 2

Evaluation Team Comments:

Application provided very little information for this section.

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

- Availability (access) of use – Stream crossings at several public roads.
- Extent of use – Very limited

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Very limited.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Not described.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Not described, but some fisheries value. Also bald eagle habitat at mouth of stream, some large habitat blocks and wetland habitat in watershed.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described, but likely good potential for nearby neighborhoods.
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Some good summary information but could have provided more details. Seems to understand the water quality status and issues. Good amount of monitoring conducted during WBP development and update process.

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

Severe impairments for several criteria.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Application listed the many issues associated with stream impairments and stressors. Priority catchments identified. Could have provided more details about sites and stressors though.

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

City appears to have fairly good understanding.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Given limited scope of project, very likely to successfully complete the project as proposed. Sites appear to already have been scoped out as feasible with preliminary designs provided.

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

Project will only treat a small area and would likely not make a big difference in water quality but will implement items in plan. DEP review of design – feedback that biofilters did not seem to include forebays to trap sediment. Not clear from application what future phases are planned.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Questions about tasks due to incomplete information provided.

Monitoring by CES listed in Roles, but not included as a task. Is this part of the project?

Why wasn't stream channel restoration proposed before the planting?

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Is anyone involved in the project besides the City? Can local businesses be engaged at all?

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

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

Not evident.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

100% of grant would go to construction. However, it is a really high cost for treating very small area. Not sure it will make a big difference.

Decent investment to continue momentum with restoration of a highly impaired stream.

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

Expensive overall costs to install 2 filters and tree planting. Stormwater retrofits costs in urban areas are often quite high, so the estimates are likely reasonable for what is proposed.

Budget tables are not completely filled out.

Task 6 PCR – is very high. Not appropriate and should be closer to \$2,000.

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

Good - City match is secure and totals 51%. No other sources provided.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __5__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Lewiston	Y	100%	5

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆Match at least 40%	X	
◆Eligible recipient	X	
◆NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	6	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	9	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	11	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	13	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	1	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	52	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 15 points **Score:** 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – MC has carried out one previous DEP grant project.

- Financial, administrative – MC has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.

- Technical qualifications – Project manager has some related experience but limited with grant management and BMP installations. No qualifications listed for other staff listed in budget tables – given their positions does not appear to add to technical quals.

- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Not clear. New project manager will have a learning curve to manage grant projects. Also, no engineering support included in project, which was detrimental to Phase I project. Relied heavily on DEP support.

- Past performance on relevant projects – Unclear given mixed success of Phase I grant project, which was not able to be fully completed according to work plan. MC staff have very full plates – capacity to be successful?

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.

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Numerous public access opportunities.
- Extent of use – High use lake that is a popular destination outside of the region.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Lots of recreational use.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Yes
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – High fisheries and wildlife values described.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other – Lake has regional and Statewide significance. Good description provided.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good summary of water quality. MC showed initiative in conducting and involving DEP in advanced analysis of data.

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

Not impaired. Some indication of increasing P trend and threat in South Arm. Improving conditions and sediment chemistry is not a risk factor.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Application recognized threats from new development, septic, ag erosion. Provided detailed on NPS sites from watershed survey and septic survey. Didn't indicate which NPS sources were biggest issues.

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: _11__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Not clear whether given past track record, new staff and lack of engineering support whether project could be successfully completed.

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

Compelling photos for some of the candidate projects, but does not include priority roads from survey. Are these the highest priorities?

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Not clear if retaining wall project is eligible for funding.
Shoreline stabilization projects likely not highest priorities and not keen to fund riprap.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Some involvement from the three towns.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Part of a long-term effort to protect lake water quality and would build on Phase I.

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

Letters from landowners associated with two of the sites.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 13

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Relatively high % of grant would go to construction (if YCC included).

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

YCC costs are high (\$30K) to address 12 sites. Crew leader is more expensive than the project manager but typically less qualified.

Is budget appropriate for the NPS sites? Is \$10k enough for the Mullgina Lane sites?

Is Railsback fellow rate correct? Should it be higher?

Travel rate is higher than allowed and should probably not cover truck costs – only mileage reimbursement.

Are any grant funds for KLSWCD?

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

Is match from Towns confirmed? No letters from the towns – relatively small contributions.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __1__

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)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Newcastle	N	16%	1
Nobleboro	N		
Jefferson	N		
Waldoboro	Y		
Washington	N		
Somerville	Y		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	12	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	9	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	19	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	20	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	75	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

Overall, very strong qualifications and experience – both within OCSWCD and with the subgrantee ARWC. Strong and well-rounded team assembled.

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – OCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects.
- Financial, administrative – OCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support. Strong quals listed.
- Technical qualifications – Project managers have many years of experience and are very effective. District engineer listed – although not typically involved in grant projects.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone very well.

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

See 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.

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Good – two town beaches.
- Extent of use – Relatively high use by local communities. 180 shoreline properties.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – DW supply and would be expensive/challenging to upgrade if water quality declined.
- Public recreational opportunities – swimming, boating, winter carnival
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Good
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Good fisheries and wildlife benefits.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: __7__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Alluded to two past blooms but no detailed provided. Lake has slightly high P and low SDT. Not provided but sediment chemistry is somewhat of a risk factor. DO low but currently no internal loading.

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

No indication of imminent threat.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good detail provided about recent survey. Active LakeSmart program. Not clear whether septic and/or ag are NPS issues.

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 19

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

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

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

Good number of sites to be tackled. Interesting idea to hold a buffer social and discuss barriers with landowners.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks
Tasks are well laid out and sequenced. Good description of NPS sites.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
Good list of partners with involvement in project.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Excellent value – good return on modest grant request.

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

6000 miles of travel seems high.

Are there enough staff hours to coordinate tasks and sites?

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

Diverse match sources. Strong match commitments. Totals only 40.3% though.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __0__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Canton	N		
Hartford	N	0%	0
Peru	N		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennessewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
Points Awarded:		
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	11	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	17	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	20	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	5	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	74	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennesseewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 15 points **Score:** 11

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – OCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects.

- Financial, administrative – OCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support. Strong quals listed.

- Technical qualifications – Project manager has many years of experience and are very effective. District engineer listed – although not typically involved in grant projects. Good quals listed for LAON involvement.

- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.

- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone very well.

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

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

Not clear whether consultant will in fact be hired?

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennessewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Several public access and viewing opportunities.
- Extent of use – 341 shoreline properties developed. Regional attraction and high use by surrounding communities.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – High recreational use.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Good
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Very good fisheries and wildlife value described.
- Commercial benefits – Not described but important draw for local businesses/Norway center.
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennessewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good overview of water quality. No internal loading but not mentioned.

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

Does not appear to be high risk lake. Low Al:Fe ratio.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennessewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: ___7___

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

2019 watershed survey information described and focus on erosion as NPS source. Didn't describe severity of NPS sites or threats from ag or septic.

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

Good handle on erosion sites in watershed.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennessewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 17

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Very likely that OCSWCD will successfully complete the project as proposed. Strong commitments from roads, individuals and Town.

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

Sites appear to be good ones. Some question about the partner capacity to properly design and install effective BMPs. Need to ensure clear communication and roles – and involve consultant/engineers where needed.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks
Tasks are well laid out and sequenced.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
LAON, SWCD and Town are main partners with good involvement. Are there others to pull in?

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennesseewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 20

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

74% of grant is allocated to construction. Very good investment in getting good number of NPS sites addressed.

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

\$3,000 for consultant – but not clear whether they will actually be hired.

Candidate site listed showed \$1,800 for drip edge and ECM – seems high.

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

Lots of cash match and solid commitments.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Oxford County SWCD – Pennessewassee Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __5__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Norway	Y	92%	5
Greenwood	N		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	11
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	(Max: 10 Points)	10
Section III. Water Quality Problem	(Max: 10 Points)	7
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems	(Max: 10 Points)	6
Section V. Feasibility for Success	(Max: 25 Points)	13
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	(Max: 25 Points)	13
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	(Max: 5 Points)	1
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	61

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 15 points **Score:** 11

Evaluation Team Comments:

Overall, very strong qualifications and experience – both within PWD and CCSWCD. However, no specific staff quals provided for PWD.

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – PWD and CCSWCD have carried out numerous DEP grant projects.

- Financial, administrative – PWD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.

- Technical qualifications – PWD and CCSWCD staff have many years of experience including with BMPs and are very effective.

- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.

- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone well.

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

See above re: CCSWCD.

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

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: ___10___

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Many opportunities for public access.
- Extent of use – Lake of Statewide significance. Top tourist destination in State.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – 200,000 households use as drinking water.
- Public recreational opportunities – Extensive
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Very good.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Very good.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: __7__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Generally application did a good job describing water quality. However, could have provided much more detail given the amount of data and known about lake.

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

Lake is in good shape with a big watershed. However, high potential for increased development and water quality threat in future.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good information on development pressure, NPS watershed survey findings, septic and other NPS inventories. Doesn't provide number of sites in tracker. Could have provided more details.

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

PWD has comprehensive watershed programs. Given size of the watershed, however, it is challenging to get a handle on the needed actions. Application doesn't describe priorities.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 13

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Very likely that PWD could successfully complete the project as proposed.

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

Given size of watershed and the types of NPS projects described, this project would not be very effective in addressing NPS sources.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Several tasks/projects are questionable value.

Porous pavement demonstration needs to be revisited. Likely not addressing an important NPS source and probably not a BMP that has high demonstration value in watershed, especially given the cost. Other BMPs much more effective and cost effective.

Boat launch planting site – would this be likely to succeed?

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Good guy in from camps, State Park. Some match from Towns but not overwhelming support evident.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Leverages other past grant phases and PWD programs.

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 13

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good amount of grant allocated to construction (63%) and would be most of project. Would this be the case if porous pavement task removed?

Porous pavement project is not a good investment and a large % of project.

Not clear if the other NPS sites are high priorities either.

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

Steering committee task match seems high - \$11,000
PCR task cost is high for small number of sites - \$5459.

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

Relatively high overall match – 54%.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: ___1___

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)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Sebago	N		
Naples	N		
Casco	N		
Raymond	N		
Standish	N	19%	1
Windham	Y		
Otisfield	Y		
Harrison	N		
Waterford	N		
Norway	Y		
Albany TWP	N		
Greenwood	N		
Bethel	N		
Frye Island	N		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	8	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	9	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	9	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	18	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	21	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	3	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	76	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 15 points **Score:** 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – City has carried out and been involved with several DEP grant projects.
- Financial, administrative – City has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.
- Technical qualifications – Joe Laverriere has many years of experience and is very effective.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Solid track record of getting projects done and done well.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone very well.

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

YCSWCD – Staff turnover recent – not clear if new project manager will have experience with managing grants or BMPs.

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

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – High use coastal beach at outlet. Numerous other access points throughout watershed.
- Extent of use – Very high use coastal beach. Good local use in other parts of watershed.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Application didn't emphasize all the recreational uses
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits –
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Rachel Carson Wildlife Refuge, Saco Heath, fisheries, wildlife values.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Water quality issues very well described. Good understanding of water quality conditions throughout watershed.

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

Impaired for three criteria.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 9

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Very good description of the NPS issues and sources in various subwatersheds. #s of sites listed for stream issues, stormwater etc. Would have been helpful to know land cover %. Good recognition of complexities.

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

Good handle on what is needed in watershed. Saco and OOB continue to scope out sources.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 18

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Very likely that City will successfully complete the project as proposed. Stormwater sites are well thought out.

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

Not likely to result in restoration yet, but clearly laid out good sites with clear environmental benefits. would continue strong progress being made in the watershed.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Tasks are well laid out and sequenced.

Is WQ monitoring helpful? Are four sites necessary?

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Several partners listed, but mainly for buffer workshop and planting. Is there local buy in from businesses?

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Yes, builds on previous phases.

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

Good support and involvement.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 21

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Very good investment of grant funds with 72% of grant for construction. Good return in supporting strong local efforts for important stream.

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

Overall very reasonable. Is 250 hours enough for YCSWCD?

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

Strong match from Saco.
Is BSCC match realistic?

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: ___ 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)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Saco	Y	67%	3
Old Orchard Beach	N		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	8	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	6	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	14	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	14	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	54	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 15 points **Score:** 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – Applicant has been active in watershed efforts, but no direct experience with DEP grants. Quas mentioned grant experience but did not provide details.

- Financial, administrative – WLA Board members listed have strong quals in this area.

- Technical qualifications – One Board member listed with engineering quals. Not clear about this person’s role or the kind of engineering involved in professionally.

- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Good quals provided for WLA.

- Past performance on relevant projects – Not applicable for DEP grant program. WLA was involved in 319 grant many years ago and project was successful, but much time has passed and this is a very different role. WLA has been effective and proactive in coordinating work with watershed farm, LakeSmart program etc.

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

CCSWCD engineer listed, but not clear if they would definitely be used. Would be a good idea since District engineer has extensive relevant experience.

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.

Would seek to hire consultant as project manager. Would have skills necessary.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

EVALUATION OF SECTION II

Relative Value of Waterbody

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Kiwanis Beach and carry in boat access. Fee to use. No motor boat access to lake.
- Extent of use – Popular beach for surrounding communities. 175 shoreline properties.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Boating, swimming, fishing etc.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – Not described.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Some warm water fishery and wildlife values described.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Provided good overview of water quality. Application mentioned stream monitoring data and nutrient loading; however data are very limited and of questionable value.

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

Data looks good – not at high risk of internal loading currently since bottom grabs look okay. Some DO depletion but no sediment chemistry data available.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 6

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Information provided about recent watershed and shoreline survey findings. Not clear if whole watershed has been surveyed. Mentioned threat from new development but no supporting information.

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

If new development is a threat, how will that be addressed?

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: ___ 14_

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

If roles clearly defined, WLA likely to successfully complete the project as proposed.

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

Unclear roles in project BMP tasks – who will do designs? WLA, CCSWCD, consultant? Very important to have someone with experience involved to ensure successful project.

Not clear if proposed BMPs will address the NPS problems and sediment sources. Need to revisit before proceeding.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks
Tasks are well laid out and sequenced.
Will the sign be placed at Kiwanis Beach? If not, where and would it be valuable?

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
Strong participation and support from Towns and WLA.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts
Would leverage WLA's ongoing efforts in watershed.

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

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 14

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good investment overall with 56% of grant going to construction. Would need to ensure candidate sites are important ones with appropriate BMPs.

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

Very high staff costs overall.
E&O task has high grant and match costs – Is it worth it?
Where is engineering time in the budget?

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

Most match is from the association but some good match from Town.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __0__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Standish	N	0%	0

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	7	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	5	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	13	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	11	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	51	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – YCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects. However, current project manager is leaving in July and new interim staff person has limited experience.

- Financial, administrative – YCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated adequate financial and administrative support.

- Technical qualifications – Not clear what District’s technical qualification will be. No mention of securing engineering support from CCSWCD or consultant.

- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Good track record of getting projects done.

- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone well although sometimes/often behind schedule.

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.

Consultant would be hired to coordinate many project tasks. Given uncertain District capacity noted above, this is a good idea.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 5

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – Access to public at West End Camp. No formal public access though.
- Extent of use – 58 camp owners on lake and 2 summer youth camps. Appears that there's not too much use beyond that.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – 2 public wells – summer camps?
- Public recreational opportunities – swimming, boating, fishing
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – not mentioned
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Some limited values noted.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good description of water quality and blooms/internal loading that have taken place in the last three years.

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

Very at risk lake and will likely be listed as impaired in upcoming Integrated Report.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good information presented on watershed survey findings. Would like to have a better handle on septics.

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

Fairly good understanding, although questions remain about septics.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 13

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Project will rely on consultant primarily. However, candidate site BMP recommendations didn't all make sense and changed from watershed survey report. Not clear about applicant's familiarity with sites and BMPs. Unclear how much engineering support will be available.

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

Should make an impact on external load to lake.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Not clear why the workshop would focus on rain gardens. Not a recommendation in watershed survey and likely not to be pursued by many owners. Revisit the workshop focus to buffers?

As mentioned previously, need to make sure BMPs are appropriate and effective.

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Strong local energy to restore water quality. No apparent town involvement or match, but good to pull into project with presentations.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

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

Strong desire around lake to address blooms.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 11

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Pollutant loading estimates are very low compared to cost. However, good to address external loading prior to community pursuit of alum treatment.

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

Tasks 1, 2, 3 and 4 – high staff costs (\$22k consultant).

Is inkind match reasonable – 300+ hours?

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

Overall match just 40% - minimum required.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __0__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Parsonsfield	N	0%	0

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	Pass:	Fail:
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	Points Awarded:	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience (Max: 15 Points)	7	
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody (Max: 10 Points)	8	
Section III. Water Quality Problem (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (Max: 10 Points)	7	
Section V. Feasibility for Success (Max: 25 Points)	16	
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness (Max: 25 Points)	15	
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan (Max: 5 Points)	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Max: 100 Points)	60	

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – YCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects, including several on Mousam Lake.
- Financial, administrative – YCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.
- Technical qualifications – Current project manager is leaving District in July. Interim staff person has limited technical experience. Not clear if they will have adequate quals in future. Not clear about ASYCC’s tech quals, but Betty Smith advisor is very good (many years relevant experience). Good to involve CCSWCD engineer in project. He has extensive relevant experience and quals.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Not clear given staff transition and small District staff.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone well, although current Mousam project somewhat behind schedule. Although extension needed, things are lined up now for construction. Some communication issues between YCSWCD and ASYCC at start of current Mousam project, but appear to have been resolved now.

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.

See 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.

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 8

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – High use state boat launch and town beach.
- Extent of use – 950 shoreline properties. Inspect 5500 boats at launch. Highly used and destination lake in SME.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – Very good.
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – not described
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – good fishery and wildlife benefits
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good understanding and explanation of water quality.

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

Vulnerable since impaired and restored in past. However, not extensive DO depletion.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Recent watershed survey with good overview and description of land use in watershed. Mentioned septic systems but not agriculture or the severity of NPS sites in survey.

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

Good understanding of the watershed by partners – with work over many years.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 16

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Can probably be accomplished. Good legwork has been done already on candidate sites and strong commitments by Towns and YCC.

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

Lack of details provided on phasing, but should be able to protected over time. Good high impact sites to address should make progress on load reductions.

3. Consideration

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

- Effective well-sequenced tasks
Can path site be fixed effectively?

- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government
Lake association is not playing a strong role in the project.

- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.
Towns , YCC, lake association support efforts.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 15

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good investment to with 42% of grant funds for construction (59% including YCC).

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

Most task cost estimates reasonable.

Task 1 Admin – cost is far to high. Is this a mistake? Not appropriate and must be revisited and lowered. Much higher than any other projects of this scope.

Task 4 – 400 hours match – Is this feasible or eligible?

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

Good quality match from several partners. Clear commitments.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: ___0___

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Acton	N	0%	0
Shapleigh	N		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

DEPARTMENT NAME: Maine DEP

NAME OF RFA COORDINATOR: Wendy Garland

NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Wendy Garland (DEP), Addie Halligan (DEP), Kathy Hoppe (DEP), Amanda Pratt (DEP), Tom Miragliuolo (DACF)

SUMMARY PAGE

Pass/Fail Criteria		
	<u>Pass:</u>	<u>Fail:</u>
◆ Match at least 40%	X	
◆ Eligible recipient	X	
◆ NPS Priority Watershed	X	
◆ Accepted and Active Watershed-based Plan	X	
	<u>Points Awarded:</u>	
Numerical Score:		
Section I. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	(Max: 15 Points)	7
Section II. Relative Value of Waterbody	(Max: 10 Points)	7
Section III. Water Quality Problem	(Max: 10 Points)	7
Section IV. Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems	(Max: 10 Points)	7
Section V. Feasibility for Success	(Max: 25 Points)	18
Section VI. Cost Effectiveness	(Max: 25 Points)	17
Section VII. Comprehensive Plan	(Max: 5 Points)	0
TOTAL POINTS	(Max: 100 Points)	63

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Application Qualifications

- Relevant experience – YCSWCD has carried out numerous DEP grant projects, including several on Mousam Lake.
- Financial, administrative – YCSWCD has managed numerous grants and has demonstrated financial and administrative support.
- Technical qualifications – Current project manager is leaving District in July. Interim staff person has limited technical experience. Not clear if they will have adequate quals in future. Not clear about ASYCC’s tech quals. Good to involve CCSWCD engineer in project though. He has extensive relevant experience and quals.
- Adequacy of qualification to carry out the project within the proposed timeframe – Not clear given staff transition, numerous other projects to manager and small District staff.
- Past performance on relevant projects – Past projects have gone well, although current Mousam project somewhat behind schedule. Although extension needed, things are lined up now for construction. Some communication issues between YCSWCD and ASYCC at start of current Mousam project, but appear to have been resolved now.

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.

See 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.

Not applicable.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

- Availability (access) of use – State boat launch and town public beach.
- Extent of use – 900 boats inspected in 2019, 600 shoreline properties. Good use but other nearby lakes are more popular destinations.

2. Types of Uses

- Drinking water supply – Not applicable
- Public recreational opportunities – swimming, boating, fishing
- Scenic and aesthetic benefits – not mentioned
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitat benefits – Good fisheries and wildlife values.
- Commercial benefits – Not applicable
- Potential for increased public use and improved habitat – Not described
- Other –

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Water Quality Problem**

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good overview of water quality and sediment chemistry.

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

At risk due to sediment chemistry but not imminent threat.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

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

Total Points Available: 10 Score: 7

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good understanding of erosion sites from 2007 and 2019 surveys, although didn't describe the site severity.

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

Are septics or ag an issue in watershed?

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION V
Feasibility of Success**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: 18

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Strong involvement and collaborations with ASYCC and SPIA – makes likely to be completed, even given the YCSWCD uncertainties.

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

Good to consider climate change and excellent description of future phasing. Likely to be successful in protecting lake. Making good progress in watershed over time with many NPS sites identified in 2019 survey and improved water clarity after watershed efforts began.

3. Consideration

- Adequate information and capacity to determine actions needed restore or protect the waterbody.
- Effective well-sequenced tasks

Tasks are well laid out and sequenced.
- Contribution or participation by appropriate stakeholders and municipal government

Good contributions by several partners.
Is \$18,600 match from Town solid – no letter?
- Leveraged with other previous or concurrent efforts

Builds on past phases and ongoing YCC work in watershed.
- Extent of community support to restore or protect the waterbody.

Very good – strong active lake association.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VI
Cost Effectiveness**

Total Points Available: 25 Score: ___ 17 ___

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Good investment with high % of grant for construction (53% or 62% including YCC).

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

Most tasks and costs appear appropriate except as noted below.
Is E&O task effective and is match eligible?
Are road sites underbudgeted?

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

Good match sources and quality from both Towns, YCC, SPIA.
Match for construction sites and overall project ~ 40%. Is there buy in?

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFA #: 20200203056

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

BIDDER: York County SWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/10/20 and 6/11/20

**EVALUATION OF SECTION VII
Comprehensive Plan**

Total Points Available: 5 Score: __0__

Evaluation Team Comments:

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

Y = Consistent

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

Town(s)	Comp Plan Consistency	% Watershed with Consistent Plan	Points
Acton	N	0%	0
Shapleigh	N		

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/2/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- City Engineering Dept has carried out numerous CSO separation projects and Phase I and II (ongoing) NPS grant projects.
• Project lead is Tom Milligan, 39+ years experience and lead on Phase I and II projects. Greg Tansley, Planner, also involved in past projects and will lead ordinance task.
• YCSWCD has been involved in many NPS grant projects including Phase I and II projects. Chris Baldwin engineer – lots of relevant experience and good to have on the team.

P – Good project team with City staff, YCSWCD and CCSWCD engineer. Good to have YCSWCD involved to support and prompt project work.

N/Q – Phase I and II projects have gone fairly well, although often behind schedule and sometimes City has very delayed response to DEP prompts/requests. Construction on Phase I was taking place on 12/31/19 on last day of contract. Not clear how project would fare if there is staff turnover with Tom or Jen.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Public access – Application listed Eastern Trail. Also some commercial and parking lots listed (see below). Other informal trails from neighborhoods adjacent to lower portion of the stream (not mentioned in application). 40 acre land trust parcel includes a section of brook.
• Wildlife and Fisheries – Brook trout (stocked annually), several BWH areas (cottontail, swamp saxifrage, vernal pools).

P – Some public access and use. I have observed scenic falls and fishing along lower segment. Watershed includes relatively large undeveloped habitat blocks that have wildlife and plants of interest/concern. City lists as important water resource. IF&W identified as an important brook trout fishery and owns a parcel in lower stream (not mentioned in application).

N - Kohls, WalMart and Park and Ride Lot listed as public access – these are located adjacent to stream/tribs, but not really public access or used. Overall, not widely known about or used by the public, although potential for increased use.

Q – Does land trust property have public access and trails?

Water Quality Problem

- Listed as impaired for aquatic life (macroinvertebrates), bacteria and degraded habitat. Extensive monitoring during WBP development. Temp good, chloride elevant in one tributary, large DO swings indicated nutrient issues in Richardson Brook and Thatcher below Route 111.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/2/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P – Accurate and concise information provided.

N/Q – Does not indicate the severity of the impairment. Stream is Class B. Biomonitoring Station on Thatcher was Non attainment in 2004 and met Class C in 2012. Lower station recovers and has met Class B in past (B in 2000, A and 2005 and 2010), but nonattainment in 2015. Chloride was 736 so chloride may be a bigger issue now.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- Application identified stream channel and habitat, buffers, elevated P, low DO and elevated chloride as main stressors. Nine priority stormwater retrofits, 2 instream habitat sites, 5 buffers, 3 culverts and one bank stabilization identified in WBP.
- Phase I – Morin Street UDSF, two instream habitat projects, culvert removal, and TA. Phase II – three UDSF on Morin Street. Work has focused on Richardson Brook which was a priority in the WBP. Good strides made with local ordinances.

P - Good, concise summary of NPS issues/stressors and NPS projects needed from plan. Relatively well understood issues, although might come to different conclusions if WBP done more recently. Work to date has focused on priority items in plan.

Feasibility for Success

- Steering committee (4 mtgs), NPS Sites (Fiber Materials – insert/rain garden, Morin Maine – UDSF, buffer, bank stabilization, Barrette – buffer and diversion to detention basin, Instream habitat – 5,900 linear feet); outreach (buffer workshop, press releases, site walk), ordinance development; and monitoring

P – Strong suite of well thought out tasks and NPS projects that already have legwork and preliminary commitments. Chris Baldwin already scoped out the sites and good level of detail provided on site list. All located in important parts of watershed to address stressors. Commitment and support by City, BCC, SWC, Morin Maine LLC, BHS documented in letters. Impressive to have business letter and support in an urban watershed. Past projects have made impressive gains with ordinances so good feasibility on the ones proposed for Phase III – very interesting model.

Q – BCC letter mentioned that they would monitoring threatened and endangered species. Is this counted in their match? Does not appear that it is related or eligible as match.

Q – Will need to confirm with Alison Moody that the work proposed at commercial sites is not required under MSGP.

Cost Effectiveness

P – Strong projects that will address priority issues in WBP. Very good investment. Extensive and creative match sources. Appear to be solid commitments of match. Reasonable costs except as noted below.

? – Project Admin costs relatively high (\$5805). Also, City inkind match for Project Admin is high \$3840. Is this comparable to the time spent on this task in prior phases? Not clear which cost category the \$23k SCF is in budget table Part 2 (listed as Other under notes, but no Other category).

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: BRWD – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/1/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- BRWD has carried out 2 successful NPS grants and 5 SWP grants on Adams/Knickerbocker.
- Received and carried out \$6m in grants/loans for infrastructure projects since 2001. Strong admin and management. Outsourced its financial recordkeeping to local firm.
- Sue Mello will be project manager. Has worked at BRWD for 6 years and biologist at US NMFS for 14 years. Strong project manager on past DEP grants. BRWD foreman will oversee construction projects. Has been at BRWD for 21 years.
- Town listed as subgrantee – but not really necessary. Cost-share recipient is better characterization.

P – Very strong quals and experience, especially in this watershed.

N – Small organization. If Sue leaves, not sure who would take over.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Public water supplies for the towns of Boothbay, Boothbay Harbor and Southport, provide potable water to about 5,000 residences, businesses. Demand averages about 540,000 gallons per day and peaks to over 1.2 million gallons per day during the summer season.
- Adams Pond is closed to swimming but is used often by the public for fishing, walking, skiing, skating and paddle boating. Public access is available from several sites on BRWD property along Adams Pond Road.
- Knickerbocker Lake is a regional destination for swimming, boating, skiing, ice skating, and year-round fishing. It is the only freshwater lake on the peninsula with public swimming and boating access via a town-owned public access/dock located off Barter’s Island Road.
- ~30 shoreline cottages and the Boothbay Region YMCA summer youth camp.
- Wildlife – watershed includes largest undeveloped habitat blocks in town of Boothbay.
- Fishery – both ponds stocker with trout.

P – Very important resource for water supply and freshwater recreation on this part of the coast.

Water Quality Problem

- Neither lake is impaired. Knickerbocker SDT average in 2017-2019 was only 3.2 m.
- Long term monitoring data and recent modeling by FBE.

P – Good presentation of the water quality data for the ponds. Sediment chemistry and occasional DO depletion indicate that the lakes, especially Knickerbocker, are at risk. Particularly vulnerable given development trends.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: BRWD – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/1/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- 2002 and 2014 watershed surveys; stream and infrastructure surveys in 2015. 2014 survey found 53 NPS sites (54% roads, 25% residential and driveways). High impact sites associated with roads, driveways, shorefront residential). Also new and projected development contributing P to lakes. Build out and modeling showed reaching max allowable TP loading in 17 and 31 years.
- 2015 watershed plan; 2 DEP grant projects fixed 42 sites; BRWD supported comp plan update, ordinance development; provides funding to town CEO; work with land trust to acquire 135 acres; outreach efforts ongoing.

P – Very recent, extensive and ongoing surveys to document and update NPS sources in the watershed. Clear understanding of the threats and needs in the watershed.

N – Did not provide details on the numbers of the high impact sites.

Feasibility for Success

No SC meetings; Task 2 – Gaecklin Road NPS construction project; limited E&O and sign; PCR

P – Project leverage past successful projects. Would likely be successfully completed and address the remaining important NPS sites. Photos of site indicate that it is important to address.

Q – This and past projects have not had much community involvement through SC meetings etc. Does this indicate future support an issue?

Cost Effectiveness

P – Modest grant request \$42k would address remaining priority NPS site in watershed. Good investment. Grant and match appear to be primarily construction, with just \$5,670 in match for administration. Town letter indicates that they will provide the required match.

Q – Task 2 needs cost category added. Assume both are construction.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/1/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- CCSWCD has carried out over 30 NPS grants in the last 10 years.
- Carried out several past projects on Highland Lake.
- Well-rounded staff that includes engineer, planner, project managers, educators, admin. Heather Hunt has 18 years experience with 14 at the District running NPS grant projects, including recent one on Highland Lake. Strong project manager. Chris Baldwin engineer 13+ years at District with extensive grant experience on roads, ag sites etc.

P – Very strong quals and experience, especially in this watershed.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- 320 shoreline properties developed on 7 miles shoreline
- 1,100 more properties in watershed.
- Used for recreation including swimming, boating, water skiing, snowmobiling and ice and open water fishing.
- There is a State-owned public boat launch (hand carry) and parking lot used by Portland area residents for fishing, kayaking. Numerous private boat launches and right-of-way access points shared by road associations and watershed residents.
- Wildlife includes habitat for endangered Eastern box turtle, bat and plant.
- Fishery includes 10 species (warm and cold water), including 40-60k alewife run.

P – Overall, average to slightly above average Maine lake in terms of use, access and values. Due to proximity to Portland, lake is valued and used by more than just residents. Many upper watershed properties and with access to the lake.

N – Although public launch, it is just carry-in, which limits use.

Q - Two land trust preserves along tributaries (433 acres combined). How much are they land trust properties used? Are there trails on the streams?

Water Quality Problem

- Declining SDT trend led to impairment listing and delisting in 2010.
- Phosphorus has been increasing gradually, especially in later summer.
- Picoplankton blooms over past six years.

P – Application provided clear, concise summary of the lake’s complex water quality issues. Lake has been focus of extensive monitoring by lake association/volunteers for many years. DEP, USM and other scientists have been studying intensively for past few years. Consensus that P reduction is important, even if pico blooms are related to alewives. Also, some urgency given the watershed development and being right on the edge of potential relisting.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/1/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

N – Would be helpful to see specific numbers for SDT and P for context.

Q – Is this the only known picobloom in North America? Or just New England?

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- 2018 survey identified 129 NPS sites, including 71 residential/driveway and 27 private roads. Two agricultural NPS sites.
- Road BMP evaluation survey found 15 of 34 roads needed some BMP work.
- 5 stream crossing with issues.
- Septic analysis identified 21 parcels needing further investigation.

P – Very recent and comprehensive NPS assessments in the watershed. Strong understanding of the NPS issues. Three past grant projects from 1999-2009. HLLT formed in 2017 – unique Town/Lake Association entity. Plan update completed recently – already fixed 36 sites.

N/Q – No information provided about the severity of the sites identified.

Feasibility for Success

6 SC meetings; 2+ private road collaborative mtgs; Overlook Road project; ag/horse farm; E&O plan implementation

P – Past grant projects were successful and led to NPS Success Story. Extremely motivated partners with 36 projects already completed since the 2018 survey. Very focused work plan that would likely be accomplished successfully and significantly reduce loading to the lake as long as farms are interested.

N – Road collaboratives/roundtables have been tried in a few other CCSWCD projects and weren't all that successful or well attended. How to ensure success or worthwhile??

N – Task 5 E&O is very vague. Plan being developed but not clear what the strategies are – so how can be evaluated here? Large amount of match associated with this unknown (\$11k) – did not specify cost category.

Q – Will the remaining sites be difficult to address – low hanging fruit gone? Not clear if the agricultural properties know about or are interested in projects?

Cost Effectiveness

P - \$100k grant is good investment since almost 2/3 is for construction on highest priority sites in the watershed. Falmouth and Windham both contributing \$10k and another \$12k Windham grant. Volunteer and partner donated hours look reasonable/realistic.

N/Q – Task 3a Road Collaborative - Expensive grant (\$5k) and unrealistic match (\$10.7k). If 20 people attended two roundtables – that's only \$2,500. What is the match breakdown? Not clear from Part 3 budget table either. As noted above, not sure it will be worthwhile.

N – Match for Overlook Road site is only 33%. \$25 of \$75k project. Is road association only contributing \$12k of a \$75k project?

Q – Why are CCSWCD rates so different compared to recent application? Changed in how they calculate indirect? Staff hourly rates now look high compared to other applicants. Experienced staff though would warrant higher rates. Part 1 seems to include Indirect, instead of aligning with Part 2.

N/Q – Why isn't the HLA contributing cash match? Poor quality match from HLA since only \$2242 in in-kind labor (97 hours).

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/2/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- CCSWCD has carried out over 30 NPS grants in the last 10 years.
- Carried out several past projects on Highland Lake.
- Well-rounded staff that includes engineer, planner, project managers, educators, admin. Heather Hunt has 18 years experience with 14 at the District running NPS grant projects, including recent one on Highland Lake. Strong project manager. Chris Baldwin engineer 13+ years at District with extensive grant experience on roads, ag sites etc.

P – Very strong quals and experience, also in this watershed and with Windham/Gray.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Fishery – IFW stocked as coldwater fishery in fall and spring with brown and brook trout. Excellent wild brook trout habitat and popular flyfishing river in SME.
- Access – fishing access along several road crossings.
- Wildlife – vernal pools, deer wintering areas, bird and waterfowl habitat, GBH habitat. Important for brook floater, freshwater mussel. State threatened species of concern – priority for IFW.

P – Overall, very good/high value resource for recreation, wildlife and fisheries.

Q - Thousands of local and out of state anglers – really?

Water Quality Problem

- Listed as impaired for DO and bacteria. DEP has three biomonitoring stations and PRLT has monitored water quality at three sites for 30 years. Trends show increasing bacteria in both dry and wet weather. Two additional sites added in 2018.

P – Good amount of data available on the river and several tributaries. Application provided accurate but limited summary of water quality. Viewed by DEP as a low hanging fruit that could be a success story since not severe impairment. Bugs are okay – nutrients are the issue.

N – Much more data could have been summarized and shared to paint a clearer picture of the potential sources and relative severity of the water quality problems.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- 2008 watershed survey identified 95 NPS sites (35% town roads, 15% private roads, 14% residential, 10% ag). Over half were high or medium water quality impact. 2009 hotspot inventory identified 7 commercial sites and also identified septics and turf as issues. Sedimentation viewed as major issue for brook floater. Heavy development pressure in watershed towns. 2019 survey of Thayer Brook – 16-20 farms lacking buffer.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/2/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Phase I – 25 TA visits, 6 NPS sites (72 tons sediment). Gray hired District in 2019 to look at Thayer Brook issues and provide recommendations. Windham Natural Resources Advisory Committee selected Pleasant River as their priority.

P – Very good summary of likely NPS issues. Several different types of surveys to look comprehensively at the watershed.

N – Past watershed survey focused heavily on erosion. Nutrients from ag sources weren't a major focus of the survey method. Surveys are relatively old now – over 12 years ago.

Feasibility for Success

- #2 Steering committee (6-8 mtgs), #3 Ag Outreach and BMPs (outreach to 16-20 properties, 5 site visits, 3 NM recommendations, 1-2 NPS projects), #4 Non Ag BMP sites (8 sites), #5 Outreach (plan developed and implemented)

P – Towns are engaged. Both initiated independent efforts in watershed in past 1-2 years. Strong project support by both Windham and Gray (\$10k each). Good to have DACF, PRLT, TU and NRCS involved. Task 3 Ag outreach and BMPs – is a good start to make inroads with farms. Will help address NPS loading to stream and move towards restoration.

N/Q – Not clear if there will be any property owner interest in the ag task. Any indications? Non ag sites look okay – make sure eligible for funding and not maintenance.

Cost Effectiveness

P – Strong projects that will address priority issues in WBP. Very good investment. Extensive and creative match sources. Appear to be solid commitments of match. Reasonable costs except as noted below. Relatively modest total project cost (\$63k) to make some decent gains on this high restoration potential river. Good amount of budget spent on construction (\$29.7k and 47%).

N – Relatively high costs for Task 1 Admin (\$6392) and Task 5 PCR (\$3381). Staff rates are relatively high – although folds in indirect and staff are very seasoned.

Q - Is outreach task really going to generate \$4492 in match? Part 1 and 2 budget combines indirect with salary/fringe, which is confusing.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Podn

DATE: 6/2/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Fair/Good

- Town of Eastbrook – Julie Curtis (First Selectman) and Lisa Folmer (Treasurer) will oversee project and financial transactions. Both have strong financial experience.
- Consultant will be hired as project coordinator. Seeking someone with grant experience, PCR and cost sharing projects.
- Cooperative Extension subgrant for Dr. Lily Calderwood to host a blueberry workshop. Excellent credentials.

P - Very good presentation of the quals and experience of the applicant and project team. Although a very small town, Eastbrook appears to have the financial capacity to hold and administer grants. I heard from the lake association that the Town was enthusiastic about serving in this role (Town unanimous decision to support). Hiring a qualified consultant will be key to project success – will be looking to hire someone with the right experience.

N/Q – Eastbrook has not received past DEP grants. Unknown entity in terms of past performance.

Q – Current Phase I grant by HCSWCD has been problematic due to staff turnover at the District. Lake association has been active and engaged in salvaging project.

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Fair/Good

- Public access – Town undeveloped shorefront parcel and Frenchman Bay Conservancy 135-acre Abraham’s Woods Preserve that will have a public access point to lake. Preserve includes all of the undeveloped eastern shoreline and forest – prevented 12 lot development on lake. Trail system being mapped out.
- Recreation – boating, fishing, swimming. Watershed hiking.
- Fishery/Wildlife – warmwater fishery and designated a ‘trophy bass’ pond. 2 loon pairs nested in 2017. Extensive birds use the pond and otters. Lake feeds Scammon Pond, a high-value inland waterfowl/wading bird habitat and part of wildlife management area.

P – Some access with more to come in coming years. Decent sized lake (435 acres) with warm water fishery.

N/Q – Very small number of lake residents. Is pond used by more than just shoreline residents? What is potential use when trails open?

Water Quality Problem – Good/Very Good

- Listed as attaining standards, but on “Watch List” due to history of blooms. Blooms in four years since 1999, including in 2012 and 2018.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Podn

DATE: 6/2/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P – Lake is on the edge with several blooms in past. Application provides a concise and clear summary of the water quality problem/threat.

Q – What is sediment chemistry? Amanda said close to thresholds and evidence for internal loading.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good

- Shoreline development (60 camps), 11% of land within 500 m of the lake is in blueberry production. Indicates that septic and blueberries may be sources as well.
- 2015 watershed survey identified 34 NPS sites (20 residential/driveways, 14 private roads. 12 high and 14 medium impact sites. 16 of these were roads and driveways.

P – Relatively recent survey and good presentation of NPS sites from survey and other potential NPS sources.

N/Q – Would be good if plan had explored blueberries and septic further. Not clear how much those are issues or how they will be evaluated.

Feasibility for Success – Good/Very Good

- Active Lakesmart program (25 of 60 properties evaluated). Thoughtful and clear description of future phasing and needs.
- #2 Steering committee (4 meetings), #3 NPS Sites (9 road/driveways 58% match), #4 Residential (5 - \$500 grants), #5 E&O (4 LakeSmart visits, buffer workshop, presentations, blueberry workshop, septic database, brochure, lake living insert, newsletters)

P – Town and lake association are both very engaged. Association was proactive in approaching Town and consultants to find path forward given HCSWCD's staffing and capacity issues. Consultant approach may prove more successful moving ahead. Indications that landowners and roads are mostly/all on board with planned projects; sites and recommendations appear appropriate. Excellent idea to include blueberry workshop. Tasks will continue momentum and help address priority NPS sources. Should be feasible to be accomplished by APA and consultant.

Q – Will blueberry owners attend workshop? Is this the best option for them, or would TA visits be more effective? Deliverable 3 does not seem fitting for the task – these aren't sites installing using their own funds.

N – Septics map and database may not be eligible task since considered planning. DEP can probably just do this, and replace task with outreach to those properties?

Cost Effectiveness - Good

P – Impressive commitment from the very small town of Eastbrook – inkind and \$1000 cash match. Strong and detailed commitment from lake association. \$68k is good investment in fixing priority sites in very threatened lake.

N – Task 1 Admin is very high \$9386 to hire consultant (likely not local consultants). Relatively high number of consultant hours overall given the project scope (~570 hours). Includes lots of travel time. 39% construction is relatively low compared to typical projects – again likely due to location and higher staff costs for consultants.

Q – How many people are actively involved in lake association? Is the match amount realistic? Is 76 hours for four SC meetings realistic – seems like it would be closer to 48 hours?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Fair/Good

- City of Lewiston – John Kuchinski and Jeff Beaulé from City engineering are project leads. CES is listed as private consultant on the team. Lewiston has carried out multiple DEP grants to develop and implement plan (

P - City has successfully carried out several DEP grants. Has experience and financial capacity for other DOT and federal transportation grants. Strong engineering experience and quals.

N – John and CES have not been involved with past DEP grants.

Q – CES listed as project consultant. Have they been hired through procurement process and on retainer for Lewiston? If not, would need to do so. CES took lead in updating WBP. DEP did not fund their plan update – locally funded.

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Poor

- Several public road crossings.

N - Application didn’t really provide much information about uses or values. Perhaps it doesn’t have many, but likely some fisheries or wildlife values could have been mentioned. No fish habitat mapped on Maine Stream Habitat Viewer.

P – Could probably have improved use and habitat value if restored. BWH maps show bald eagle habitat near mouth of stream, 11 acres wading bird/waterfowl habitat on east of watershed, ~200+ acres of undeveloped habitat blocks.

Water Quality Problem – Fair/Good

- Class B stream - Listed as impaired for DO, bacteria, aquatic life (habitat, macroinvertebrates, algae). Problems with low DO and large DO swings. 22% impervious cover in watershed. Storm flows, channel alteration.
- Monitoring since 2011 by City and DEP at 5-10 stations. DEP biomonitoring since 1999 with 4 stations for bugs and one for algae. Chloride also an issue and borders on chronic toxicity levels during baseflow.

P – Severe impairment for multiple criteria. Good body of data available on stream.

N – Application did not describe succinctly and where instructed.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Fair/Good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Stormwater flow issues, channel alteration, stormwater nutrients. Nutrient sources – stormwater, fertilizer, wastewater leakage from pipes, yard waste. Bacteria sources – wastewater, pet waste.
- Numerous sewer line crossings and line runs along stream. Stream straightened and lined with concrete in sections in industrial park contribute to high temperatures, low DO and higher flow velocity. Lack of riparian shading also an issue. Priority catchments identified in the WBP.

P – Listed the various NPS issues in the watershed.

N – Application did not summarize the specific past assessments for the watershed. Also, note that WBP update not funded by 604b. Past 319 projects not clearly summarized.

Feasibility for Success – Fair/Good

- Task #2 Watershed Working Group (how many meetings?), #3 and #4 Biofiltration (treating 1+ acres road), #5 shade tree planting (linear feet?)

P – Good idea to reconvene watershed working group. Projects are priorities in the plan and would address stressors. Feasible to accomplish. Leverages past efforts and updated plan – keeps momentum going on a long term undertaking. Project designs included indicate that sites are already well scoped out.

N – Won't result in attainment, much much more to do in the watershed.

Q – Monitoring by CES listed in Roles, but not included as a task. Would only be eligible if goal is measure effectiveness of restoration efforts. If so, should be undertaken below proposed and/or past projects. Other tasks are clearly described – cut off in table outlining progress implementing WBP.

Cost Effectiveness – Fair/Good

P – 100% of project going to construction. Strong match (51%) with secure funding source.

Q - \$150k is all for the two biofilters. Is this a good value? Need more details on shade tree planting. \$25,000 seems like a lot but hopefully for a long length of stream with good-sized trees.

N - Task budget tables aren't fully filled out. \$10,530 for PCR is high, given the level of effort needed. Should be scaled back.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Fair/Good

- MC – Formed in 2016, merging 5 area organizations. Improved capacity and larger staff,including Finance/HR Director. Grant experience including Phase I 319 grant. Cara O'Donnell project manager is new to MC, but 17 years experience including tribal 319, Pearce Brook WBP, ag NPS assessments. DLWA had extensive experience with 319 grants, although mostly new staff.

P – Good organizational depth and admin/financial support. Project manager is new to MC but has relevant experience.

N – Staff turnover hindered success of Phase I project. Cara has relevant experience, but not clear about BMP quals/experience. No engineering support, reliance on DEP.

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Very Good

- Public Access – State park, 2 public boat launches, 2 semi-private boat launches (private landowner and campground). State Park offer day access and sand beach. Private campground and 2 summer camp campuses. MC-owned island used for swimming and camping.
- Largest lake in Lincoln County. Regional attraction and one of few large lakes along midcoast region. Scenic values. Flows to Great Salt Bay which has shellfish beds and tidal bird habitat.
- Fisheries – abundant cold and warm water fishery. Destination fishery with many tournaments. 1 million alewives annually access via fish ladder, brook trout streams.
- Wildlife –, 50 adult loons, 2 species of state-listed bluets, bald eagles, GBH, large tracts deer wintering areas, inland wetland waterfowl and wading bird habitat.

P – Lake of regional/Statewide significance for people, fisheries and wildlife. Very good overview presented.

Water Quality Problem – Good

- Lake monitoring since 1977 in each of the three basins. Slight improving clarity trends with average SDT 16.9 m. Sediment chemistry not conducive to internal loading. Increasing P trend in South Arm basin. Temperature and P increases pose threat to WQ. Also reduction in DP in hypolimnion.

P – Excellent summary of water quality and threats. MC has been working with DEP to interpret trends. Very high-quality lake. Climate change poses greatest threat.

N – Low likelihood that waterbody will not attain standards in future. Mostly improving trends and sediment chemistry not risk factor currently.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Very Good

- 6% watershed ag and 6% developed. Septics, erosion, new development (2% increase from 2004-2016). Several watershed surveys including 2014 that identified 172 NPS sites. (Not sure about

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

original breakdown by currently 81 high/med priority sites including 17 State roads and 6 town roads). Septics survey resulted in 11 inspections, 8 designs. Only 1 of 11 inspected was entirely satisfactory.

- 2001 project (24 NPS projects, 26 TA), Phase I (42 BMPs at 8 NPS sites, YCC 69 BMPs at 29 NPS sites)

P – Relatively recent and comprehensive survey. Good to recognize new development. Septics inspection results are revealing. Good to recognize need and future approach for agricultural NPS and involve NRCS and SWCD on steering committee.

Q – Didn't MC/DLWA run the YCC prior to the Phase I project? Addressed many other sites.

Feasibility for Success – Good

- Task #2 (3 mtgs), #3 NPS Sites (9), #4 (YCC 36 BMPs on 12 NPS sites), #5 E&O (2 workshops, 4 newsletter site profiles, 4 press releases, presentation to each of 5 towns, fact sheet, promote stronger ordinances)

P – Letters from two landowners on Mulligan Lane committing to projects and match. Site photos are helpful in understanding issues. Good idea to limit YCC size to three-person team. Good amount of time for project manager to complete a more involved project. Tasks are well laid out and well supported by multiple staff and volunteers. Appears feasible and leverages past and ongoing efforts in the watershed.

N/Q – Wallace site is relatively expensive and entails retaining wall – not something 319 typically funds. Would need to revisit. 4 of the NPS sites are shoreline erosion. How much is this an issue for the lake? Do not want to promote use of riprap through the grants program. Would need to focus on non riprap solutions. YCC was very time consuming to run in past and often hard to find qualified crew leader. Is it feasible/likely to be successful? Why weren't funds budgeted for engineering support – this was identified as a need from the Phase I project?

N/Q – Phase I project met with mixed success. Is Phase II better positioned to be a success?

Q - What will be on town fact sheets? One sentence about promoting stronger ordinances – what will this entail and how much time is dedicated to this endeavor? Should be beefed up if really important.

Cost Effectiveness – Good

P – Strong match from towns and MC: \$3,000 contributions from three towns. Good match from MC – three staff - >\$7k and \$2k from donors. High % of grant for BMP installations – 43% or 75% if include YCC. Good overall investment to continue momentum on this important resource.

N – YCC cost of \$30K grant is high to address 12 NPS sites. However, provide benefits beyond actual sites.

N – Travel expenses should be clarified and adjusted as needed. Mileage rate is higher than allowable State rate. Make sure travel expenses are for separate staff (i.e., truck costs are for YCC, and mileage reimbursement is for staff not using truck). Also, mileage rate is typically used – not the gas reimbursement.

Q – Is \$10k enough to fix the Mulligan Lane sites? How many hours for KLSWCD? 50 notes in Part 2 notes, but if just for Steering committee, seems high. Did Towns commit to cash match?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Very Good/Good

- OCSWCD – Strong track record of several successful 319 grant projects as well as other grants. Good information provided on Michele’s financial, administrative and outreach quals. Jeff Stern ARWC will be subgrant to support project. Jeff has extensive experience and quals on many 319 and other grant projects, including the previous Lake Anasagunticook 319 project. District engineer also listed, although not often used for 319 projects.

P – Excellent qualifications and experience for OCSWCD and ARWC. Successful teamwork by Michele and Jeff on numerous past 319 projects.

Q – Would there be capacity to complete project if there is turnover?

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Very Good/Good

- Public Access – Public boat ramp in Canton, 2 popular public beaches with year-round uses including swimming, skating, carnival, hockey. Hartford owns 80-acre wetland natural area and several miles of former railroad bed, now trail adjacent to lake.
- Uses – drinking water supply for 90 households and 10 businesses, 118 waterfront lots.
- Wildlife/Fishery – cold and warm water fishery with 12 species. Stocked with brown trout in 2012, 2016 and 2019. Streams are brook trout habitat. Loons on the lake and deer/bear/bald eagles/moose etc. in the watershed.

P – Very important to local communities as drinking water supply and for recreation. Good access. Scenic lake as well.

Water Quality Problem – Good

- Lake monitoring since 1980. 4.7 m SDT – slightly below average for Maine lakes. Slightly elevated P and DO depletion in hypolimnion. Algae bloom noted in 1980s and close to bloom in 1990s. (not shown on lakesofmaine).

P – Good overview of the lake’s water quality.

Q – What is the sediment chemistry?

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Good

- 2019 watershed survey identified 62 NPS sites, including 34 roads, 17 residential, 7 beach/boat access, 4 paths/municipal.
- 2000-2003 319 project, active LakeSmart program with Gold status. Two more phases needed.

P – Recent survey with good understanding of the sites and how to approach.

N – Did not provide information on ag, septic or severity of NPS sites identified.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Feasibility for Success – Good

- Task #2 (4 mtgs), #3 NPS Sites (14), #4 TA (22), #5 Res. Matching Grants (7), #6 E&O (2 LAA and 2 Selectboard meetings, 2 workshops, final brochure, buffer 'house meeting')

P – Project tasks and candidate NPS sites look reasonable and feasible. Work is likely to be completed and will result in substantial load reductions to lake. Good participation by towns and LAA. Leverages past efforts on lake.

Q – Does LAA have the leadership, communication skills and capacity to effectively support and carry out the project? Watershed survey project revealed some challenges within the association.

Cost Effectiveness – Good

P – Letters of commitments from LAA and Town of Hartford (\$4k cash, \$3k inkind), Canton (\$8k cash, \$2k inkind) and Canton Mtn Wind (\$5k and truck for 3 days). Hartford will vote on \$5k. High quality match from diverse sources. Impressive amount pursued from two small towns. Good investment and modest grant to accomplish a good amount of work and reduce significant pollutant loading. 51% grant budget for construction.

N – Doesn't appear to be enough funding for three of the tasks. Task 1 Admin (only 36 hours for PRs, FPRs, invoicing, Site Tracker and tracking), Task 4 TA (only 4.5 hours/site for coordination, visits, reports), Task 5 \$1775 staff costs for 7 projects.

Q – Need to confirm that volunteer match is eligible for TA consultations and workshop. To be eligible, need to 'contribute services', not just receive information.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD – Pennesseewassee Lake

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Good

- OCSWCD – Strong track record of several successful 319 grant projects as well as other grants. Good information provided on financial, administrative and outreach quals. Engineering support from consulting District engineer. Consultant may be hired with skills/experience in 319 and BMP design/installation. Three LAON members listed with engineering training and BMP experience.

P – Good qualifications and experience on OCSWCD and LAON. Good to bring on consultant, given the limited time for OCSWCD to support project.

Q – Is division of labor clearly mapped out? Will consultant be hired or not?

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Very Good/Good

- Public Access – Town park (16 acres) that includes playground, beach and boat launch – used 100-250 people/day in summer or 300 people at peak. Land trust has two parcels on the lake (trails and wildlife habitat). Ordway Grove park on lake (trails, lake views). 2 commercial marinas with private boat launch. Town rest area with parking and picnic facilities overlooks lake. Carry in access on Crocket Ridge Causway.
- Uses – 341 shoreline residences. 570 shoreline properties in Norway generates 20% town tax revenue. DownEast magazine lists as one of 12 best Maine lakes for swimming. Fishing including 3 bass tournaments in 2020. Doesn’t mention recreation other than fishing – but assumed.
- Wildlife/Fishery – White cedar swamp, large pines, bald eagles, inland wading bird and waterfowl habitat (high and medium ratings).

P – Large lake that is a regional draw. Proximity to Norway village provides easy access and important economic driver for the area. Excellent public access and opportunities.

Water Quality Problem – Good

- Lake monitoring since 1976. Monthly DO profiles. Average SDT 5.7 m. DO depletion in hypolimnion by Augusta. Some P release in sediments.

P – Good overview of the lake’s water quality status and threats.

Q – What is lake’s sediment chemistry? What is the relatively risk of nonattainment?

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Good

- 2016 watershed survey of upstream North Pond (37 NPS sites). 2019 survey of Lake Penn. Identified 180 NPS sites – included roads, shoulders, ditches, culvert and shoreline buffers.
- North Pond 319 project addressed 26 of the 37 sites and reduced 35 tons/sediment. Several past 319 projects in watershed in 1990s. Three phases envisioned to address 180 sites.

P – Recent survey with good understanding of the sites and how to approach.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD – Pennesseewassee Lake

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

N – Didn't describe the relative severity of the NPS sites or discuss non-erosion NPS sources like ag or septics.

Feasibility for Success – Very Good/Good

- Task #2 (4 mtgs), #3 NPS Sites (16), #4 Residential BMPs (10 \$350 matching grants), #5 E&O (2 LAON and 2 Selectboard meetings, final brochure, TA and 2 workshops,

P – Excellent letters of commitments from LAON, OCSWCD, Town of Norway and 3 roads/individuals. Strong pledges of financial and inkind support. Also, proactive work by town and road association to independently address additional sites. Estimated load reduction of 51 ton and 44 pounds P impressive. Sites are clearly laid out with appropriate and eligible solutions. Very motivated and involved lake association with good model for local ownership and leadership. Likely to be completed as laid out and to result in good progress with WBP.

N – Some confusion in North Pond project about roles – between LAON, SWCD and Jeff Stern. Led to inefficiencies and in some cases not enough technical oversight of BMP installations.

Q – Goal in Task 5 of reaching LakeSmart certification. Is this an active program currently on the lake? Delete first sentence of task 5b – TA? Low task grant and match cost doesn't indicate that it will be provided under this task. If so, delete deliverable as well. Also not needed if all lead to matching grants.

Cost Effectiveness – Good

P – Strong and solid match commitments from several sources. Overall match 42.7%. Only inkind match from LAON but it will be high value match in coordinating and designing projects. 73% of grant is for construction. Very good investment in making solid gains on an important lake. Cost estimates reasonable for tasks

N – Grant and match costs appear to be too low on Tasks 3, 4 and 5. Only 5 hours/ staff time for each residential site and 8 hours for each NPS site. \$3,000 grant for consultant support equates to about 40 hours. Seems like this will be needed but how to ensure used and used best?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/5/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Very Good/Good

- PWD grantee and CCSWCD project support. Both have extensive experience and expertise and a history of working well together on several past 319 grants. PWD and CCSWCD have good financial and admin quals. CCSWCD staff listed have skills and experience. Although not mentioned in Quals, Kirsten Ness is listed as project coordinator and has been with PWD for many years, serving as primary contact for past 319 and WBP update process. Other staff are seasoned as well.

P – Strong team with extensive quals and experience. Depth to both organizations.

N – Application does not mention specific PWD personnel quals or experience.

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Very Good

- Uses - 2nd largest in the State. 2300 homes on shoreline. Drinking water supply for over 200,000 people in 11 communities (15% of the State’s population). Top tourist destination for the State. 7 summer youth camps. Recreation – boating, sailing, fishing, swimming, skating, paragliding etc.
- Public Access – 4 public boat launches, 7 marinas, 5 public beaches, State Park that includes beach, boat launch and campground and day use area.
- Fisheries/Wildlife – managed for lake trout and landlocked salmon. Only lake in SME with landlocked salmon. 8 other fish species. Watershed includes extensive important habitats and 5 species of concern.

P – Extremely important lake of statewide significance for water supply, economy, recreation and fisheries.

Water Quality Problem – Good

- Extensive lake monitoring since 1976. 14 monitoring programs and monthly monitoring on three deep basin stations. Oligotrophic lake, SDT > 10 m. One of clearest lakes in Mine. TP < 5 ppb, chla < 1.5 ppb and 75% DO saturation at bottom before mixing. Overall stable.

P – Good, albeit concise overview of water quality.

N – Based on info provided, does not appear to be at great risk of decline/impairment. Could have provided more information given the extensive monitoring (e.g., are some bays more at risk?)

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Good

- 2011-2012 Crooked River watershed survey (164 sites and 20 riparian sites), 2013-2015 Sebago Lake WBP project (61 road sites, hotspot/neighborhood survey, PWD site tracker). Overall fund soil erosion, roads, lack of shoreline vegetation and lack of stormwater treatment biggest problems. Application mentions threats and programs to address impacts from new development. Septics, shoreline development.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/5/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Phase I (10 sites, 40 tons sed) Phase II (15 sites, 47 tons), Crooked River Phase I (16 sites), Phase III (14 sites, 68 tons). Updated 2014 plan in spring 2020. PWD staff runs watershed protection programs. Anticipate two more phase before resurveying for high impact sites.

P – Surveys completed in 2011-2015 and PWD adds to Site Tracker. PWD has strong watershed presence and involved in many aspects of watershed/source water protection.

N/Q – Very large watershed area to fully understand and inventory sites. Not clear how many sites are on the site tracker, locations with biggest issues and the breakdown of land uses/severity.

Feasibility for Success – Fair/Good

- Task #2 (4 mtgs), #3 Campground Sites (14), #4 Porous pavement parking lot, #5 Native Plant Demo Site, #6 Lakescaping and Project Promotion (8 buffer and road sites with PWD match grants, 4 project articles)

P – Project tasks appear feasible. Leverages extensive past and ongoing work by PWD. Good involvement by partners.

N – Task 4 Porous Parking Lot Demo Site – Does not appear to be a worthwhile use of funds since it is not treating a high P export area and there would be many other lower cost options. \$60k total cost not worth it as just a demo site. Probably not many places in the watershed where porous pavement is warranted – but could explore switching to St. Joe's College campus or North Windham Route 302 commercial corridor.

Q – Plantings at boat launches have a rather spotty track record due to high use/trampling/poor soils and need for frequent watering in first few seasons. What measures would be taken to ensure viability of plantings? Should add summary of Task 6 projects to deliverables. NPS Site report deliverable should be listed with Tasks 3, 4 and 5.

Cost Effectiveness – Fair

P – High amount of grant for construction 63% and strong overall match at 54%. Match sources are good quality, firm and diverse (\$5k Town of Sebago, \$2k Standish, \$54k PWD cash/in-kind, \$15k State Park, \$5k Camp).

Q – PWD match for staff costs should go in Part 1 of budget. Will PWD coordinate Task 6 and provide TA and oversight – very little grant or match listed for staff time?

N – Steering committee match of \$11k seems high. Subgrant staff costs associated with Task 5 native plant demo site are very high (\$5459) for a relatively modest demo site project. "Signs will be installed with construction funds" – should be shifted to supplies/other. Task 3 – not a good use of funds unless possibly shifted to another location. Based on the descriptions, candidate sites provided don't appear to be high priorities – pictures would have been helpful. Would be good to continue addressing NPS sites and raising awareness, but project doesn't appear to be a very high return on the investment.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Very Good/Good

- Saco will be grantee and YCSWCD provides project management support. Joe has extensive experience and strong quals in stormwater management and construction management. Has worked on Goosefare Brook project since 2015. As a private consultant, also worked with Saco. Jen Harris has worked on Phase I and II Goosefare projects.

P - City of Saco/Joe Laverriere have been an excellent grantee on WBP and Phase I projects. Very conscientious. Partnership with YCSWCD has worked well with District doing the reporting and outreach type tasks. BSCC has demonstrated strong interest and environmental projects – have not been involved in past projects

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Fair/Good

- Public Access - Outlet of stream at public beach in OOB. Several land trust properties and hiking trails in watershed and along stream. BSCC located along stream. Saco Heath TNC properties at headwaters, Rachel Carson Wildlife Refuge along large segment of the tidal portion of stream.
- Wildlife/Fisheries – Application only notes 'large diversity of terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna'

P – Extensive use and values in tidal portion of the stream. Eastern Trail, Blueberry Plains Preserve, Rachel Carson WR (650 acres), Middle Goosefare trails, Saco Heath Trail boardwalk.

P/N – Application did not mention all the recreational uses, state species and habitats of significance in the watershed, tidal wading bird habitat, brook trout and sea run rainbow smelt habitat

Water Quality Problem – Very Good/Good

- Class B stream – impaired for aquatic life, bacteria and toxic metals. Extensive macroinvertebrate data at 8 sites over 31 years. Upper site meets Class A. Other sites are mostly NA.MHB beach monitoring at beach at mouth of stream – swimming advisories. Metals associated with upstream legacy sources. DO – mostly met standards except at 3 sites. Chloride – elevated in some parts of watershed, but only slightly at some stations.

P – Excellent summary of water quality issues. Indicates good understanding of the issues and good body of data over many years. Impairment is somewhat severe but not throughout entire watershed.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Very Good

- Bacteria – 5 of 16 subwatersheds – likely sewer and septsic, animals secondary source. Chloride – 7 of 16 subwatersheds with elevated/near chronic toxicity due to winter salt. Habitat – Stream corridor assessment identified 72 habitat problems in 5 subwatersheds and 40 high priority sites. Toxics – 3 subwatersheds, 2015 stormwater retrofit survey identified 58 projects, including 28 high priority. Nutrients – 6 subwatersheds with septic/sewer, stormwater, fertilizer.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Past activities – sewer and septic problems addressed. OOB 2500 feet sewer lines replaced. Saco lined 2000 feet of sewer lateral along Bear brook. Replaced severe fish barrier with DEP culvert grant. Phase I – 13 NPS sites and 4 cleanups. Phase II - 13 NPS sites and 2 matching grants.

P – Excellent, thorough and clear description of NPS issues and severity throughout the watershed. Appears to be a very clear understanding of actions needed.

Feasibility for Success – Very Good/Good

- Task #2 (4 mtgs), #3 NPS Sites (2 retrofits, 6 buffers, 1 instream project), #4 WQ Monitoring, #5 E&O (buffer workshop, 2 cleanups, 2 press releases), #6 Stormwater Matching Grants (2)

P – Excellent environmental outcome statement with clear, strong benefits. Extensive list of project partners with strong involvement from schools, municipal groups. District has already worked closely with BSCC to scope out projects, and City has excellent track record in getting projects completed. Strong participation by community partners. Leverages past two phases.

Q – Is debris removal project necessary warranted? Does WQ Monitoring include important parameter/locations? BSCC monitoring is more for Audubon certification, but doesn't cost very much. Would help support environmentally-friendly golf course activities.

N/Q – Not likely to result in restoration yet, but good incremental progress over time.

Cost Effectiveness – Very Good

P – High amount of grant for construction (72%). Strong match from Saco. Task and construction costs appear reasonable. \$69k project is an excellent investment to address several NPS sites and maintain momentum and community interest.

Q – Is 250 hours enough for YCSWCD? Is BSCC in kind match really going to amount to \$7154?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/8/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Fair/Good

- Watchic Lake Association grantee. Board member will provide oversight, budget tracking and engineer review.
• Plans to hire consultant with NPS, grant and Watchic experience.

P – Very active lake association and strong Board qualifications including treasurer, President, VP and others. Association is 501c3 and has very strong fundraising and project management success. Was involved in past 319 grant in early 2000s, but not grantee. CCSWCD engineer support is good idea.

N/Q – David Bradbury will provide engineering design, but not clear if he is or was a PE. Mentions that the association has managed funds from multiple grants, but none listed. Consultant quals/experience does not mention BMP experience. CCSWCD engineer listed in Roles but not in Quals.

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Fair/Good

- Access – Kiwanis Beach and boat launch private ownership but public use for fee.
• Use – 175 developed shoreline properties, boating, fishing, swimming. Close to Portland so receives heavy use. Public wells on north of lake and SE watershed border. Aquifer lower part of watershed.
• Wildlife/Fishery – managed as warmwater fishery. 11 fish species. Brown trout stocked until 1980s – before water decline. Deer wintering areas, wetlands and rare species habitat and State Listed dragonfly habitat.

P – Average lake in many ways but Kiwanis Beach is used heavily by neighboring communities

N – No free or motor boat public access.

Water Quality Problem – Good

- Water quality monitoring started in 1974. Hiatus from 2006-2009. 2016 – long term monitoring buoy with continuous DO and temp readings. Epi core and grab sampling on Paine and Page Brooks. SDT 5.2 m, epicore TP 9.6 ppb, chla 3.9 ppb. Low DO in bottom of lake.

P – Good amount of data. DO depletion looks quite severe.

Q – Any sediment chemistry data for lake? What are the N and P values for the streams – DEP expressed caution with stream grab sampling. Is there any evidence of internal loading? No recent bottom grab data.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Good

- Threats existing and new development, septics, agriculture (one horse farm with past issues) 2019 watershed identified 26 NPS sites with town and private roads as priorities. 59% road should and ditch erosion, 21% culvert issues, 8% buffer issues. 44% town road, 22% private road, 13% res.,

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/8/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

13% state road, 4% logging, 4% boat or beach access. Shoreline survey documented 175 17 parcels. 2016 – FB – Watchic Lake Risk Assessment. 2011 – horse farm retrofit – WLA fundings; 200-2004 319 grant project addressed 13 NPS sites, 38 tons/year load reduction. 1998 watershed survey. Anticipate 3 phases.

- 2019 Completed protection plan,

P – Good understanding of NPS sites in the watershed

Q – Did recent survey look at all properties from the land or just by boat?

Feasibility for Success – Fair/Good

- Task #2 (3 mtgs), #3 NPS Sites (2 town roads, 3 private roads), #4 Residential matching Grants (10 \$400), #5 E&O (2 mailings, 3 press releases, brochure, WLA annual meeting, sign, buffer workshop)

P – Good participation and support by town. Very strong support and involvement from lake association.

N/Q – Site A11 Road 15 – problem states sediment from road but does not address the source – only remove accumulation, vegetate and infiltration steps. Not likely to be effective if sed source not addressed. Same issue with description for Site A9 – rock sandwich won't deal with the sediment from the road.

Note – no need for final designs for NPS sites as deliverable – unless want to ensure effective BMPs being proposed.

Cost Effectiveness – Good

P – Cost for most project tasks seems appropriate. Good amount focused on construction 56% of grant. Good value to address 15 sites and support/leverage ongoing efforts by a motivated, active lake association. Strong match from town and lake association.

N/Q – Task #5 - \$12K match seems high for the modest tasks listed. Is all this eligible as match? 70 hours for annual meeting – probably only a fraction eligible for the project update/presentation. LakeSmart match listed but LakeSmart is barely mentioned in project task – should be elevated if this is a component - also match of 72 hours for 2-3 property evals/year seems too high. Where will sign be posted that could be viewed by many – how much value would it provide? Is District engineer time in the budget?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Good

- YCSWCD serve as grantee and provide project management support. District has carried out 35 similar projects. Consultant will carry out most project tasks.

P - YCSWCD and consultant partnership is good approach, given the many potential projects led by the District. Seeking consultant with specific 319 experience.

Q – No mention of engineering services. Might be helpful depending on the skills and experience of consultant hired. Listed later under Roles.

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Fair/Good

- Public Access – Beach and boat launch at West End Camp open to the public.
- Uses – Local residents use for boating, swimming, fishing, skiing. 58 shoreline camps. Two public wells (summer camps?).
- Wildlife/Fishery – winterberry holly, wetland habitat. Brook trout habitat (Stream viewer)

Overall, relatively small pond mostly used by 59+ mostly seasonal residents and summer campers.

Water Quality Problem – Very Good/Good

- Lake monitoring since 1983. Stable and relatively good clarity until 2010 when reduction to ~ 5 meters. Cyano blooms in 2006, 2017, and 2018 SDT 3.7 m. Sediment chemistry shows low natural Al makes lake more prone to internal loading, which appears to be taking place.

P – Good description of water quality. Not yet impaired but likely to be listed in next report.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Good

- NPS sources – development, septics, internal loading. 2019 watershed survey – 33 NPS sites. 7 roads, 19 residential, 3 driveways, 4 summer camps. 2 high impact, 12 medium and 19 low impact.
- LakeSmart evaluations since 2007.

P – Fairly good understanding of NPS sources in the watershed. Good description of future phasing and needs.

Q - Not yet known how much septics are an issue. Not clear how many LakeSmart properties but was very active in the past.

Feasibility for Success – Good

- Task #2 (4 mtgs), #3 NPS Sites (10), #4 Residential (10 sites), #5 E&O (project notices, rain garden workshop, 2 Town and 2 association and 5 community presentations, student posters)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/4/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P – Good description of sites to be addressed. Work appears reasonable and feasible. Community motivated by blooms to address external and internal sources.

Q – Were rain gardens recommended for many properties? In my experience, not readily adopted, maybe better to focus on buffers. Not clear if town is engaged, but project attempts to involve them.

Cost Effectiveness – Good

P – High % of project grant on construction (47%). Strong construction match. Very strong match from LPA (\$5860 cash for Task 1, and \$16k for construction). Would be good investment to start addressing NPS on this at risk lake.

N – Task 1, 2, 3 staff costs appear high. Overall match just exactly 40%.

Q - Is it feasible for LPA to contribute 300+ hours? Are road associations and camp on board with match and fixing sites?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/8/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Good

- YCSWCD grantee – extensive experience with lake 319 projects, including several on Mousam Lake. Jen is currently implementing project on Mousam Lake. Chris Baldwin CCSWCD will provide engineering support. ASYCC three staff – with veteran Betty Smith as advisor.

P – YCSWCD has good track record with 319 and Mousam. Given small staff at YCSWCD, good to have CCSWCD engineer and ASYCC as team members.

Q – How is District doing on current Mousam project? How much capacity does YCSWCD have for running several concurrent 319 projects?

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Very Good/Good

- Access – Mousam Lake Beach and State boat launch.
- Uses – 950 shoreline properties. In 2019, 5500 boat inspected at launch. Didn't mention other recreation but boating, swimming fishing etc.
- Wildlife/fishery – managed as warm and cold water fishery. Stocked with brook, lake, brown trout and landlocked salmon. Known for bass fishing. Several streams wild brook trout habitat. 4 town conserved properties (including Goose Pond Preserve) and 2 land trust easements. 2 sq miles inland waterfowl and wading bird habitat. Large deer wintering area. 14 square miles undeveloped habitat blocks.

P – Very good value lake. Regional draw with heavy recreational use. Good fishery and habitat value.

Water Quality Problem – Very Good/Good

- Extensive lake monitoring data, information on trends, and general info on sediment chemistry provided.

P – Good presentation on the past data, improvement and current threats. Given past decline and sediment chemistry, this is a very threatened

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Good

- NPS sources – developed shoreline, septics, gravel roads (29 miles of camp roads). 2017 survey identified 189 sites – 60% residential and 28% roads. TMDL 24+% septics 6-8% loading from camp roads.
- Extensive watershed efforts since 1999 including several 319 projects and YCC since 2006 (680 sites). Currently Phase I project started in 2019. Could use more detail in the future phasing.

P – Good understanding of NPS sources. Several surveys and studies since 1997 to inventory NPS sources. Recent and comprehensive watershed survey.

Q – What and how many high impact sites from the 2017 survey? Have agricultural sources really been looked at?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/8/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Feasibility for Success – Good

- Task #2 (4 mtgs), #3 NPS sites (4 sites), #4 E&O (workshop, 2 presentations, final brochure, 2 press releases), #5 Res Matching grants (15 \$400 and YCC installation),

P – Will likely be completed as laid out, given Town's commitment and active YCC program. Good to have CCSWCD engineering support. Towns, YCC and MLRA strong interest and involvement. Leverages extensive past and ongoing work in watershed. Good to address issues on Totte Road – long standing major NPS issues with landowner disagreements that appear to be resolved now.

N/Q – Are the partners 'ready' to start another phase, given that the current phase had a slow start? How many sites in Task 3 - 4 or 6? What is MLRA role – not clear from letter?

Cost Effectiveness – Good

P – Decent value project and most tasks are relatively reasonable. Good investment to keep from returning to impaired list. 42% or 59% (with YCC) grant funds focused on construction.

N – Task 1 cost very high @ ~\$11k! Is \$6k in engineering support needed for 4-6 NPS sites?

Q – Is 400 volunteer hours realistic and all eligible?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/5/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience- Very Good/Good

- YCSWCD grantee – extensive experience with lake 319 projects, including three on Square Pond. Jen is currently implementing project on Square Pond. Chris Baldwin CCSWCD will provide engineering support. ASYCC three staff – with veteran Betty Smith as advisor.

P – YCSWCD has good track record with 319 and Mousam. Given small staff at YCSWCD, good to have CCSWCD engineer and ASYCC as team members.

Q –How much capacity does YCSWCD have for running several concurrent 319 projects?

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Very Good

- Access – Shapleigh town public beach. State owned boat launch. 900 boats inspected in 2019.
- Uses – 600 developed shoreline parcels, Popular boating destination in the region.
- Fishery/Wildlife – managed as cold and warm water fishery. Known for bass fishing and stocked with landlocked salmon, brook, lake and brown trout. Wetland meadow by boat launch 65 acres is significant wildlife habitat. 300 acre Town Forest has high occurrence of rare plants. Treasure Island bald eagle nesting site.

P – Extre

Water Quality Problem – Good

- Monitoring since 1983. Very good quality with SDT 7.5 m, TP 5 ppb and 2.6 chla. Added to NPS priority list due to sediment chemistry. Low DO in bottom 2-3 meters – although no evidence of internal loading probably due to small volume with anoxia.

P – Good information and some risk. However, not imminent risk.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems –Good

- 2007 watershed survey – 207 erosion sites. 2019 survey 128 NPS sites – 73% residential, 7% town, 5 % private roads, 8% driveways.
- Phase I project in 2009 address 30 sites and 2011 Phase II project addressed 22 sites. 145 YCC sites since 2001. Since 2006, 16 sites/year in watershed. Two more phases envisioned.

P – Comprehensive and recent survey. Good understanding of the issues.

N – Limited information provided about NPS sources beyond erosion – septic? Ag?. Severity/priority sites not described.

Feasibility for Success – Good/Very Good

- Task #2 (4 mtgs), #3 SC (5), #4 NPS sites (8 sites), #4 (RMG – 15 \$300 and YCC labor), #5 E&O (2 press releases, SPIA presentations, two workshops, final brochure)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/5/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Wendy Garland

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P – Good involvement and support by Towns, and site match already appears relatively solid. Very likely to be accomplished with strong, active SPIA. Good to recognize importance of culvert sizing and climate resiliency. Candidate sites look important and with good solutions. Builds on past and ongoing local efforts.

Note – Remove CSAs from deliverables. Change final project report to final project brochure in deliverable 4? Explore removal of pavement from site 6-7.

Cost Effectiveness – Good/Very Good

P – High % of grant for construction – 53% or 62% with YCC. Good match amount and quality from both Towns, YCC, SPIA. Aside from below, costs appear appropriate for tasks. Good investment for the amount of grant and match proposed.

N – Is \$15k (110 hours) really needed for engineering support for 8 sites?

Q – Is the same town cash match being counted twice – Square and Mousam? Will Task 5 really generate \$9k in match – ensure realistic and eligible.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

2

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ lots of 319 grant experience, some past rocky roads but seem to have moved past them
- experienced project manager
+ completed phase I but barely
- Not sure how much ag experience and connection with the ag community (not demonstrated in app) – don't see letter of support. DACF has not in my experience provided much useful help.
- Lots of things happening in Biddeford
- hard to reach Biddeford, last project was down to the end.
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ at road crossings for fly fishing
+ wildlife habitat
No mention of boat access or swimming. Likely happening but unknown
+ important to IWF for a muscle
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
+ impaired, low DO & bacteria
+ bacteria TMDL Pleasant, NPS TMDL Thayer Brook
+ bacteria exceedances in both wet and dry weather Class B
Comment: soil erosion/sediment does not impact DO or cause DO violations, organic matter breakdown does (aka BOD). Nutrients = big DO swings but no comment regarding swings. No comment about results of biomonitoring ?, No work on bacteria other than monitoring.
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

2

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

+ 9% ag, 12 wetlands, 0.5 highly developed, 5 low intensity development, 1.5% med intensity, Increasing development/growth in Gray and Pleasant
+ 2008 NPS survey town roads 35%, private roads 15%, residential 14%, ag 10%, state roads 9% 95 sites
+ hotspot inventory 2009 – 17 sites
Brook Floaters? (Recreationalists?) – decline
+ MS4 Windham
- no description of the type of ag or how much ag (aka # farms, animal units, hobby or industrial)
- soil erosion into rivers and streams not likely cause of DO impairment – something else.
Comment – disconnect. Believe this is an old WBP that looked at traditional soil erosion issues without really looking for the cause – this watershed likely would benefit from New WBP using Stream Stressor Guide. Feels like they are going through the typical NPS activities but not getting to the real problem.
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Likely to complete project?
+ completed phase 1
- It is hard to get farmers to install buffers
- no indication of road ownership, match ?
Likely to improve or protect?
+ previous work but on soils .. not sure about bacteria but I guess NPS TMDL
+ Reviewed development and ordinances in 2019
- No bacteria work to date ... plan to fence ag out and manure storage but little partnering with NRCS – doesn't seem like they are a player yet for long term ag, you need NRCS
- sediment doesn't cause DO problems
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- Why isn't EQUIP being used for ag problems? Pictures all show projects that would fit with EQUIP
- don't think we do demo sites ..
- only 47% of project or 46% of grant going to BMPs. This is with FREE DACF assistance. High management costs.
+ cash match (MS4)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

3

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

BIDDER NAME: Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ have financial and project management experience
+ BMPs are all engineering and they have engineers and engineering firm as part of project
+ have completed 319 projects in the past
- Very Very poorly incomplete application – recommend we toss it out.
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
- None really – a truly restoration effort
? unclear if it goes through neighborhoods and thus kids likely to play in it
No mention that if restored will be an important stream to Lewiston
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
+ altered stream channel, underground/piped, lined channel, straightened ...
+ increased flows in upper watershed – know sources
+ impervious surface 22%
+ DO low and big swings, temp
+ bacteria, bugs, algae all issues - Doesn’t appear they have IDed source of bacteria - Nutrient sources also vague
+ Impaired, IC TMDL
+ did check for chloride via conductivity and don’t believe that is an issue
- not a lot of numbers or data
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

3

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

BIDDER NAME: Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Clear understanding of habitat/stream channel alteration impact
Vague about sources of nutrients and bacteria and doesn't appear they have tried to ID bacteria sources. But it is listed for IC and not bacteria
- confusion – statement that 2019 update points to low DO in Upper watershed but project proposes to work in lower watershed
+ lack of shading
- Didn't summarize past assessments
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Complete project as proposed?
+ likely this is the type of project that governments are good at completing
- many typo, spelling and other errors (e.g. failure to remove 'applicant' and replace with their name) Sloppy – wonder if this is an example of their work ethic and attention to detail?
- Working group is only city staff, not bringing in partners or community support
- Don't think this will make a difference in the stream (ditch stream)
Succeed in restoring or protecting?
- no mention of future phases
- very small compared to work needed in whole watershed
- City is driving action – no evidence of local support beyond the city
- Not sure they are picking the best places
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- No money from grant or match budgeted for Project management. More than sloppy incompetent
- T2 budget incomplete
+ 100% going to construction
- T6 Pollutant Load Calc
+ match is secure
- no details on contractual details
- pricy for not much public benefit

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

4

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

BIDDER NAME: Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ Completed 2 earlier phases, proven team
+ town plus YCSWCD
- low project manager experience
+ Joe, Saco Engineer excellent
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ outlet at public beach – Old Orchard
+ hiking trails
+ Country club that allows public access
+ Rachael Carson wildlife refuge
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
Impaired, aquatic life, bacteria and toxic metals
TMDL Toxics, Statewide Bacteria, IC TMDL,
Measured bugs, bacteria, DO and conductivity
+ Lots of subwatershed monitoring – seem to know what problems are in different subwatershed
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ descriptions down to sub watershed level. Complex issues when taken as a whole
+ lots of data collection and surveys
- Complex

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

4

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

BIDDER NAME: Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- no break down of land cover
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Complete project?
+ laid out well, completed in past
+ Phase III, so completed earlier ones
- T4 monitoring not going to really tell us anything - odd
+ provided details, size of NPS sites
Improve or protect?
+ Long way to go but appear to be hitting it systematically
+ Lots of players involved
- would have been nice to see more community development
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
+ management costs are in line
+ most going to construction (72%)
+ cash match
+ 69K to keep project moving along, good investment

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

5

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD Long Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ 319 grant experience
+ District has long history of conservation work and stable staff (e.g. Melissa since 2006)
+ financial and organizational capability and experience
? hiring a consultant (FB) (likely pass through) Not sure about BMP experience
- Project manager only 1 year experience, and lots of projects (structured as passthrough)
- York didn't do WBP, and FB may not have been there. Not easiest Lake Ass to work with.
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ Boat Launch and beach owned by Wet End House Boys Camp but open to public.
+ 2 kids camps
58 properties
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
P2
+ declining water quality <2m recently, TP 16ppb in 2017, 13.5 2018
+ recent blooms
+ low Al
- why the recent change in water quality?(Climate Change?)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

5

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD Long Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ 2019 watershed survey, 33 sites, 2 high, 12 medium, 19 low (7 private road, 19 residential, 3 driveways and 4 camp sites)
- Don't think they have explored all possible problems ..
- how much LakeSmart ?
Comment: reads like basic lake protection plan with twist that lake is declining. No mention of increased development in watershed, is this an issue? Looks like they are already thinking al treatment ...
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Complete project?
- Likely but unknown, phase 1 and consultant is doing heavy lifting
? rain garden
- concern about recommendations (messing with streams ?)
Protect or restore?
+ all past work to date done with local funds and energy
+/- 3 phases expected, looking at internal phosphorus loading P2
- no municipal involvement – no town road issues, however what about ordinances and CEO
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- T 1 & T2 seems high
- T 3 21,732.50 contract engineering = 50% of grant costs or 31% of task cost
- not good return for level of \$ for P and Sediment
+ cash match good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

6

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD Highland Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ lots of 319 grant experience, some past rocky roads but seem to have moved past them
+ experienced project manager & engineer
- no reference to livestock experience but mentions bringing in DACF – not sure how much design or implementation experience they have
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ hand carry state boat launch
+ swimming, fishing (no public beach)
+ box turtle
+ alewife
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
+ TMDL 2003
+ was impaired 1990-2010 – might be relisted
+ declining water quality (6-7m in 70s to 5 m)
+ TP 8-10 ppb
+ picoplankton blooms
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ 4% development
+ 320 shorefront properties along 7 miles of shore (~100 ft. frontage 36900/320)
+ Most at risk from development (close to Portland)
+ 2018 survey 129 sites, 71 residential, 27 private roads + horse operation

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

6

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD Highland Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

+ road survey 2019 to check previous BMPs, 19 did not need maintenance
+ tributary road crossing survey 5 problems
+ septic survey IDed 21 potential issues to be investigated in 2020
- not clear if this helps with pico since this is alewife issue
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Likely to be completed as proposed?
+ CCSWCD recent good record
+ very active community
- E & O not strong
- Does big project line up with 319 and is budget enough ? Question about edibility ??
- unsure horse farms are on board
Likely to protect or restore?
+ improved town ordinances
+ already offering local cost share grants with committee
+ 3 phases total – this is phase 1 (seems well laid out)
- LakeSmart
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- management costs seem in line
- T4 doesn't add up correctly – thus whole budget is off T4=25,187.45 total project 158, 124
- T2 seems high – why 6 meetings in 2 years when there are only 3 NPS owners to work with. No need to look at candidate lists and decide ??
? match might not be 60:40 after correction
- not a lot of lake association involved.
- Road association isn't really contributing much
- match seems high for some projects
+ fair amount of cash match from towns

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

7

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

BIDDER NAME: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams & Knickerbocker Lakes

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ grant and loan experience
+ 319 experience
+ project manager has science and training (eg LakeSmart)
? sub grantee town, public works (doesn't say if foreman has had erosion control training or gravel roads so don't know skills)
- (if Sue left – limited capacity) – not a team
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ No boat launch but public access along town road/owned property/pullouts
+ public water supply
- Adams closed to swimming
+ Knicker swim public access dock
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
+ modeling indicates susceptible to blooms
0 No listed for water quality impairment
+ Lake most are risk from development/drinking water
Adams – 4.7m, chla 6.1ppb, TP 14ppb 2.5 flushing rate
B Knicker – 4.8m, chl a6.3ppb, TP 12.1ppb (Unfavorable sediments), 1.3 flushing rate
L Knicker TP 16.4, chl a 5.7, 3.2m
+ shallow

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

7

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

BIDDER NAME: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams & Knickerbocker Lakes

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
Watershed survey 2014 48 sites + 5, Roads biggest issue
+ build out model – 17 & 31 years
0 Adams Pond development 13% = 71% of P load, Knickerbocker 7% developed only 57%of P load
0 Most of Adam’s pond shoreline is undeveloped owned BRWD, Knicker is private with 30 residents
- didn’t provide magnitude of the different sites
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Project completion success?
+ completed phase 1 in phase 2
1 town road project – likely to be completed
Successfully improve or protect water quality
+ updating comp plan
+ lots of spots where future development and the need to address brought up
+ support for CEO
+ land conservation
0 last phase
- tourist facilities indicating growth is already pushing on P allocation
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
+ all grant money going to subgrant/road work
+ management costs minimal
- didn’t provide how significant this is to watershed e.g. amount of P and sediment load reduction

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

8

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

BIDDER NAME: Eastbrook Abrams Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ town is applicant and handling \$\$
+/- hiring consultant, will consultant have farm experience? (Jen?)
+ UMaine Cooperative Extn work with blueberry growers
+ lake association is really pushing
Summary: New team since SWCD was unable to complete past project. It appears ag has a potential to be big player but missing strong ag player to work 1:1 with landowners.
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
- no formal boat launch but can access via town owned lot
+ conservation lands – laying foundation for public access
- mostly residents benefit not much public benefit
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
+ P2
+ history of algal blooms
X = 4.7m, TP 15ppb, Well mixed but anoxic late summer (shallow wind whipped?), low flushing rate, cla 10.2. Bottom grabs high P so might be leaning to recycling
Shallow
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ road ownership – private with no formal associations.
+ 11% w/l 500m is blueberry
+ 2015 survey –34 sites (20 res, 14 private roads,) Did not include ag land or septic

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

8

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

BIDDER NAME: Eastbrook Abrams Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- did not survey ag land yes a big piece
- No discussion of actually how they will tackle learning about ag or when
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Likely to complete?
+ trying to make Phase I happened despite HCSWCD
+ looks like connected with Jen
- only letter of support was ass. Or road ass with large match
Likely to protect or restore?
+ 2011 LakeSmart25 of 60 participated 11 full awards
+ continuing on despite HCSWCD backing out of Phase 1
- not without ag participation
- road ownership – private with no formal associations
- Only 1 additional phase but haven't touched ag
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- T4 seems pricey. And doesn't add up $5 \times 500 = 2,500$ grant match – looks like lots of TA or admin?
- 60% of grant is contract for services
- consultant \$\$
- match not strong

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

9

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ Grantee is recent composition of many historical NGOs with long history of environmental work more staff people
+ recently handled Phase 1 2017 319 grant
- Project manager is new to area and little experience handling grants
- Unclear who will design BMPs, Cara/project manager doesn’t have this experience
- 226 hours for Ali, Jessica and Railsback Fellow but don’t know their skills or what their role will be
- lots of turnover of staff
- no engineering
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ 2 Public Boat Launches, Damariscotta Lake State Park
+ Fishing tournaments
+ Public beach
+ state park
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
0 -Not impaired, no TMDL
0 -X = 16.9 ft LSM 5.2 m, chla 4.8ppb, TP = 10ppb, St 1, 2 looks improving, 3 stable ? DO kinda funky
+ statement that New Development is greatest threat, Lake Most at Risk of Development – land cover change 4% in 2004 and 6% in 20016
+ watershed survey
(didn’t talk about basin by basin – and didn’t get into)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

9

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ 172 sites in 2014 whole watershed survey. 81 high to med. 17 State roads 6 town roads + Ag issues in Phase II - but not addressing the state or town roads
+ 2017 septic system survey (only 15% response rate)
- states ag is issue and needs to be addressed during this phase but no task connected to it, is it an issue?
Appears disconnect between survey med and high priority sites, ag, new development and proposed work – what is the problem?
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Successful project completion?
- Candidate road sites – hard to tell who owns the road, is it a road association and if so are they are board?
- T4 says ‘municipal properties’ but no evidence of town involvement
- Project manager has no BMP design experience, no plans to hire help, no evidence person experienced in BMP implementation is involved other than YCC BMPs
Project restore or protect lake?
- states new development is greatest threat, but weight of work doesn’t equal (attend 1 meeting)
- 17 high or med state road sites but none are being addressed in this phase
- 6 town roads high or med but none to be addressed in this phase
- no town involvement in this project even though T4 says ‘municipal properties’
- states ag is issue and needs to be addressed during this phase but no task connected to it
- LakeSmart ?
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- T4 49,854.20/36 BMPs = 1,385/BMP or 49,854.20/12 sites = 4,154.50/site – seems high for residential sites.
- only 25% match, no explanation why (T3) are these particularly hard to sell BMPs? Doesn’t look like it.
- ~50% of federal for salary but does not include engineer, seems high.
+/- 3K municipal cash ? but no letter from any of the towns listed

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

10

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD Pennesseewassee Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ grant experience including 319
+ financial ability
+ TA/engineering help with experience
- Not clear what subcontractor will do (engineer on staff already) (WG thinks there is a need)
+/- Lake association/shorefront owner skills including engineering. Unknown (Phase 1) if they will really step up.
+ OCSWCD completed 319 project in lake in chain
- lake association believes they can do things they can't. Division of labor not clear. Lake Ass. is active but micromanage
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ town park includes public boat launch, beach
+ public parks
+ marina boat launches
+ 341 properties
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
Threatened – not impaired, 5.7m, bottom 6 m low oxygen
Dam
Most at Risk lake
Lake Ass hires consultant to do level 3 aquatic survey for invasive plants (interesting they don't do it themselves... aren't the getter done types?)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

10

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD Pennesseewassee Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Limited water chemistry data (concerning since lake has dam ...) – till I looked at LSM
- (assumed regular lake protection, but there is a Dam, how does this play into protecting the lake or restoring ???)
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
341 shorefront properties ? or 1,4000 watershed
+ 2019 survey 180 sites (roads mostly)
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Successfully complete project?
+/- Likely but a bit unknown. Depending on volunteers. Unsure if they will need to hire help
+ Lots of road projects with town who should be able to complete
- not earth shattering BMP sites
Restore or prevent?
- Plans to address 30% of the 180 IDed problems in phase 1 – plans for 3 phases
+ camp road workshop + buffer planting
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
+ lots of cash match
+ low admin costs, most money going to BMPs

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

11

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD Anasgunticook Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ grant experience including 319
+ financial ability
+ TA/engineering help with experience
- Subcontract with Androscoggin River Watershed Council but no info on their quals (12 NPs projects + 5 matching grants)
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ Public boat launch
+ 2 public beaches
118 camps/homes
+ drinking water source 90 households + 10 businesses
+ trails (rails to trails) along lake
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
0- Not impaired, no TMDL
4.7 m, TP 9ppb, low DO in late summer at bottom
Listed at threatened due to drinking water source.
2019 watershed survey, 62 sites IDed 34 were roads (town, state and private)
- didn't mention drinking water concerns ...
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ Lake protection project to protect drinking water source

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

11

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD Anasgunticook Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- tasks aren't all that compelling/small steps w/ exception of T3
+ Candidate site list has IDed some needed road projects
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Likely to complete project as proposed?
+ tapped many in the watershed, organizations, businesses, road associations, municipal ...
+/- Ambitious small projects vs larger ones – could be challenging
- lake association has been a challenge
Water body will be restored or protected?
+ Active LakeSmart Program – gold level with >15%
+ figure only one more phase to get the high priority sites
+ feels like local energy and self-reliance “will handle remaining low impact through LakeSmart”
- no mention of proactive work with municipalities like updating shoreland zoning or CEO, comp plan ...
- Water district isn't involved – and we are giving them credit for drinking water supply
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
+ T5 ~1,000/each residential -
~ 270/NPS site T4 – might be low
- project brochure 😞
+/- Hope they can do all this for this amount of money
+ diverse match, cash match better quality

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

12

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

BIDDER NAME: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ PWD experience handling grants & money
+ CCSWCD has lots of experience plus engineer
- not enough detail on who at PWD and quals
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ 3 public boat launches, 4 public beaches
+ drinking water supply
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
Not on impaired list, no TMDL
Most at risk from development due to drinking water source (and southern location)
>10m, TP ,5ppb, Cla a 1.5, good oxygen - lake stable -
- could have provided more detail
Summary: P2 project, big watershed.
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ Development increased 5.4% to 8.9% from 1987-2009
+ 2,300 shorefront property owners
+ Crooked River survey (2011-2012) 164 sites, 20 riparian corridor sites
+ 2012 Watershed assessment included hotspot and road survey
+ 2013 & 2015 chronic site inventory

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

12

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

BIDDER NAME: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

+ lots of past work on NPS sites
+ clear list of sites they want to work and est of pollutant reduction
- Not clear that these are really bad sites, sever issues give size of watershed
- data oldish
- didn't explain why these sites? Ranking ... didn't explain well
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Will project be completed?
+ Both PWD & CCSWCD have history of success
Will this restore or prevent water quality degradation?
- Question whether the highest priority sites are being addressed. And if growth 5.4-8.9% is an issue what is being done to make sure new development is LID? Past mention of ordinance review
- Porous pavement location not a great site and not likely the best BMP for site. Not a good Demo site
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- Pricey steering committee – 6 meetings, seems high given they have clearly IDed the sites and players. 2,700/meeting (T2)
- T1 admin/management costs seem high compared to other projects
- T4 is this the best BMP for this site? Seems pricy. How much is this site used if it is just a PWD treatment facility?
- PWD isn't putting in any salary/staff into this project?
- T5 (15K) demo native plant garden buffer – how large? Seems pricy. And price doesn't match candidate list (4K)
+ good match

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

13

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Ass, Watchic Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

<i>Type or write down notes on under the scoring criteria below:</i>
Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
- Volunteer organization
+ lots of professionals from work life, upper management including engineer
+ completed WBP, done lots of work on their own
+ will hire a consultant to do project (T1-6) (FB? Has BMP experience) didn't list BMP experience
- no grant experience, no paid staff, concern about capacity
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ Non-motorized boat access at Kiwanis Beach
Kiwanis Beach – Public ??? (looked it up Private beach open to the public)
175 parcels
Summary: Limited public value, benefit to shorefront property owner's vs general public.
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
0 Not impaired, protection project
- Risk of Development but no description of how much development is occurring in watershed
5.2 m, TP 9.6 ppb, cla 3.9 ppb "low DO' in bottom
0 "existing and new development"
+ 1999 and 2019 watershed surveys + shoreline survey. 26 NPS Sites, 17 really bad shorefront properties
- no stream biological data (FB)
? No bottom grab samples, (FB)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

13

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Ass, Watchic Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Summary: Lake protection project- states risk from development but no discussion about how much development has happened.
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
+ Watershed & shoreline survey (see above)
- At risk for new development but no mention of being P2 or how much growth is occurring
- was the whole watershed done? Survey
Summary: At risk for development, working since 1999 on lake so local interest but no indication that they are doing P2 (shoreland zoning, CEO enforcement) – not sure they really understand new development. Focused on past.
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Project completed as described?
+/- likely using FB
- Question on ability to design BMPs
- solutions don't make sense
Protect or restore?
3 phases – doesn't indicate what will be accomplished in other phases
Only if they address new development and use enforcement
- not without proactively reaching out to NPS problem site owners (e.g. 17 shorefront owners with the worst problems)
- LakeSmart ?
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
- High management/labor cost (contract is for all labor and is >44% since it doesn't include engineering)
- T4 ~2,000/shorefront, seems high since they aren't targeting the 17 biggest problems
? would the ~17k on outreach be better spent on installing BMPs?
- Low sediment and TP values so not good return on investments
+ cash match
Summary: High management costs, high shorefront property costs.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

14

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD Mousam Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ 319 grant experience
+ District has long history of conservation work and stable staff (e.g. Melissa since 2006)
+ access to engineer who has long SWCD history
+ financial and organizational capability and experience
- Jen is new and struggled at first
- current project going into 3 rd year (Covid), YCC snafu last year
- number of grants they already have and number of projects
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ public boat launch, courtesy boat inspection 5,500 boats in 2019 – Busy lake !
+ public beach
+ WWH
+ 950 residential structures
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
+ has a TMDL based on 1990s data
0 not impaired, St 1 X = 6.7 m, TP X 6ppb, St 2 X=6.6m, X TP=7, cla 4.0, low chance of internal recycling from low DO but bottom sediment chemistry say otherwise.
+ most at risk from development
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
- water was bad, resulted in bad enough for TMDL, then improved and removed from list “several mitigation activities circa 1991 but doesn’t say what and how big. Wondering if THE issues have been dealt with and now just picking away as smaller things? Unclear. They may know but I don’t know.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

14

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD Mousam Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

+ watershed survey 189 problems, 60% residential, 28% roads - no mention of other landuse issues so no problems?
0- P2 project
+/- watershed surveys completed over the years most recent 2017, 189 sites 60% residential, 28% roads ... No comment on shoreline, or problems on other landuses – none found? Watershed or shorefront survey?
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Project likely to be completed successfully?
+ laid out well
+ SWCD has experience
- Project manager new
+ active YCC
Project likely to restore or protect?
- Mousam Lake Ass. Isn't putting in a load of effort or money – same ole same ole lake association work.
+ municipal cash in project
- Tattle Road Association – not putting anything 'new' into project – same ole road ass. Work. No match
- summary – seems little stretchy or real commitment to project, low energy, minimal landowner commitment (they aren't doing in-kind labor YCC is), landowners seem to be at arm's length, not the 'getter done' types
- additional phases but less clarity about specifically what next
- Since P2 project no mention of how to prevent New problems other than education, Town CEO, Planning Board SZ?
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
+ Cash investment by landowners – individual projects \$9,700,(~657/landowner – 15 landowners)
- minimal in-kind match by landowners (YCC doing labor)
- Salary & Fringe, management seem high, higher than square pond which is pricier project and more activity.
- T1- Really ?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

15

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD Square Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Applicant Qualifications and Experience (15 pts)
+ 319 grant experience
+ District has long history of conservation work and stable staff (e.g. Melissa since 2006)
+ access to engineer who has long SWCD history
+ financial and organizational capability and experience
- Jen is new and struggled at first
- current project going into 3 rd year (Covid), YCC snafu last year
- number of grants they already have and number of projects
Relative Value of the Waterbody (10 pts)
+ public beach, boat launch
+ significant wildlife habitat
Water Quality Problem (10 pts)
0 – Lake is stable, 7m, TP low 6-9ppm X=5ppm, chla X2.6 – P2 project, low flushing rate
Potential for internal recycling based on bottom sediment chemistry
+ watershed survey completed in 2019. 128 erosion sites
- All discussion and problems focused at the lake, no discussion of potential problems up in watershed from other landuses, are there any? (development, ag, forestry ?) Silent
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems (10 pts)
0 - ~20 years of work and still have high priority town issues
+ have survey with clearly identified sites
0 - typical lake problems, road surface, culverts. Routine .. nothing compelling but still needs to be done.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

15

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD Square Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) June 3- 10 , 2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Kathy Hoppe

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- No description of residential issues, projects YCC will work on. Shorefront? Homeowner driveways?
- No discussion of landuses in the watershed
Feasibility for Success (25 pts)
Project likely to be completed?
+ lots of past activity, since 2001, YCC & 319
+ municipal support \$\$ for YCC
+ clear ID of future phase projects
+ municipal commitment in projects and money
- ~20 years of work and still have high priority town issues, question their acceptance of responsibility. Will they only undertake work if they get \$\$
+ believe this project will be completed as described.
- no letter of support for big support
Project(s) likely to restore or protect lake?
- brochure ... Need to look at using social media and other 2020 communication outlets. Not likely to have much impact (but not much \$\$ just shows lack of creativity or awareness)
- no discussion on P2 work (shoreland zoning, town enforcement or planning) – long term health of lake seems to focus on addressing existing problems and not P2. Lake is not in trouble. With 20 years of work doesn't seem community can handle protecting their lake without grants. Doesn't look good for long term success of protecting the lake. Can they 'own' and step up without federal money?
+ Stakeholder involvement good
Cost Effectiveness (25 pts)
0 – ok ... 53% of grant to construction costs
- 46% grant to salary (subgrants + project manager) = 42,845
+ cash \$6,000
+ T3 + 4 BMP tasks = 80,222 grant \$ or 86% of grant
- engineering costs high
- No indication of buy in from local roads

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/2/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

N-Town of Eastbrook – no previous 319 administration experience, but worked on Phase I grant managed by Hancock Co. SWCD

P-Consultant will be hired for project management (agriculture experience for consultant?)

-Subgrant to UMaine Cooperative Extension for Blueberry workshop

N-Need an entity with agricultural expertise/capacity listed

Relative Value of the Waterbody

-Access exists, but no formal boat launch

-Headwater lake in a chain of lakes that flow to the Union River (Critical Salmon habitat)

-60 shorefront camps

-Recreational Use

-Conservation land

N-Could have provided more detail

Water Quality Problem

-Shallow – 8 m; very low flushing rate

P-Signs of internal loading (ratios are above thresholds, but Al:Fe is 3.6, several bottom grabs > 40 ppb)

P-Previous algal blooms, usually in Sept. (1999, 2002, 2012, 2018) - Dolichospermum

-Dissolved oxygen depletion only at the very bottom of the pond, except in early August, where bottom 3 meters show hypoxia (short-lived due to shallow depth)

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

-Lots of blueberry barrens

-11% of land area within 500 m of the lake is in agriculture

-Logging

-2015 watershed survey identified 34 NPS sites—20 residential and driveway sites (59%) and 14 private road sites (41%). Of these 34 sites, 12 were identified as high impact and 14 as medium-impact sites.

-Sixteen of the high- and medium-impact sites were roads or driveway

N-No ag sites in watershed survey/identified later?

N-No discussion on NPS issues surrounding the blueberry agriculture

-Septic systems

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/2/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Feasibility for Success

-Letter of Support from Abrams Pond Association

-Other partners include UMaine Cooperative Extension

P-Consultant will be doing much of the grant implementation work

-Preliminary estimates indicate this project will reduce pollutant loading to the lake by approximately 27 pounds of phosphorus and 31 tons of sediment per year.

-Workplan: 5 private road sites, 4 driveway sites

-Residential matching grants: 5 @ \$500

N-Requiring high % match for NPS projects – both larger and smaller residential sites. No indication of buy-in from landowners, no road associations in the watershed – is it likely that there will be cooperation to pay to fix these sites/long term stewardship?

-Education and Outreach includes press releases, lakesmart evaluations, buffer workshop, presentations, workshop on blueberries, project brochure, newsletters/tax bill inserts

N-E&O Septic database & map is more of a planning document – not sure if this can be funded through 319.

Q-No agriculture BMPs?

P- I like the idea of reaching out to blueberry farmers through the workshop & involving an expert

Cost Effectiveness

N-40.3% match

N-39% of grant funds towards construction

-Project administration costs are high

N-Consultant cost is very high

Q-Very small number of hours for Town staff – is this realistic? 53 hours worth of work over 2 years? Should be higher.

N-Seems like they're increasing the match requirement for construction to offset the high cost of the consultant – not sure this is the best approach.

N-Small amounts of match from only 2 sources other than landowner construction match.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams & Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/1/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- Past 319 grants – Adams & Knickerbocker Phase I and II; several other federal/state grants
- P**-BRWD has good capacity & track record with other grants
- Subgrant to Town of Boothbay for construction (BMP experience for public works?)
- Q**-Quals for consultant/engineer?

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Public access available, boat launch on Knickerbocker Lake (less formal access to Adams Pond)
- Commercial/Residential development, campground
- 30 residences on Knickerbocker Lake
- P**-Public drinking water supply for 5,000 customers
- Adams Pond – no swimming, but used for other recreation
- P**-Knickerbocker Lake is the only freshwater lake with public access on the peninsula
- Recreational use
- No specifics on species, but has some important wading bird/waterfowl habitat
- Fish stocking

Water Quality Problem

- P**-Lakes Most at Risk list
- P**- Unfavorable sediment chemistry, some indication of internal loading based on water quality data
- Lower than average water quality
- Oxygen depletion
- Currently meets state water quality standards, but at risk due to NPS
- Could have mentioned climate change impacts/future risk

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- Biggest NPS threat appears to be development
- 2014 watershed survey – 48 sites +5 added. 54% roads, 25% residential/driveways
- Major roads/transportation corridors near lakeshores
- Residential development, country club, botanical gardens
- “Developed areas cover about 13% of the Adams Pond watershed, these areas contribute 71% of the total phosphorus watershed load to Adams Pond. Similarly, developed areas cover about 7% of the

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams & Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/1/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Knickerbocker Lake watershed but contribute 57% of the total phosphorus watershed load to Knickerbocker Lake.”

-“Developed watershed properties contribute a significant pollutant load to the lakes from runoff associated with hard structures and contaminants associated with septic systems, motor vehicles, pesticides and fertilizers.”

-Buildout analysis: “Modeling by FBE indicates that both lakes are very vulnerable to nutrient inputs from existing NPS sites, as well as, any increases in phosphorus inputs from future development. They estimate that increases in TP levels in Adams Pond of greater than 1 ppb or 2-3 ppb in Knickerbocker Lake would likely result in an unacceptable level of water quality decline.”

-Adams Pond watershed has 287 ac. of conservation land, Knickerbocker – 90 ac.

Feasibility for Success

-Only 1 site - \$71k and 40% match

-Town of Boothbay – letter of support, construction match

-How big/significant of a site is this? No pollutant load reduction estimate, but clearly an issue from the pictures. Large - 2250 ft. of road.

-Zoning/Ordinance component would be good, but looks like they’ve already done some of that

-Much work has been done in the watershed through BRWM programs/grants

-Small list of partners – Town of Boothday, possibly the lake association and SWCD.

-E&O component – sort of vague - articles/presentations, sign

-Very simple proposal

Cost Effectiveness

-44.5% match

-100% of grant funds to construction (subgrant)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County Soil and Water Conservation District (Lake Anasagunticook)

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/20/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P-OCSWCD has successfully managed several previous 319 grants. Michele and Jeff both have good experience and work together well.

P- OCSWCD has in-house engineer

Relative Value of the Waterbody

P-Public water supply (80-90 households, 10 businesses)

-Boat launch, 2 public beaches, residential development, recreation, some forestry/ag

P- Lake gets a lot of use by community; it is near the center of town and there are not many other lakes in the area.

-Drains to Androscoggin River

-Warmwater fishery (some trout stocking)

Water Quality Problem

-Past algal blooms (secchi <= 2m, 1980, 1998) – no other info about when they occurred, what species etc.

-Water quality is below average – relatively low clarity and high-ish phosphorus

-Dissolved oxygen depletion

-Not included in proposal, but Al:Fe is 2.2, Al:P is 92.30. Bottom grabs do not indicate internal recycling.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

P-NPS mainly in the form of soil erosion

-2019 watershed survey – 62 sites on roads, residential, lake access, and municipal/path sites

-Provided pollutant reduction estimates – 50 lb sediment, 42.5 lb phosphorus

N-Septics noted in watershed plan, but not mentioned here

Feasibility for Success

P- Strong letters of support from towns, residents, and businesses; diverse list of project partners

N-Water district does not appear to be involved

-Some difficulty in getting proposal together/drumming up support

P-Subgrant to ARWC - good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County Soil and Water Conservation District (Lake Anasagunticook)

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/20/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

-Workplan includes 14 med and high impact NPS sites, technical assistance on at least 22 residential sites, 7 residential matching grants, and education and outreach (including 2 workshops, press releases, town meetings and LAA meetings, and buffer outreach)

-Tasks are well described – I like that they focus on buffer education and outreach and that they have a separate task for technical assistance. Very straightforward.

-Lots of sites and not a lot of time budgeted for each, but if there is a lot of cooperation, I think it could get done as proposed.

Cost Effectiveness

-Costs for many of the tasks seem too low.

-Match 40.3%

-Approx. 50% of grant will go to construction costs

Q-OCSWCD engineer is listed as contractual? If he is on an existing contract with OCSWCD not sure how this works in terms of procurement

-6,000 miles is a lot of travel! But makes sense since the lake is not close to OCSWCD office.

Q: Not sure why office space and computer are listed for \$60 as supplies. Interesting.

P: Lots of diverse match sources; innovative

Q-Enough staff time budgeted?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- Midcoast Conservancy was previously awarded a Phase I grant, knows the watershed well
- Project manager is new to the position – some familiarity with 319, but mostly in water quality (not much BMP experience)
- Organization does have administrative capacity
- N**-No engineering support written into the grant, no one BMP expertise written into the grant
- N**-Other Midcoast staff listed in budget – no bios listed

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- P**-Cold & warmwater fisheries – wild brook trout in tributaries
- Very large lake
- Recreational use
- Residential use
- P**-State Park, Summer Camps, Campground
- P**-2 Public Boat Launches
- Two species of state listed bluets have recently been found within the watershed, as well as state listed bald eagles and great blue herons
- Drains to Great Salt Bay – shellfish
- N**-This section would have benefitted from including numbers to give a sense of how much use the lake gets. How many shoreline residences? How many boat inspections/year? Needs more detail.

Water Quality Problem

- Listed as Threatened due to sensitivity to additional phosphorus inputs
- P**-Says that Al:fe ratios are unfavorable to sediment phosphorus release, but several samples show Al:Fe at <3:1. Al:P ratios are above 25:1 threshold, but there are signs of TP release (esp. at Station 2) (not mentioned in proposal but should be included)
- N**-Better characterization of DO data should be included – what is the area (or depths) affected? How severe? Lakes of Maine shows station 1 has a metalimnetic oxygen minima, but pretty good DO to the bottom (does not go anoxic), whereas stations 2 and 3 has severe oxygen depletion affecting the entire hypolimnion during stratification.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

-watershed is 6% developed, 6% agriculture

P-Lake most at risk

-Top NPS threat is new development

-172 sites in most recent watershed survey

-Septic survey was done

Feasibility for Success

-2 letters of commitment from landowners

-Other project partners include Damariscotta Lake Watershed Council, SWCD, NRCS, local road associations

N-Not very strong sources of match – very little from towns, otherwise just donated time and construction match.

-Task 3 – BMP installation at 9 private property NPS sites – description was sort of generic. Could have been more detailed; I know there were issues getting sites for Phase I so I would have liked to have seen a description of follow up work to identify and prioritize sites for Phase II. The proposal doesn't detail any significant follow-up or reassessment since the 2014 survey

Q-Candidate site Stillwell Spear Rd. site photo attachment doesn't really match what is in the workplan. Does not mention replacing or armoring the undersized culvert – not sure if proposed work will fix all the issues there. Otherwise, candidate sites and proposed work seem appropriate (although we typically don't look favorably on installing a lot of rip-rap).

-No one with BMP design expertise has been written into the grant – may run into issues there

-Task 4 – YCC – 12 sites (36 BMPs) proposed each year (total of 24 sites). Did not give examples of the types of BMPs that will be installed.

Task 5 – Education and Outreach – 2 community workshops (septic and streamsmart or gravel road); newsletters, press releases, website posts, selectboard meeting presentations, fact sheet.

N-No agriculture related sites or tasks – why is NRCS on the steering committee if none of the project is focused on agriculture? Need to write in ag outreach task separate from steering committee.

P- Workplan seems doable – a basic lake NPS project.

Cost Effectiveness

-40.7% overall match

-43.5% of grant funds to construction (not sure if some of the YCC hours should count as “construction” – currently all considered salary/fringe.)

N- Mileage reimbursement covers the cost of gas – cannot double bill for that. Also need to use \$0.45/mile rate. This would reduce the “travel” grant cost to \$545.

Q/N- I don't think you can use your truck lease payment as match. Especially if the truck is used for any work outside of the scope of the grant.

N- Used 40% match for all construction projects. Would like to see more cushion built into matching funds.

Q/N- YCC task cost works out to be \$2,077 per site or \$692 per BMP. Seems kind of high to me for small residential BMPs.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/21/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- Experience with Phase I and II grants
- P-Town of Saco staff have been good to work with
- YCSWCD Subgrant – doing much of the implementation of the grant, other than more technical BMPs
- YCSWCD project manager has experience working on Ph II project
- Biddeford-Saco Country Club is also listed here – involved with water quality monitoring task

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- P-Public access includes golf course and beach near outlet, hiking trails
- Tidal estuary below Old Orchard Road
- Residential and Commercial land uses – could have included more detail
- P-Saco Heath in headwaters, Rachel Carson Wildlife Refuge in tidal portion
- N-No detail on flora or fauna
- Did not get a good sense of the watershed from the proposal.
- P/N-Did not highlight public use of the waterbody, which is significant but not mentioned

Water Quality Problem

- P-Impaired – NPS priority listed for Highway access-related development threat, Individual, IC, and bacteria TMDLs
- IR listed for toxic metals, bacteria, and aquatic life use
- Bear Brook tributary is also impaired for bacteria
- Detailed water quality discussion, but could have been presented more clearly
- Some sites show DO issues
- Chloride results appeared to be elevated but not too bad at sites with less roads/ development – did testing occur at other sites? What was the 860 mg/L reading from? Summary is a little unclear.
- P-Looks like a fair amount of water quality data has been collected

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- 5/16 subwatersheds are in fairly good shape
- P-remaining 11 subwatersheds have NPS issues related to:
 - Bacteria from Septic/animal sources
 - Chloride from winter road salt application

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/21/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

72 stream sites identified as impacting habitat (erosion, lack of riparian vegetation, inadequate stream crossings for fish passage, stream channel alteration

Excess nutrients

Toxic metals – 58 stormwater retrofit sites

N-High impervious cover, but does not give a breakdown of % land uses in watershed

-This was a pretty good summary of the nature/extent of NPS issues.

Feasibility for Success

-Phase III project

-Partners include Loranger School, OOB Conservation Commission, Biddeford/Saco Country Club – all for buffer planting workshop

-450 lbs of TSS removal & 7.1 lbs nitrogen (bioretention basin, I assume)

-625 feet of riparian buffer plantings

-Good list of partners, could have more buy in from businesses?

-Task 3 of Workplan includes 2 stormwater retrofits (bioretention basins to filter parking lot runoff), buffer plantings and habitat restoration. This task is written in a confusing way, but I think it is saying that there are 6 buffer sites and 1 habitat restoration site in total. Habitat site should be broken out from buffer sites. The overall wording of this task should also be clarified.

N/Q-Task 4, water quality monitoring – will need to decide if this is fundable, or needs to be modified.

-Task 5 – education and outreach includes buffer planting workshop & 2 cleanup days

-Task 6 – private property stormwater retrofits

P- Appear to have good buy-in from project partners, building on previous 2 phases

P-Tasks are reasonable and likely to be able to be completed in grant timeframe

Cost Effectiveness

-41.6% match

Q- How is the country club providing in-kind match for project admin? They are not described in the task narrative.

-Task 6 – private property stormwater retrofits – no budget for staff time is included – should at least be counted as match

-Make sure cost of buffer workshop is not counted twice – it is mentioned in education & outreach and NPS abatement project section.

-Both SWRs' construction costs are 40% match – bare minimum

-72% of grant funds going toward construction

P-Project costs seem reasonable

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Lewiston (Hart Brook)

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/19/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- Sounds like the main project personnel do not have direct 319 experience.
- Lewiston has had some prior 604b/319 grants, has capacity
- List CES – private consultant – Looks like they already hired them outside of the grant. They probably should not be listed here – it doesn't look like they are involved in this proposal/workplan.
- Hiring a consultant to do Pollutant Load calculations and nothing else – is this CES?

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Mixed land uses – commercial, industrial, agriculture, residential
- Tributary to Androscoggin
- Public access = near public roads in a few places... sounds like it's not used by the public much.
- MS4 priority water (they did not say this in the application)
- N**-Not highly used by public; not much use potential

Water Quality Problem

- P**-Urban Impaired
- Does not meet standards - DO, bacteria, temperature, nutrients, aquatic life
- Increased flows from upper watershed due to imperviousness
- Channel modification/straightening in one sub-watershed, stream lined with concrete or piped underground in some places
- Diurnal DO swings
- Chloride – close to chronic threshold
- Bacteria – sewer pipes, pet waste
- N:** does not provide any numbers to give a sense of the severity of the impairment. No biomonitoring data is cited.
- Biomonitoring data:
 - Macroinvertebrates: Downstream site, 2017 = NA; next site up: 1998 & 2003 = C, 2008, 2013, 2017 = NA. next site up: 2017 = I. Next site up: 2017 = NA.
 - Algae: Downstream – 2003 & 2004 = NA, next site 2008 = C, 2013 = C.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Lewiston (Hart Brook)

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/19/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

22% impervious

TMDL states 61% developed and 33% non developed.

Impaired

IC TMDL

Poor riparian habitat

Habitat & channel modification

N-Wish they had discussed stream stressors more specifically.

WBP identifies key sub-watersheds – Lower and Industry.

Feasibility for Success

N-No letters of support/does not seem like they're bringing in anyone outside of city employees

-Watershed working group should include more stakeholders

-Progress implementing WBP – some text is cut off in the table; also references old (2008) plan that is expired, not recently approved 2019 plan.

-Start date June 2020, End date Dec 2021 – should be Jan 2021 – Dec 2022 (or earlier). Will not be able to start this coming June. Maybe September.

P-Leveraging Capital Improvement Funds

-Workplan entails installing 2 biofiltration BMPs as recommended by WBP and consultant, shade tree planting

-Mentions Woody Debris installation by contractor in partners section, but this is not in the workplan.

-Mentions hiring a consulting engineer to do water quality monitoring, but this is not in the workplan.

-Workplan states that they are hiring a consultant to do PCR calculations and nothing else, but this does not line up with what is in the project partners section.

P-Overall, high feasibility of getting the project successfully completed.

-Treating about 1 acre of impervious surface and providing shade to brook (no indication of length of stream that will be targeted for plantings).

P-The City has worked with a consultant to prioritize BMPs that will have the greatest impact on water quality.

-No discussion of future phases of work, which will be needed to significantly improve water quality

Cost Effectiveness

-51.2% match

P-All grant funds (\$150,000) will be used for construction

N-\$10,000 to pay a consultant to do pollutant load reduction calculations is unnecessary/expensive

-Some issues with filling out budget tables properly (tasks, non-federal match) – looks like there is actually more match than what they list as the total \$ amount (city match not included)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/26/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P-CCSWCD Project Manager is experienced and has worked on a number of previous projects, including Highland Lake 604b – knows the watershed and project partners well. CCSWCD District Engineer will also be supporting the project – very experienced

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Closest lake to Portland
- Heavy residential development – 320 shorefront lots and 1,100 backlots
- state-owned hand-carry boat launch – not much else in the way of public access (no beaches, etc)
- on Lakes most at Risk list
- Recreational use
- Some conservation land within the watershed
- Habitat for some rare species.
- Alewife restoration

Water Quality Problem

- Previously impaired
- Picrocyanobacteria blooms over past 6 years (some <2m, some >2m) – may be caused by alewife reintroduction or internal loading/mixing, or some combination of factors
- Increasing phosphorus, decreasing clarity
- Shift to late-summer phosphorus maximums

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

-“Land use in Highland Lake’s Watershed include Forest Land (71%), Wetlands (16%), Open Space (9%), Low Intensity Development (3%), and Medium Intensity Development (1%).”

-Small amounts of agriculture, logging, and commercial development in the watershed

-2018 watershed survey: 129 erosion sites were documented with 71 sites being residential and driveway and 27 sites being private roads. Private roads were identified as having the most significant erosion problems. One agriculture property (a horse stable) was identified as contributing nutrients into a tributary of Highland Lake. A second agriculture property was identified as possibly contributing nutrients via road drainages.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/26/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Feasibility for Success

Partners – HLA, Towns of Windham and Falmouth, Overlook Road Association (letters of support)

P-HLLT is very active and motivated

P-Lots of work has been done so far through local efforts; lake association is very effective

P-“Preliminary estimates indicate this project will reduce pollutant loading to the lake by 68 tons of sediment and over 57 pounds of phosphorus.”

-Workplan tasks include 2 private road collaborative roundtables, BMP installation at high-cost road site, horse farm matching grants, and E&O – newsletters, social media, press releases, town council presentations, and website posts.

N-Would have liked to see a further E&O component beyond reporting on the project.

Q-Overlook Road site – estimated to cost at least \$75k, but cost budgeted for construction is only \$74k. Also, not sure if we can fund repaving. Previous 319 work was done at this site under 1999 and 2004 grants – will need to make sure this new project is eligible.

N-DACF should be listed as a project partner since they are helping with the ag sites

Cost Effectiveness

-40.9% match

-Only 2-3 sites will be addressed, however they are the worst known sites in the watershed.

-Match for steering committee does not appear to include in-kind match for steering committee member time.

Q-Will budgeted amount be enough to complete Overlook Road site, given that the cost is estimated to be more than the amount allotted (construction grant + match = \$74k)?

-Steering committee “payroll” costs seem high – personnel costs are on the high side (also it should be listed as “salary and fringe”)

N-Overlook Road site only 33% match

N-Road roundtable match really high – is that realistic?

-No Cash match from HLA

-63.5% of grant funds used for construction

-Some issues in the budget tasks/tables:

Q-Salary cost, if you add up to the amounts in the tasks under the “payroll” category, you get \$31,364.65 grant cost and \$9,276.49 match, for a total of \$40,641.14. This does not agree with Table 2 totals, which show \$35,763.45 grant for salary & fringe and \$19,913.07 in match (total of \$55,676.52 in table 1&2).

Q-\$11,323.62 under Task 5 does not have a category assigned to it. Is this payroll match? If so, it would mean that the total “payroll” match would be \$20,600.11 – more than what is listed in table 2. (but still less than the overall staff costs in the table when added to the grant cost) Also, unlikely that all of the match for this task would be from salary/fringe.

Q-Salary & Fringe/indirect costs are different between part 1 and part 2, but they both add up to the same total. (They don’t match the budgets laid out in the tasks, however).

-\$10,000 grants from each of the towns is being used for CCSWCD salaries (match) – needs to be reflected in task budgets

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: York County Soil and Water Conservation District – Long Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/22/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- YCSWCD – project manager is new but has good 319 experience
- Hiring a consultant to do much of the work (pass-through)
- N-Did not include consulting engineer in this section
- N-YCSWCD is not super familiar with the watershed, and I don’t think there are consultants who have visited the watershed

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- N-Small pond, mostly local use
- residential (58 properties), 2 summer camps
- Apple orchard(s)
- P-Boys Camp has launch/beach area open to public
- Part of larger Saco River watershed
- Winterberry holly – species of concern
- Public drinking water wells

Water Quality Problem

- 2017 and 2018 sudden drop in water quality
- Negative clarity trend (listing reason)
- Blooms in 2006, 2017, 2018
- P-Low Al:Fe ratio, internal loading

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- 500 ft buffer around lake consists of 84% natural land cover, 10% agricultural land, 6% developed land, and <1% impervious cover
- NPS sources include internal loading and erosion related to watershed development
- Septic systems – potential source
- 2019 watershed survey = 33 sites – roads, residential, camps, driveways. 2 high, 12, medium, 19 low

Feasibility for Success

- One Letter of support from LPA – cash match amount was changed
- No letter from summer camps

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: York County Soil and Water Conservation District – Long Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/22/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

-Small watershed, not many erosion issues

-estimated pollutant reductions: 3.1 tons of sediment, 2.7 pounds of phosphorus, and 5.4 pounds of nitrogen per year

-Workplan includes: addressing 10 non-residential NPS sites and providing 10 residential matching grants.

-Education & outreach – school poster project – would have been nice to have a letter of support from the school. E&O also includes newsletter updates and rain garden demo site, annual meetings, selectboard meetings, local organization meetings

-Lots of cash match from LPA

N-I am concerned that the applicant/grant writer have not actually visited any of these sites, and that recommendations are based solely on opinions of people with less technical expertise.

Recommendations in some cases are very different from those identified during the watershed survey, and some are questionable (see below).

-It looks like site 2-3 is on a stream – proposed work would not be appropriate in that case. Should not disperse water into a buffer. Original watershed survey recommendations were “Armor inlet/outlet, replace or enlarge culvert.” Site 2-4 also seems like the recommendations might not make sense or might require some regrading/ditching to convey water to the proposed infiltration basin. Original recommendation from survey: “Install turnouts, build up road, reshape (crown) road.”

N-No mention of ag even though it's as much as 10% of the watershed

P-Proposed work should be able to be completed successfully within the grant period.

Cost Effectiveness

N-40.0% match – bare minimum

N-Project (task) costs are a little high, likely due to use of consultant

-47% of grant funds going toward construction

N-\$117,000 to get 2.7 lb of phosphorus reduction isn't a great return on investment

-Construction costs look reasonable

-Good match from local lake association

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: York County Soil and Water Conservation District – Mousam Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/26/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- YCSWCD – new Project Manager, but has experience with Mousam Phase I and several other grants
- P-CCSWCD “Engineer Consultant” – should be written in as a subgrant
- ASYCC – subgrantee. N- Had some communication issues in Phase I grant.
- No mention of district intern listed in budget table

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- P-Public beach & boat launch
- 950 shorefront properties
- residential, commercial, and agricultural land uses
- P-5,500+ boat inspections in 2019
- P-Coldwater fishery
- Conservation lands, inland waterfowl and wading bird habitat, focus area of statewide ecological significance
- N-No mention of rare species

Water Quality Problem

- Previously impaired
- Lakes Most at Risk list
- Oxygen depletion is mild – only affects deepest portion on the lake
- P-Unfavorable sediment ratios – high risk of internal loading

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- Some agriculture and commercial land uses
- Previous studies/surveys show septic, gravel roads, and residential properties as important NPS sources
- 2017 watershed survey identified 189 sites impacting, or have the potential to, impact water quality. Of these sites, 60% were found on residential properties and 28% were associated with roads.

Feasibility for Success

- Letters of Commitment from ASYCC, Town of Acton, and MRLA
- Subgrant to ASYCC

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: York County Soil and Water Conservation District – Mousam Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/26/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P-CCSWCD being used for engineering

- 213 lbs/year of Total Suspended Sediments will be removed a result of a proposed catch basin on Goose Pond Road --- **Q-** TSS or sediments? Wondering what method was used to come up with this number as it doesn't seem to be Region 5 based on the units.

N-Phase I grant may be extended into 2021

-Project partners include ASYCC, CCSWCD, MLRA, Towns of Shapleigh and Acton, Tattle St. Road Assoc., and Three Rivers Land Trust.

-Task 3 – Four NPS Abatement projects – curb & catch basin, boat launch, steep slope, redesign catch basin

-Task 4 – Education and Outreach – includes 1 BMP workshop, press releases, presentations at MLRA annual meetings, and project brochure

-Task 5 – 15 \$400 residential matching grants (ASYCC Subgrant)

-Goose Pond Rd. site was part of previous 319 grant – need to make sure work is eligible – was also proposed in Phase I but not completed

Cost Effectiveness

-44.3% match

N-Boat launch site matching funds are low (32%) – minimum is 25%

P- good sources of match, including cash match

-42% of grant funds being used for construction (59% with ASYCC counted)

N-Task 1 cost really high (\$11k)

-# of volunteer hours unrealistically high

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County Soil and Water Conservation District – Lake Penneesseewassee

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- P-OCSWCD has successful track record of past projects
- P-Good experience and capacity – admin, engineering services
- Q-“Subcontract for specialized services” seems vague to me – sounds like they may or may not issue based on if they need assistance. Will need to go through procurement.
- P-LAON, the local association, has several well-qualified volunteers that can lend expertise.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- P-Town Park (public launch), another hand-carry launch, nature preserves, marinas w/ private launches
- 1,413 properties in the watershed; 341 shoreline properties
- Recreation/economic benefit
- P-Large lake near downtown
- Significant wildlife habitat (inland wading bird & waterfowl habitat), Bald Eagle
- Coldwater fish habitat

Water Quality Problem

- Threatened due to sensitivity to additional phosphorus
- Lake most at risk
- Dissolved oxygen depletion in bottom 6 meters in August
- Did not mention Al:Fe ratio of 2.6:1 puts it at higher risk of internal phosphorus recycling

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- P-180 sites found during 2019 survey.
- Roads/road infrastructure, lack of buffer were biggest issues
- N-More detail on breakdown of land use and impact rating would have been helpful here
- Previous watershed assessment work should be included in section a (some is lumped into section b).
- N-No discussion of agriculture

Feasibility for Success

- P-Letters of support: Town of Norway, 2 road associations, 1 landowner
- P-51 tons sediment/44 lbs phosphorus estimated reduction
- P- Very dedicated, involved & active lake association

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Oxford County Soil and Water Conservation District – Lake Penneesseewassee

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

N-List of project partners does not include organizations beyond SWCD, town, and local association – more diversity would be valuable

-Workplan: task 3- 16 high & medium impact sites – town roads, private roads, medium-impact residential

-States that 75% cost share may be needed for some sites – will need to ensure that overall average is at least 40%. Task states “up to 40% match” but could/should be higher for some sites.

-Task 4 – residential BMPs – 10 sites, up to \$350 matching grant

-Task 5 – education and outreach – presentations at lake assoc. meetings, select board updates, press releases, website posts, emails, final project brochure. Technical assistance, 2 workshops (camp roads, buffer planting).

-Some task costs/match amounts seem low (steering committee, education and outreach).

Q/N-Lots of ditch armoring proposed on candidate site list. Not sure if this is always necessary/recommended. Also, the last site recommends rip rap – may want to look into alternatives, if feasible.

Cost Effectiveness

-42.7 % match

P-73% of grant funds to construction

P-Costs are reasonable or even a little low

Q-Is the contractual cost in the budget for the OCSWCD engineer or for the consultant? Did not list OCSWCD engineer under part 1.

N-\$1800 for ECM and drip edge trench seems high (candidate site list #04-07)

Q-LAON mileage being paid for through grant?

-OCSWCD Donated services should be put under the Salary & Fringe match column.

N-Road association/landowner in kind match amount seems high. (164.4 hours)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/3/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

P-CCSWCD – strong capacity, many past projects, experienced staff
N-No mention of NRCS/Agriculture professional applicant quals

Relative Value of the Waterbody

-Fishing is popular; occurs at various road crossings
-Flows into Presumpscot River, Casco Bay
-Agricultural and residential land uses
P-Stocked with trout, also contains native brook trout
P-Only Brook Floater population in Southern Maine (rare mussel), blue heron, wading bird habitat

Water Quality Problem

P-Impaired due to DO and E. coli. Thayer Brook tributary is also listed as impaired, but only for DO.
-NPS TMDL (Thayer Brook), Bacteria TMDL (Pleasant River)
N-Water quality section was really lacking in detail. Needs to include some numbers/data from biomonitoring and bacteria sampling. No mention of dissolved oxygen issues/data in this section.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

-Current land uses in the watershed include forest land (63%), agricultural land (9%), wetlands (12%), open space (9%), high intensity development (0.5%), low intensity development (5%), and medium intensity development (1.5%).
-High development pressure
-2008 survey - 95 NPS sites, which included town owned roads (35%); private roads (15%); residential areas (14%); agricultural lands (10%); state roads (9%); and businesses, construction sites, trails, and boat access sites (17% combined). Out of the 95 sites recorded, more than half (54 sites) were ranked as having a high or medium impact to water quality.
Q-Follow up from 2008 survey?
-Bank stability is an issue, water is very turbid, likely due to bank erosion
N-Agriculture (could have been discussed in more detail)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/3/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Feasibility for Success

-Letters of Support – Town of Gray, Town of Windham

-Other partners include Trout Unlimited, NRCS, DACF, and PRLT

P-Diverse group of steering committee participants

-Preliminary estimates of sediment reduction in addressing this project's NPS sites are 55 tons of sediment per year or 47 pounds of phosphorus per year.

-Workplan tasks include agriculture outreach and BMP installation at 1-2 sites

-BMP installation at 8 non-agricultural NPS sites

N-Press releases/social media posts are the only education and outreach components

Q- It seems that many of the non-ag NPS sites are on town property, so will town road crews be doing this work? Not essential to include in application but would have been informative to know what the expectation was surrounding these sites and whether they were public/private roads. No indication that landowners have agreed to fix sites. Seems more likely that work is completed if it's town property.

N- No indication of buy-in from ag or non-ag sites – may be difficult to implement workplan if there is not much interest from landowners. No indication that outreach has been done.

Cost Effectiveness

P-48.7% match

-46.7% of grant funds to construction

P-Good buy-in from towns

N-Not a lot of diverse match sources (mostly steering committee, other than towns' cash match)

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/21/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- PWD – a few past 319/604b projects (with CCSWCD), lots of capacity & experience in the watershed
- P- Subgrant to CCSWCD (Project Manager Heather Huntt and engineer Chris Baldwin)
- N- No staff bio or indication of who will be overseeing the project at PWD.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Huge value.
- P-Drinking water source for Greater Portland
- P-One of the most popular lakes in Maine for recreation
- Summer camps, residential development (2300 homes)
- P-Multiple public boat launches and beaches
- Tourism
- P-the only indigenous landlocked salmon population in Maine
- “The watershed includes State listed animal habitats for species of special concern including the bald eagle, great blue heron, eastern ribbon snake, pygmy snaketail, and the endangered least bittern.”

Water Quality Problem

- Threatened due to public water supply, outstanding water quality
- currently has excellent water quality (oligotrophic)
- N-Application should have listed threats to water quality
- Application does mention a small increase in developed area and decrease in green space from 1987 to 2009.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- 84% forested, 7% developed watershed
- Watershed survey data that WBP is based on was slightly old (2015)
- “Predominant impacts to Sebago Lake from the surveys conducted include NPS pollution (primarily soil erosion), road impacts, lack of shoreline vegetation and disturbance of riparian areas, and lack of treating stormwater runoff.”
- 61 road sites in 2014, 2012 survey - 164 sites on Crooked River alone
- N-More recent numbers and more detail on # of sites in entire watershed would have been helpful
- Hard to get a sense of scale/number of sites because it’s such a large watershed.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Portland Water District – Sebago Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/21/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Feasibility for Success

- Subgrant to CCSWCD –responsible for much of the implementation of the grant
- Project partners include summer camp & campground (letters of support)
- N**-very large watershed, only targeting small areas/low hanging fruit
- P**- PWD has an effective source protection/watershed control program to build on
- Task 3 – campground demonstration sites - If projects have already been done at the state park and camp, need to make sure that proposed sites are new. One site is proposing rip-rap.
- N**-Task 4 – porous pavement parking lot - is it going to have an impact on water quality? Is this a high impact (problem) site/cost effective?
- Task 5 – Native buffer planting at Standish boat launch
- Task 6 Lakescaping – residential outreach and cost sharing (mostly matching funds)
- It seems like they picked “easy” sites that have full landowner buy-in, so there should be no problem completing the project tasks as proposed.
- I like that the sites they chose are visible to the public and will be used for education/outreach purposes

Cost Effectiveness

P-Match 54.1%

- Task 1 cost is high, but looks like the \$5000 match is just there as a placeholder and has not been allocated to a specific project or task yet
- N**-Task 2 - 6 steering committee meetings is a lot – significant source of match within the proposal.
- Task 5, \$15,000 for a native plant buffer seems high - \$5k subgrant and \$5k donated labor is a lot for a simple buffer planting.
- Task 7 (pollutant loading) is not added up correctly (travel not included in total cost)
- N**-No personnel expenses listed for PWD – needs to be included, even if it's all match.
- P**-63% of grant funds going to construction
- P**- good sources of match, PWD is providing a large amount of match
- proposal aims to reduce loading by 40 tons sediment/34 lbs phosphorus removal
- Q**- Are the camp sites really the worst/highest priority sites in the watershed, or are they just easy because of existing partnerships?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: York County Soil and Water Conservation District – Square Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/1/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- YCSWCD – Project manager is relatively new, but has worked on several 319 projects
- P-Subgrant to CCSWCD – Engineering services. Engineer is highly experienced
- Subgrant to ASYCC – past issues, but has new staff who have improved communication with YCSWCD

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- P-Public boat launch
- P-Public beach
- P-recreation – 900 boat inspections in 2019
- 500 shorefront parcels
- P-Cold and warmwater fisheries
- P-bald eagle habitat, inland waterfowl and wading bird habitat, conservation lands, focus area of statewide ecological significance within watershed
- Near Mousam Lake and Great East/Horn/Wilson Lakes.

Water Quality Problem

- very slow flushing rate
- P-Low Al:Fe and Al:P ratios, however not currently showing signs of internal loading
- Relatively shallow – 13 m
- N-Clear water – deep thermocline, very small hypolimnion – DO depletion not a big issue
- Water quality is average

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- Residential development
- Gravel pit & Christmas tree farm
- P-Watershed survey in 2019 - 128 erosion sites with most sites (73%) associated with residential areas. Town roads accounted for 7%; private roads accounted for 5%; driveways accounted for 8% and the remaining 7% were associated with beach/boat/trails/ROW and construction sites.
- N- no description of NPS beyond summarizing watershed surveys – should have discussed septic systems here, since there is a septic social in the work plan.
- N-Did not discuss severity of NPS problems. How many high, medium, and low impact sites?

Feasibility for Success

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: York County Soil and Water Conservation District – Square Pond

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/1/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

-Project Partners – ASYCC, SPIA, Town of Shapleigh (letters of support)

-Other partners include Three Rivers Land Trust and Town of Acton

-Workplan includes: NPS projects at 8 high and medium priority sites, 15 residential matching grants (\$300), E&O includes 2 press releases, newsletters/websites, SPIA annual meeting presentations, BMP social & septic social, project brochure.

P-Mention of climate change considerations

N-The biggest chunk of match - \$18,600 from town of Acton for construction – is not backed by a letter of support due to COVID-19 – no reason to think they will not be able to fund, but does make the proposal shakier.

-Overall, a straightforward proposal. ASYCC should have no problem addressing residential sites; for the 8 larger sites, match might be an issue, but the projects seem reasonable and should be able to get done within the grant period.

Cost Effectiveness

-Overall match 41.5%

-Low match for NPS abatement projects task

N-7 of the 8 projects are budgeted at 40% match (one at 50%) – more match would have strengthened the proposal

P-Match is diverse

-52.5% of grant funds to construction (62% if you fold in YCC as construction)

-Engineering cost high for only 8 sites

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Biddeford

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/2/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

- Experience includes Phase I & II Thatcher Brook grants
- YCSWCD Subgrant – Project manager is new, but familiar with previous Thatcher Brook projects
- CCSWCD Subgrant for Engineering

Relative Value of the Waterbody

- Application does not mention recreational use, but there is some public access (Eastern Trail), fishing
- P-Brook trout habitat
- Eastern cottontail
- Threatened plants
- P -High priority MS4 waterbody

Water Quality Problem

- P-Impaired for bacteria & aquatic life
- P -Urban Impaired
- P -TMDLs – statewide impervious cover & bacteria
- P -Highway Access-Related Development
- Does not meet Class B standards for benthic macroinvertebrates
- Diurnal DO swings, nutrient issues, high bacteria in Richardson Brook
- Stressors include: poor riparian vegetated zone, stream channel alteration and resulting stream bank erosion and degraded habitat, elevated phosphorus [range from 10 to 300 µg/L (criterion: 30µg/L)], decreased dissolved oxygen (DO) (range from 4.9 ppm to 9.68 ppm; multiple sites with more than 7 days lower than 7 ppm criterion) and elevated chloride and specific conductance (260 mg/l).

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- 13-14% Impervious cover in watershed
- Stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces is the largest source of NPS
- Dense commercial development, retail/industrial parks

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Biddeford

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 6/2/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Feasibility for Success

- An estimated 11 lbs/year of Total Nitrogen, 1 lb/year of Total Phosphorous and 780 lbs/year of Total Suspended Sediments will be removed (numbers are only for the proposed soil filter), habitat improvements

-Letters of Commitment from Biddeford HS, Saco River Watershed Collaborative, Morin Maine LLC, Biddeford Conservation Commission

-Other partners include Town of Arundel, Maine DOT (Restoration Committee)

-Workplan includes BMP installation at 3 properties in the industrial park, 1 chop and drop (5,900 feet)

Q-No use of consultant for chop and drop? I believe they used one for Phase I work.

-Education task includes 1 buffer workshop, 2 press releases, and a site walk.

-Ordinance development task

N-Water quality monitoring task – Not sure how effective this sampling plan will be at determining if BMPs are working – the underdrained soil filters don't do anything for temp, DO, or chloride. Would want to see macroinvertebrate sampling & nutrient samples being collected too. Also, water quality monitoring is not highly compatible with the 319 grant program.

Cost Effectiveness

-42% match

-71.7% of grant costs used for construction

Q-Volunteer in-kind match to project management? Does not fit with this task

- stormwater compensation fund money should be listed separately in the matching funds table (budget part 3).

-Costs seem reasonable

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/22/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

N-Watchic Lake Association has no prior 604b/319 grant experience and has no paid staff. Concern about capacity.

P- Involved parties do have impressive credentials and show commitment to the project.

P- will hire consultant to assist with all tasks in the workplan; no indication that they will require BMP design experience

-There is a lot of unnecessary information in this section that belongs elsewhere in the proposal.

N-WLA volunteer engineer – not enough detail provided to assess whether he is qualified to review BMP plans. Also only listed as “reviewing” not actively making recommendations- would benefit from a qualified engineer to assess some of these sites.

Q-CCSWCD engineer is listed in project partners, but is not listed in this section

Relative Value of the Waterbody

-carry-in launch at Kiwanis Beach, public access (paid)

-Saco River watershed

-residential development – 175 shoreline parcels

-Some agriculture, gravel pits, and logging in the watershed

P-Relatively close to Greater Portland means heavier use by public

-Coldwater fish habitat

-public wells, some rare species (dragonfly), habitat

Water Quality Problem

P-Lakes Most at Risk List

-Mentions internal loading, but I don’t think there is evidence of this. No sediment chemistry data exists that I am aware of, and bottom TP grabs do not suggest large amounts of internal load (although more data should be collected).

-Mesotrophic

-Dissolved oxygen depletion

-Streams have somewhat high nutrients/low DO & pH, but did not enumerate. – no biomonitoring/DEP data to back this up that I could find.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202002031

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: (reviewed by evaluator) 5/22/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Amanda Pratt

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

- Main source of NPS is erosion from development (more data could have been presented here on the amount of development pressure)
- Acknowledge NPS contribution from septic, agriculture, logging operations, and gravel operations
- Watershed and Shoreline survey in 2019. I don't know much about the watershed survey – DEP was not involved. 26 sites identified.
- Watershed survey site breakdown: "59% erosion issues (soil, surface, road shoulder, or ditch erosion, and sediment transport), 21% culvert issues (clogged, damaged, unable to handle water volume, or undercut stream banks), 8% buffer issues (poor or lack of buffer), 5% roadside plow/grader berm, 3% new development, and 3% animal/nutrients input." – breakdown provided later differs from this one

Feasibility for Success

- Letter of Support from Town of Standish (in-kind match for town road work)
- Engineering support from CCSWCD – not mentioned in applicant section or in budget or tasks, no letter of support – should be included as a subgrantee – not sure if they were put into project partners section by mistake?? Some of these sites would benefit from having engineering assistance. Proposal mentions WLA volunteer engineer – I don't know what his background is, and he may not have the correct qualifications/certification that are required to adequately assess these sites. Credentials were vague.
- Consultant being used for much of the work proposed
- Workplan calls for BMP installation on 3 private road sites and 2 town road sites. Not sure I agree with the recommendations for site A11. Looks like the road/driveway should also be addressed (unless the vegetation is replacing the parking area). Also not really sure if planned work for sites B2 and B3 will fully address the erosion problem, however this is a difficult site. Because it is a stream, I am not sure if you will be able to get a permit for a "stone step pool". May want to have an engineer look at the site and give recommendations.
- Ten residential matching grants
- Education and Outreach: press releases/mailings/emails/web posts, brochure, annual meeting presentations, educational sign, buffer planting demonstration project – very little detail on the last piece.
- Would have been good to have a task related to ordinances/addressing issues around new development

Cost Effectiveness

N-40.1% match

N-Estimated 2.5 tons sediment/2.3 lb phosphorus removal is really low – I think this is an underestimate; however \$126,000 for such a small reduction is not a good return on investment

N-Overall costs higher than average because of use of consultant

N-3 steering committee meetings at a contractual cost of over \$3000 is really high - \$1000 per meeting; I would also expect match to be higher for this task.

-56% of grant funds going toward construction

-Most of the match is coming from WLA.

-Other than the higher contractual costs, construction costs and other task costs seem reasonable.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Biddeford

DATE: 5/27/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / **N=**Negative / **Q** = Question / - Other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Good

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

P: Biddeford successfully completed Phase I, and working on Phase II. City Engineer has worked on the first two phases, City Planner worked on Phase I (Comp Plan WQ work, and Nonpoint education program both positive).

P: YCSWCD – experience managing 319 grants/ CCSWCD engineer included.

N/Q: YCSWCD has applied for a handful of grants this round as both grantees and subgrantees, and currently managing 6 (some may finish this year, some may extend , potential to be managing 10)

Relative Value of the Waterbody- Fair to Good

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

P: Public access to waterbody via Eastern Trail

P: Endangered species and signficiant habitat areas – New England Cottontail, highly threatened brook trout fishery, threatened swamp saxifrage, and vernal pool areas.

P: Saco Valley Land Trust – 40 acre parcel with section of Brook.

N: focus for BCC / City of Biddeford Master Plan as important – but doesn't explain why.

N: Does not suggest it's has recreationally or commercial value

Water Quality Problem- Very Good

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

P: Impaired for bacteria & Aquatic Life (benthic macroinvertebrates, degraded aquatic habitat). Statewide Bacteria TMDL, Statewide IC TMDL.

P: Understanding of the issue is clear and data collection supports it; 2004,2012, 2013 macro samplings. 2012/2014 water quality monitoring supports - likely IC is largest pollution source

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good to Very Good

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

P: May require the characteristics of a watershed with 8% IC

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Biddeford

DATE: 5/27/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P: various assessments to ID stressors: poor riparian zone, stream channel alteration/degradation, elevated P, decreased DO, elevated chloride and sc

P: WBP identified 9 retrofit projects, two instream habitat restoration projects, 5 buffer restoration projects, three culvert replacements and one bank stabilization project.

Feasibility for Success - Good (Phase II extension)

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

P: Strong cohort of stakeholders – that have been actively working on restoring the brook.

P: Won't be restored with this phase, but additional phases planned.

P: well sequenced tasks. BMP installations, educational component both strong and have stakeholder participation (esp. workshop Task 4)

P: Morin Maine letter of commitment.

Q: Looks like Morin Maine is being matched with Stormwater Comp Funds? See question in Cost Effectiveness section

Q/P: Task 5 ordinance development success in previous phases? Appears so...

Q/N: Task 3 – BMP: #1 we had previously said 319 would likely not pay for improving a filled in catch basin- still written such that it is unclear what DEP will cover and what Biddeford will do.

N: Phase II seems likely to go into an extension year, therefore if awarded there would be concurrent implementation projects

Cost Effectiveness – Good

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Significant match for Task 3: BMP Installation

N: Task 4 doesn't seem like enough to cover

N/ Q: Morin Maine LLC site seems rather experience (\$77,081) – does that seem reasonable?

Q: Is Christine Ohman technically a contractor to the city and not city staff?

Q: majority of match is coming from Comp Fund, not from landowners, only ~10,000 from landowners – is that still a CSA with landowners ?

- Donated Services Labor doesn't match in Part 2

Comprehensive Plan

Misc. notes for Group discussion:

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Boothbay Region Water District

DATE: 5/28/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience – Good to Very Good

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

P: BRWD successful grant management / experience, construction experience

P: Successfully completed a 319 NPS grant since 2015, working on Phase II – 42 NPS sites remediated.

P: Staff well experienced; Sue Mello- grant manager , Dale Harmon – Construction Foreman

P: Subgrantee, Town of Boothbay, Public Works Dept. for BMP install / consultants – contractors and design experience

N: Doesn't include consultants qualifications

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Good to Very Good (esp. drinking water)

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

P: Public water supplied for Boothbay, Boothbay Harbor and Southport – provide water for 5000 residences, businesses, public and private institutions. → critical for both health and economic vitality.

P: Recreational uses: Adams – fishing, walking, skiing, skating and paddle boating (no swimming) & knickerbocker – swimming (only freshwater lake on peninsula for swimming), boating, skiing ,ice-skating and year round fishing.

P: Town-owned public access/dock for Knickerbocker.

P: Partly within largest undeveloped habiata block in Boothbay – habitats of statewide significance for wading birds.

Water Quality Problem - Good

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

P: Threatened – Most at Risk for New Development

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Boothbay Region Water District

DATE: 5/28/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P: Water quality monitoring since 1977 (Adams) and 1991 (Knickerbocker) – MDEP considers water quality below average for the state., prolonged oxygen depletion during summer months in Knickerbocker – potential for P to leave bottom sediments.

P: Lake modeling conducted by FBE in 2018 – which indicated 13% developed area contributes to 71% P load for Adams Pond & 7% developed area contributes 57% P load to Knickerbocker = both lakes very vulnerable to nutrient inputs from NPS/ any inputs of P from new development.

N: only occasional DO depletion in Adams deep areas

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good to Very Good

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

P: watershed surveys in 2002 & 2014, stream and infrastructure surveys in 2015 – 48 sites, 5 additional – roads were most frequent NPS site (54%), driveways – second more common (25%), shorefront residences, public facilities.

P: Understanding of how recent tourist facilities developed in watershed could attribute to NPS / lacked stormwater mgmt.. – current ordinances allow for development in watershed

P: FBE modeled – Adams TP increase of greater than 1ppb or 203ppb in Knickerbocker would result in unacceptable water quality decline. - max loads could be reached in Adams in 17 years and Knickerbocker in 31.

P: 2015-2019, BMPs installed in 42 NPS sites – needs continued work.

Feasibility for Success - Good to Very Good

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

P: strong history of stakeholder involvement – BRWD, Town of Boothbay, Knox Lincoln SWCD, Knickerbocker Lake Association, Boothbay Region YMCA, BRLT, West Harbor Pond watershed association, and landowners

P: Strong actions outside of grant work – zoning ordinances, Comp plan updates, CEO meetings

P: Task 2 seems reasonable / good use of money – project seems straight forward and based on images provided, the site would benefit greatly from BMPs

Q: anticipating no further phases, is 3 enough to protect the waterbodies? 48 sites found in watershed survey, 5 additional – 42 addressed throughout the phases – so, yes, maybe this is all that is needed- but clear that the town is prove to have momentum to address development risk through zoning ordinances, COMP plan updates and CEO Meetings. .

N/Q: Education and outreach task seems a bit vague and not able to measure if the outreach is successful or not – but then again, it's also a low cost task.

Cost Effectiveness - Good to Very Good

P: Reasonable cost estimate for overall project, and budgeted for all that is left to be done of the WBP.

Q: enough money for PCR?

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD

DATE: 5/29/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience – Good

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

P: Heather and Chris have ample experience. Heather has been involved with Highland Lake for past two years – watershed survey & assisted with writing the plan. Chris involved in past three phases/ They are supported by CCSWCD with financial support and educators

Q/N: No subgrantee or consultants? Task 3a includes contractual – maybe lawyers? Should their qualifications have been described?

Relative Value of the Waterbody - Good

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

P: Recreational: closest Lake to Portland – predominately year-round residents – highly developed- 320/ on shorefront and 1100 in watershed. Year round recreational uses - swimming, boating, water skiing ,snowmobiling, ice and open water fishing. Public boat launch.

P: Habitat: Endangered Eastern Box Tutle, and habitat suitable for lang-eared bat and small whorled pogonia. 2 dozen species of migratory bird habitat. Fish – 9 species. Alewife population / dam improvements

Q/N: Doesn't mention if it's a drinking water supply for the residents? Assuming it is.

Water Quality Problem – Very Good

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

P: Very informed understanding of issues from extensive WQ data sets since the 1970s and recent intensive studying.

P: Was impaired, removed in 2010 after extensive remediation, but P levels have been gradually increasing

P: Cyanobium picocyanobacterial blooms in past 6 years – clarity drops to 2-3meters → many researchers involved/lot of focus – suspected alewife-altered trophic cascade is triggering bloom – either way experts agree need for P reduction.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD

DATE: 5/29/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Q/P: "Debated about being relisted as impaired" – (ask Amanda where this stands) – potential for nonattainment in the future. – Watch list for Lakes Unit

Theory – coming back into equilibrium

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Good to Very Good

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

P: HLA lead an updated NPS watershed survey – 129 erosion sites document, with 71 residential/driveway, 27 being private roads (most significant erosion problems), two ag site. Road BMP survey 2019 – 34 roads total, 19 did not need maintenance.

P: DEP staff surveyed lakes perennial trib road crossings 2019 – 5 trib stream crossings with issues → added to NPS Tracker

P: Septic system vulnerability assessment conduct – 21 parcels met the criteria as at risk to contributing and need further investigating.

- Overall, very thoroughly analyzed, and surveyed with a strong understanding of P issues, and database of sites that need to be addressed.

P: Updated 10-year 2020 Highland Land Watershed-Based Management Plan

Q: not clear to me if the Road BMPs that were added to the tracker were from previous 319 or not

Feasibility for Success – Good to Very Good

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

P: Strong stakeholder involvement historically and currently– HLA, HLLT, DEP, Town of Windham, Town of Falmouth – that has been successful with past CWQ section 319 grants and independently through HLA and municipality action.

P: Focuses on highest known NPS sites and provides load reduction estimates – 68 tons of sediment and 57 pounds of Phosphorus

P: Task 3b seems very important, and not feasible without 319 financial assistance.

P: Overall, I think this project is a proactive and targets the highest priority NPS Sites, while educating a large sum of people in regards to road associations/ BMPs/ maintaining their roads to prevent any further degradation.

Q: Task 3a- What is being considered "Donated Labor"? is it attendance for the roundtable.

Q/N: Task 5 – It seems like the match in Task 5 might come from the Committee's 10 year education and outreach plan, and it would be helpful to understand what actions are being considered for implementation here.

- 6 S.C. meetings – too much?
- Additional phases needed/planned in order to protect the lake.
- Maybe combine 3b and 4 and have a "NPS Abatement Site" Task and have 3a being it's own task

Cost Effectiveness - Good

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Similar to comment above – I think this is a good return for investment, Task 3b is expensive but its targeting a high priority site, especially after so much work has been completed in previous phases.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD

DATE: 5/29/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Q/N: Is the Windham Watershed Grant funds guaranteed? Does it weaken the proposal if there isn't a backup for match funding?

:

P: Task 5 education match value is strong, as well as Task 3a, which will both lend to local ongoing efforts outside of this grant.

Q: Total Cost for task 4 doesn't add up correctly. Total cost should be \$25,187.45 – doesn't seem like much for the amount of match?

P: Project Budget should be (when Task 4 is fixed), Federal Funds: 87192.05 and nonfederal match: \$70932.40, therefore total project cost is \$158,124.45 and the grant/match ratio is 55% to 45%

Q: Does Payroll for Ag sites seem expensive for Task 4? Preliminary outreach to 2 horse farms – It seems appropriate if BMPs do get installed, but the way it is written it doesn't seem clear if they'll be interest/participation from at least one of the two landowners.

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD

DATE: 6/1/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience – Good

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

P: Heather and Chris – extremely competent, years of experience

Q/N: will there be town/consultant involved for ag sites? No qualifications described

Relative Value of the Waterbody - Good

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

P: Recreation: highly prized fly fishing river in Southern Maine – IF&W manages for coldwater fisheries by stocking, excellent native Brook trout habitat

P: significant vernal pools, deer wintering areas, inland wading bird and waterfowl habitat. Great Blue Heron habitat- species of concern. Only habitat in southern Maine for Brook Floater – state threatened and federal species of concern – drastically declining numbers in past 10 years.

Q/N: Trails and/or Preserved Land?

Water Quality Problem – Fair to Good

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

P: impaired. Data for 30 years

Q/N: Impaired for DO but does not provide details/data to support this

P: Partners (DEP, PRLT, CBEP and others) identify Pleasant River as the top emerging threat to wq of Presumpscot and Casco Bay.

P: understanding of impairment – Bacteria # repeatedly exceeding Class B standard in dry and wet

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Good

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

P: Watershed survey /assessments to help with understanding of issues and actions

- 2008 – 95 NPS sites (35% town roads, 15% private roads, 14% residential, 10%ag, 9% state, and business, construction, trail and boat access sites (17%) – half ranked as high or medium impact!

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD

DATE: 6/1/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- 2009 Hotspot inventory/neighborhood assessment – certain roads “moderate” for NPS pollution from septic and turn mgmt.. 7 sites as potential hotspots (spills,leaks, waste mgmt., turn, landscaping...)
- IF&W Brook Floater survey, 2001 – 120 documented. 2009- only 20!! → 2020 summer bank erosion survey follow up.

N: Bacteria is tricky -

Feasibility for Success - Good

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

P: both towns expressed strong interests in addressing issues, and have proven to be proactive. NRAC in Windham, and Gray worked with CCSWCD in 2019.

P: Strong steering committee

P/Q: Task 4 – 8 BMP sites will be impactful – is their landowner commitment for any of these sites?

P: The social media outreach plan seems like a great way to reach a broader audience

Q: 6-8 S.C meetings seems high

N: Task 3 seems like good education, but what does “explore incentives” mean? It appears that there hasn't been any direct outreach to agricultural landowners at this point to see if there will be interest/buy in. I can see that this task will be helpful for future 319 projects, but uncertain about its impact for this phase.

Cost Effectiveness – Good to Very Good

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Significant match provided – nearly 50% Demonstrates a strong stakeholder interest and how much they value their project / the resource.

P: Estimates seems reasonable for the projected outcome.

Comprehensive Plan

- Was the plan updated? It says 2011 for WBP

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook

DATE: 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Notes / O - other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- Ms. Curtis (First Selectmen) and Ms. Folmer (Treasurer) to oversee the grant / strong financial management and grant experience.
Qualified environmental consultant - experience with 319 grants, working with municipal staff, and implemented watershed-based plans, capable of pollutant load calculations and outreach.
Subgrant: UMaine Cooperative Ext. wild blueberry specialist – Dr. Lily Calderwood – research and education program work to develop whole system approaches to wild blubbery production, and IPM at forefront of work.

P: This grant has put together a strong group of qualified individuals.

Q/N: Who was involved in Phase I from the town? Were either Ms. Curtis or Ms. Folmer involved and therefore knowledgeable and experience specific to this grant? If they weren't involved, is there continuity/communication between the two phases?

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Fair

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

- Public Access via Town Lot Road (no formal boat launch) & undeveloped & Frenchman Bay Conservancy 135-acre Abrahams Woods Preserve – but public access is being negotiated– foundation for increased public access - otherwise all roads are private.
Headwaters to (via four other lakes) of the Union River – designated critical habitat for the Atlantic Salmon.
Recreation – boating, fishing, swimming, public hiking trail being mapped out.
Habitat – warmwater fish- bass, perch, pickerel – “trophy bass” pond designation. 2 loons, bald eagles, osprey, kingfishers, blue herons, ducks...

Q: Given it's proximity to other lakes in the area – how significant is it to the public recreationally/economically? Can't see on google maps much of an access from Town Lot Road – is that well used?

Q: 60 developed camps - Seasonal/year round? Is it drinking water supply for these homes.

P: Progress in conserving land, and making the lake more accessible in the future. Headwaters for Union River – important for atlantic salmon.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook

DATE: 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

N: Overall, it doesn't appear to have a strong recreational value, as there is limited public access, there are other larger lakes close by.

Water Quality Problem- Fair to Good

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Flushing rate is 0.42flushes/yr
- Threatened – Watch List – history of algal blooms
- Data collection since 1980 - Secchi average – 4.7m / Phosphorus average 15ppb. / well mixed, and low DO mid-summer in the bottom 3m.
- Nuisance algal blooms – potential is moderate to high (1999,2002,2012,and 2018)

P: ~40 years of data to help understand the issue – they included clear and essential data.

Q/N: It is included that unless nutrients are addressed, the potential for algal blooms will continue. It is curious that has only bloomed 4x in the past 21 years) – it would have been helpful to also see other data to see if water quality in general has been declining through the years.

Q: Who collects and analyzes the data? Has the town been involved in this?

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Fair to Good

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- LakeSmart Program 2011-present 25 of 60 have participated
- 2015 Watershed Survey – 34 NPS sites – 20 residential and driveways (59%)and 14 private road sites (41%). 12 high impact, 14 medium impact = 26, 16 of 26 were roads and driveways.
- Additional assessment needed for septic system and runoff from commercial blueberry barrens is needed.
- 2017 Watershed-Based Protection Plan – 10 year plan.

P: eyes on almost half the residential properties via LakeSmart through watershed survey and ten year plan.

N: Runoff from commercial blueberry barrens (DEP est. 11% of the land within 500m is agricultural production) seems critical to assess for nutrient enrichment to lake– has this been done?

O: Mentions APA in Section IV, but not previously – would have been great to have mentioned their involvement/credentials.

Feasibility for Success – Good

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

- Anticipated that one additional phase will be needed to address all NPS sites – unanimous vote from Board of Selectmen for the Town to serve as grantee
- Pleased to see workshop for blueberry farmers as a task
- SC – 4x , NPS Abatement: 5 private roads & 4 driveways , Residential NPS sites – 5 sites, Education/outreach- 2 press releases, two LakeSmart evals, buffer workshop,

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook

DATE: 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

two presentations, workshop on blueberry harvests, septic database and septic vulnerability map, project brochure, Watershed Living insert, newsletters

P: board involvement and only one additional phase, demonstrates both commitment and the likelihood that this lake will be protected through these efforts, however...

N: reiterating that I think the blueberry field runoff and septic's are important future steps in order to address the protection of this body of water fully.

N/Q: Septic assessment – don't think that is eligible.

Q: **Is Phase I going into 2021?**

P: Overall, all the tasks seem significant, impactful and manageable in scale.

Cost Effectiveness - Fair to Good

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Overall it seems like a good return for investment, as high priority sites will be addressed, significant education and outreach will be conducted, and the blueberry farmers workshop demonstrates initial steps to begin to address agricultural issues.

P: verbal commitments from landowners

N/Q: Task 5 seems potentially underbudgeted, and Task 4 seems over budgeted for contractual work – as those all seem like simple projects. Task 3 \$59,000 construction cost for 5 roads and 4 driveways? – May seem low based on severity of issues,

N: Consultant costs seems very high, and SC APA 76 hours seems very high (if each meetings ~2 hours, that'd be roughly 9-10 participants from APA – is that accurate?)

Q: If APA is involved in SC, education and outreach, liaison for cost-share projects, distributing press releases, conducting LakeSmart evaluations, assisting in buffer workshop, etc. I'd imagine there match would be significantly higher than \$4,751 (172 hours)

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Lewiston

DATE: 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- John Kuchinski -P.E Project Engineer City of Lewiston, 35 years of experience in civil engineer design and stormwater mgmt.- is the stormwater coordinator for City. Familiar with requirements
• Jeff Beaulé – P.E Acting City Engineer – 21 years of experience, involved with watershed plan.
• Consulting firm
• City of Lewiston – experience with federal grants

N: Consulting firm needs to be put out to bid, unless from city contract that followed procurement services - additionally no watershed management personal listed/described – nor describes consultant experience in past watershed implementation projects .

Q: Who managed Phase I?

Q: The grants mentioned – were those 604b/319 funded? – Just one soil filter? Updating a watershed? USSR Surveys?

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Poor to Fair

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

- Value is degraded for most recreational purposes
• Stream retains some riparian habitat - Limited aquatic habitats

N: The description provided does not describe the stream as valuable for any reasons, aside from retaining some riparian habitats.

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- WQ data monitored since 2011
• 22% IC – heavily developed portions of upper watershed
• Impaired for temp, DO, bacteria and nutrients, aquatic life.
• E.coli – nutrient and bacteria loading from anthropogenic sources

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Lewiston

DATE: 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Chloride- runoff from road salt or washing of road salted grit – toxic to freshwater stream organisms / chloride in groundwater can impact base flow

P: Thorough explanation of impacts from elevated water temp, DO, *E.coli*, and chlorides– demonstrates understanding of issues and impacts on the health of Hart Brook

P: waterbody is impaired for many reasons, and nonattainment in the future is certain without action.

N: Numbers weren't provided to support these descriptions

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- Polluted stormwater, excessive fertilizer use, disposal of yard waste, wastewater leakage, transport via groundwater
- *E.coli* – nutrient and bacteria loading from anthropogenic sources – underground leakage of sanitary sewer pipes, potential pet waste runoff
- Concrete lined channel and lack of riparian vegetation – resulting in high temps.
- Priority catchments – Industry and Lower watersheds b/c of IC & nutrients

N: Generalization of cause for impairment – does not describe the results from any assessments done to determine the actual causes and therefore how to prioritize remediation efforts.

Q: Were assessments done? If so what were the results?

Q: What occurred in Phase I = was that successful?

P: Though the issues described are vague, there is an understanding of actions needed to address the various NPS issues in this watershed.

Feasibility for Success

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

- Working group – doesn't say how frequently they will meet
- Task 3– biofiltration structural BMPs – 0.55 acres to be treated- pollutant and temperature reduction of stormwater runoff – does not mention that DEP will review and approve plans prior to construction.
- Task 4 – biofiltration structural BMP- reduce peak flow and provide water quality treatment – pollutant and temperature reduction of stormwater runoff. Treat approximately 0.5 acres of road runoff
- Both BMPs will be in Industrial Subwatershed
- Task 5 – Shade tree plantings
 - Q:** How many shade trees?
- Task 6 PCR – two sites

P: BMP Installations will have some impact – around 1 acre of IC will be treated through this project.

N: Not likely waterbody will be restored – but progress!

Q/N: Are there stakeholders, other than city staff, that should be a part of this working group? Landowners, businessowners, etc.

N: doesn't appear/acknowledge community support or input – this project could benefit from community involvement – be it on the steering committee, through education and outreach, etc.

N: The Bio-infiltration structures will just be going back into the cement lined ditch, which isn't good habitat and will pick pollutants back up.

Cost Effectiveness

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Lewiston

DATE: 6/4/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

- Task 1 and 2 grant/match cost not completed – assumed it's match given breakdown
- Task 2 doesn't include any match from participating stakeholders – only city staff
- Significant construction match from the city
- All grant funding going to construction
- Task 5 is vague – how many trees can you buy / what's the install cost – it's all lumped into one construction cost
- Task 6 cost is very high for only two projects.

N: Significant amount of money for a brook that isn't described as highly valuable, nor does plan describe how many phases needed to reach attainment.

P: All grant funds go to construction

N: Task 6 is way too expensive.

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Notes

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- MC regional conservation organization – merger of five organizations. Damariscotta Lake, Sheepscot River, Medomak River
Director of Finance and Human Resources
Cara O'Donnell – manage and provide technical expertise to implement. 17 years of experience in watershed mgmt., managing a previous 319 grant (?), nonpoint source assessment, ag non-point source assessment

P: Support from additional MC Staff and KLSWCD – Director of finance, Cara has relevant experience, and the addition of Jess and KLSWCD to conduct education / outreach will be beneficial –

N: however KLSWCD, Jess and Ali quals are not described.

N: No consulting services included – especially engineering support. MC has needed DEP assistance in understanding NPS sites, BMPs, and 319

N: Concerns about phase I – staff turnover, meant two different managers – both unable to put in the adequate time needed to complete the grant in a timely and organized fashion, and this grant is similar in size and requirements.

Q: Will KLSWCD receive a subgrant – S.C., technical support, and community workshops?

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Economic and Recreational benefits - Largest lake in Lincoln County, Damariscotta Lake State Park, seasonal and year round residents, two summer camps, private campground, two boat launches, and two private (public) launches
Drinking Water source – residence
Terrestrial/Aquatic benefits – abundant cold and warm water fisheries – 1 million alewives, 50 loons, bass, brown trout, lake trout, rainbow smelt, state-listed bluets, bald eagles and great blue herons. Outlet – shellfish beds
Scenic and Aesthetic benefits - MC Conservation easements

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P: Great description of the value of this waterbody, incorporating all key benefits, supported by data.

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Threatened – “sensitive to additional p inputs”
- Data collection since 1977 at three points – temp, D.O, Secchi Disk Transparency May-October & Baseline data
- Increase in water clarity over time, no reduction in water clarity to South Arm – statistical increase in clarity
- Greatest threat – Phosphorus – upward trends in the south arm, but not discernable trends in Muscongus or Great Bay. However – later notes “esp. If P levels continue to increase” – contradictory conclusions?
- Chlorophyll A is stable.
- Increasing temps – water clarity trends unlikely to continue in positive direction
- DO reduction within hypolimnion – potential increase productivity - nutrient release from sediments under anoxic sediments – however sediment chemistry is unfavorable for P release
- Climate change – temp increase and loss of ice cover

N: Increase in water clarity suggest improvements, and Muscongus and Great Bay P loads are not concerning- and therefore nonattainment in the future is not a concern, except for South Arm (but is shallower and more narrow). Sediment chemistry in unfavorable for P release and therefore internal loading unlikely.

P: Clear and thorough data analysis provided, top concerns are water quality in the South Arm, and warming temperatures due to climate change.

A little confused – as when I spoke with Jody she was very concerned with the data suggesting water clarity was declining based on the report Zach finished? However, I believe Cara and Patricia met with Linda to discuss the report that was created.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- First NPS watershed survey in 1990 14%, 1999 remaining 86% → First WBP in 2001
- 2014 – watershed survey of entire watershed – 172 sites identified (81 high and medium priority sites, 6 are town roads, 17 state roads → WBP 2015
- 2017 voluntary Septic Survey, 11 inspections and 8 designs – all but 1 was unsatisfactory.
- New Development as NPS threat – increase by 2% developed in 12 years (one square mile impacted). 6% of watershed is developed – mostly concentrated near lake.
- Need to address ag NPS sites – plan to work with NRCS/KLSWCD

P: septic survey is very interesting, especially to know that over half of the inspections were unsatisfactory and therefore makes me wonder how many throughout the watershed may be unsatisfactory – great additional info to the NPS surveys and momentum for addressing septic sites.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P: acknowledging new development and agricultural sites as a threat is a strong addition to the NPS survey.

P: Strong understanding of the types, numbers, and severity of NPS sites.

Feasibility for Success

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

- 9 NPS Sites will be addressed, YCC at residential NPS sites
- Stakeholders – DLWC, KLSWCD, landowners, municipalities – Jefferson
- At least 3 S.C. meetings, town representatives, MC members – engineers/educators, road association presents, DLWC members, KLSWCD and NRCS.
- 9 NPS sites – sites and BMPs were selected based on priority, impact and landowner interest and cooperation.
- Task 4 YCC – 36 BMPs on 12 properties in each field season = 24 properties total
- Task 5 – 2 workshops – StreamSmart or Gravel Rd Workshop plus Septic Workshop

Q/N: DLWC will provide outreach to its council ? Not sure what this means – DLWC council is already knowledgeable about these issues – who will they be educating? Is this counting as match somewhere?

N: Wallace Ave – while Dave suggested retaining wall – it was discussed that that likely isn't eligible with 319 funding – an alternative would have to be looked into

Q/N: Shoreline stabilization – alternatives to riprap should be explored. Are these all neighbors? What will the total length of riprap be?

P: Seems likely to be protected through the current efforts, and 2-3 more anticipated additional phases. The tasks are well sequenced and address issues directly, while educating the public, agricultural landowners, road associations, addresses septic issues – well rounded.

Q/P: was their verbal agreement from any of the S.C members – strong group of stakeholders with varying knowledge and expertise to share.

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Overall good return for investments

Q: is Dept. Ag soil Scientist time counting as match?

N: YCC program costs seem very high. Previously relied more on match/donations since this is less impactful than NPS abatement projects. **Q/N:** lease for truck doesn't seem eligible?

Q/N: crew leader is more expensive than Project manager but far less responsibility and far shorter timeframe?

Q/N: BMP construction costs seems generally underbudgeted - Tharpe property seems underbudgeted, MacDonald seems underbudgeted for a culvert replacement – slight concern about projects being more expensive than available funds.

Q: Not sure it's eligible to pay for Railsback fellow through grant? They should not receive volunteer rate.

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / **N=**Negative / **Q =** Question / - Notes

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- Michele Windsor has been a project/program manager for numerous grants, including four 319 grants – tracking progress/spending. Environmental education bacvkground, LakeSmar program, CPESC
- Sub-contract with ARWC - Jeff Stern 39 years of experience in watershed management, extensive 319 experience (at least 8)
- Contracted Engineer for OCSWCD – Ross Cudlitz – 30 years of NPS projects

P: Incredibly well rounded group of project highly qualified and experienced project managers/sub-contractors.

Q: Is the Contracted engineer from an ongoing contract that used procurement services to hire?

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- 118 waterfront lots
- Drinking water source for 90 households and 10 businesses (economic significance)
- Recreation: Public boat launch, two town beaches- swimming, ice hockey, skating, carnival, Trail on east side.
- Aquatic habitat – warm water fishery – 12 fish species, stocked with brown trout (2019, 2016,2012). Habitat for wild brook trout
- Wildlife – Loons, deer, bald eagles, ducks and moose
- 80 acre wetland

P: Of significant importance for recreational uses, drinking water source, and aquatic and wildlife habitat

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Data collection since 1980 – one algal bloom in 1980, close to another bloom in 1990s

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- WQ is slightly below average. P higher than average, water clarity relatively close – slightly below average, DO depletion substantial
- Threatened – serves as a public drinking water source

P: Threatened – and data suggests overall slight decrease in water quality.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- Watershed survey in 2019 – 62 erosion sites, 34 on roads, 17 residential, 7 beach/boat, and 4 municipals/paths.
- Soil loss provided for highest impact – understanding of P issue
- LakeSmart program – 15% of more properties have had LakeSmart evaluations
- Previous survey – 1998
- One additional phase needed to address high impact sites

P: Evident that there has been ongoing surveys through the years, and an active LakeSmart program – education and action on many sites, and therefore remaining high priority sites needed to be addressed to attain water quality standards.

Q/N: any septic or ag concerns in this watershed to address on top of NPS sites to ensure all potential sources of nutrients are addressed

Feasibility for Success

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

- Stakeholders – OCSWCD, Town of Canton & Hartford, ARWC, LAA, Canton Mountain Wind, Lake Shore Drive residents, Pine Shore Subdivisions, Snowmobile club & watershed residents – all participating and supporting to various degrees
- Tasks – S.C. at least 4 times, NPS abatement sites – 14 high priorities sites, 22 tech assist visits, 7 residential matching grants, workshops – camp roads and buffer plantings,
- Benefits – estimated 45 tons of soil per year for pollutant load reductions, and 5 tons/yr from technical assistance, est. 5 tons/year from matching grants = 55tons total and 50' of shoreline buffered.

P: Strong and diverse stakeholder participation

P: Education and outreach task demonstrates the grantee wants to understand any barriers that landowners may have and try to bridge the gap and provides incentives.

P: The tasks are well sequenced, balanced, and take a very holistic approach to addressing watershed mgmt issues.

Q: Task 4: will these be installed? who is doing implementation of tech assist? Residents? Or is this just outreach. Because a pollutant load reduction is included, it seems like they'd be installed.

Q/N: #3-01 #4-02, sounds like it may be a maintenance issue

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: great return for investment

P: Match comes from diverse stakeholders , demonstrating commitment to this project as a community at large.

Q: Task 3 may be underbudgeted for 14 NPS Sites – Especially - #6-07, #1-08, #6-05, #6-04,

→ Excavation costs/equipment costs for plunge pools & culvert replacements

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- Michele Windsor has been a project/program manager for numerous grants, including four 319 grants – tracking progress/spending. Environmental education background, LakeSmart program, CPESC
Contracted Engineer for OCSWCD – Ross Cudlitz – 30 years of NPS projects
Subcontract – valid BMPs implemented – well versed in non-point source pollution prevention and water quality protection, must be knowledgeable of 319 grant, and record of successful implementation of 319 work.
Volunteer quals –
->Sal (civil engineer) worked on North Pond 319 grant, gained local support, designed solutions, obtained contractors and tracked site progress. Successful project manager
Alice – PE Civil / Land Surveyor – planning, estimating and implementing BMPs – Previous NRCS employee – implemented conservation practices (stream crossings, roads, level lip spreades, ag sites) & Brunswick DPW – road reconstruction and drainage projects
Jon – Civil engineer – worked on North Pond 319 – site plans.

P: Strong collaborative effort by program manager, contracted engineer, subcontractor and impressive volunteer involvement with professional experience.

Q: ASK GROUP – reliable commitment from volunteers, especially time?

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Recreational/Economic Benefit: Public access- Norway town park, Western Foothills Land Trust – multiple preserves on lake, Ordway Grove – Public park and nature preserve. Two commercial marines with private boat launches. Park used by 100-250 people per day. Ranked in top 12 best maine lakes for swimming. Large and small bass and trout, bass tournaments. Trails, preserves
1413 residential, commercial, town and ag properties in watershed. 341 shoreline
Drinking water source for waterfront properties

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Economic – Norway's four lakes – shoreline property owners make up 20% or the property tax revenue.
- Habitat: bald eagle, 25.5 acre shallow water inland wading bird and waterfowl habitat – significant wildlife habitat under NRPA.

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Outlet for North Pond which is threatened, then Lake Penneesseewassee, then into Androscoggin.
- Threatened - Most at risk for new development
- WQM – since 1976 by DEP/hired contractors & since 2015- LAON volunteers
- Historically SDT 5.7m. DO – devoid by August in bottom 6m. P concentrations 12.3, chlorophyll 4.6ppb
- Bottom contours of lake make it susceptible to a certain level of “natural” oxygen loss

P: Summarizes all key data, and provides thorough explanations of what may be causing decline in water quality

Q: bottom contours of the lake - - natural oxygen loss? ASK AMANDA

Q: Aluminum/iron ratio of bottom sediments – sediment chemistry, to determine if phosphorus is being released? Low ratio 2.3 – but there isn't evidence of internal recycling.

- Gleotrichia

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- History of LAON efforts to understand lake issues and protection – WQM, CBI, IPP, outreach, watershed mgmt. added in 2015
- Lake Penneesseewassee Survey – 2019: 1400 properties surveyed, 180 NPS sites. Primary source – road surfaces, unstable road shoulders, ditched, culverts and lack of adequate vegetative buffers.
- Implementation grant on North Pond (outlets to Pen) – fixed 26 sites
- Phase I to fix 30% of the sites – most impactful and complex

P: Clear understanding and investigation into what NPS sites need to be addressed, and an approach to complete nearly all (30% in phase I and 50% through II and III = 80% addressed) through a multi-phased approach in order to improve water quality.

Q: What was the breakdown of high, medium, low priority sites? And town roads, private roads, residential breakdown?

N/Q: it is not clear to me if there could be any internal P loading – and therefore if by addressing all these NPS sites, the lake will be able to come off the threatened list?

Feasibility for Success

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

- Phase I will help maintain standards – pollutant reduce loads by 51 tons of sediment and 44 pounds of P

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD

DATE: 6/5/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Stakeholders: OCSWCD, LAON, Town of Norway, DEP, EPA, Consulting specialists – if needed
- Tasks – at least 4x S.C mtg, Task 3 NPS Abatement Projects – 16 high and medium sites – town road, private roads and med. Residential sites – 60% cost share, 75% for two projects – preliminary engineering is done. Commitment from town, and local road associations! Residential BMPs – at least 10 sites, free technical assistance – 50/50 – up to \$350 in grant funds to be matched. E&O- presentations, technical assistance, camp road workshop and buffer workshop, and enhance 50' shoreline veg.

P: Strong and varied stakeholders, town involvement, historically strong volunteer engagement in other projects – especially volunteers with specialized knowledge. 216 hours of LAON volunteer support

P: Current phase targets nearly 30% of NPS sites – great start to help protect lake.

Q: Is Subtask 5b – “Residential Matching Grant” technical assistance the same as Task 4? – how is the technical assistance cost broken up – in task4 or 5b?

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

Q: E& O: presentations, 2 meetings with Select Board, press releases, mailings, project brochure, 10 technical assistance visits, two workshops, List/description of all tech visits, and follow up....

- ➔ Education and outreach might be slightly underbudgeted – but extra cost could just be additional match? Is the technical assistance cost in Task 5 or Task 4 – it's described in both...

P: Tasks all seem reasonably priced, 76% spent on installation/construction

P: Quality match – significant amounts from Town of Norway, 2 Road Associations, and LAON, among others.

Q: S.C. salary & fringe for OCSWCD? – is that tied into donated services match? Should separate it out.

Q/N: A good amount of the sites seem underbudgeted? In particular, NPS Site project costs that seem underbudgeted:

- ➔ 03-02/03-03 – replace culvert might add to the cost
- ➔ 04-19 – crowning road – what is the length of road? Might not be enough to crown a road
- ➔ Cost of 04-19 is only 3372 but 11.52 tons of sediment, but 06-02 is \$20700 and only 0.847 tons/year – I do understand they are just estimates.

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: PWD

DATE: 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / **N=**Negative / **Q =** Question / - Other

Applicant Qualifications and Experience – Good

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- PWD: protect & educate since 1908, monitored since 1976. Lead the Sebago Lake Watershed Mgmt Plan in 2020, and 2014 survey. Completed Phase I, II, III
- CCSWCD – both Heather and Chris. Heather 18 years experience, Assisted/ Managed PWD last two implementation grants. Chris – has supported the 3 previous 319 grants with PWD.

P: Not a lot of specific qualifications given in regards to PWD individual who will be involved, but either way, PWD with assistance/management from CCSWCD makes for a very strong collaborative effort, with all having been involved in previous phases.

Q/N: Who specifically at PWD will be the project manager and what are their specific qualifications?

Q: Phase I, II, III 319 grants – what years were these?

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Primary drinking water for 200,000 – 15% of states population !
- Recreational: 2nd largest lake in Maine, 5 public beaches and 4 public boat launches, 7 marinas. Top tourist destination in Maine – 7 youth camps, and numerous recreational activities
- Aesthetic beauty
- Economic: 99.7 miles of shoreline – most privately owned, 2300 season and year-round homes.
- PWD expends more than 1.1million annually on source protection program
- Habitat – IF&W manages for lake trout, landlocked salmon, indigenous salmon population. Bass, brown trout, pickerel...Veral pools, wading bird and waterfowl habitat, deer wintering areas, state listed animal habitats for species of concern – bald eagle, great blue heron, eastern ribbon snake.

P: Very evident that Sebago is a highly valued waterbody for numerous reasons.

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: PWD

DATE: 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Monitored since 1976 – 14 current programs
- Oligotrophic – clearest lake in Maine, stable, SDT deeper than 10m, TP below 5ug/L, Chlorophyll-a below 1.5ug/l, DO 75 % saturation at bottom.

P: Data provided demonstrates the clear understanding that Sebago Lake has outstanding water.

N: Did not describe why it is on the threatened NPS Priority List – upon looking it up, it states “Outstanding Water Quality/ Public Water Source” Does data demonstrate any signs of declining water quality? Since it is such a large lake, it would have been nice to see data for each basin – see if there are any chances on a smaller scale....

Q: for group – is it on the list because of how critical it is that this lake remain healthy for the sake of it being a public water supply for 15% of the state?

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- Crooked River – 2011-2012 164 NPS sites
- 2014 – Sebago Lake Watershed Assessment and Prioritization Project – 604b: 2014 NPS Road Survey – all roads within direct watershed (define direct) – 61 road sites
- Neighborhood Hotspot = 27 neighborhoods – 5 commercial hotspots and 38 ag sites.
 - Conclusion: roads, lack of shoreline, disturbance of riparian, lack of treating stormwater

P: With the understand this is a very large watershed, there is clearly some direction of sites to address through the 2015 assessment of roads, and neighborhood assessment.

N/Q: How were the neighborhoods decided? What were the results?

N/Q: What is being defined as the direct watershed? How were certain neighborhoods prioritized? Has the whole watershed been surveyed?

N/Q: How many NPS Sites need to be addressed- how many are on the current NPS Site Tracker, how do they rank -high,med,low, what percentage are roads, shoreline, etc. Results are a little vague.

Feasibility for Success

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

- Maintain standards by addressing 8 high priority sites, for a reduction of 40 tons of sediment and 34lbs of P
- Stakeholders: PWD, CCSWCD, Camp O-At-Ka, Sebago Lake State Park
- Tasks: 6 S.C meetings, ? NPS sites in Task 3 50/50 cost-share, Task 4 Porous Parking Lot, Native Planting demonstration site at boat launch, lakescaping matching grants

N: Task 3 should summarize how many NPS sites will be addressed and how.

Q/P: The project partners does not include residents or municipalities – which would be key additions, though they are included in the Steering Committee

Q/N: No Town contributions/involvement, road associations?

Q: How were the 8 high priority sites chosen?

Q/N: Task 4 is very expensive – is it clearly a concern/contribution or more of a demonstration site, if mostly demonstration that is expensive.

Q/N: Task 5 – similar to comment above – is the boat launch a clear NPS site? And is buffer plantings all it needs?

P: Task 6: 8 sites to be addressed for private roads and residential sites.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: PWD

DATE: 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

N: Related to the water quality problem section – it's unclear how to measure if the work will help with attainment, as it is already meeting standards

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

•

P: Construction of BMPS are ~50/50 cost share, good source of match.

P: Match overall is 54% which is high, and roughly 59% match for construction projects.

P: Match - \$15,000 from state park (they don't get federal funding right? Any federal grants pass through to state to parks?)

N: Task 4/5 not good return for investment.

Q/N: Steering Committee seems budgeted – but mostly match.

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco

DATE: 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Notes

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- City of Saco – Joe L – 30 years experience, civil engineer, project management. Successful Phase I, and support to phase II.
• YCSWCD – Experience with 319, Jen project management.
• BSCC – new partner, but mission aligns with project, and proven to be committed.

P: This partnership has proven to be successful in Phase I and II. Joe has extensive experience in stormwater management, and engineering experience, and YCSWCD has been advantageous for outreach, reporting, and a variety of tasks. BSCC has a horticulturalist on staff – which will ensure proper care and maintenance of BMP installations.

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- OOB Beach destination – outlet of stream (recreational and economic value)
• Saco Heath at headwaters, Rachel Carson Refuge – public access and recreational value

P: Provides some recreational value

N: Overview is vague and does not describe much details not mentions aquatic or terrestrial habitat benefits.

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Impaired for Aquatic Life Use, Bacteria & Toxic Metals
• Aquatic Life – 31 year span of macroinvertebrate surveys – data suggest significant drop in classification in many locations.
• Bacteria – numerous exceedances, beach closures Ocean Park shellfish closure
• Toxics – identified potential sources for heavy metal sources,
• DO – 3 stations fell below class B standards (Bear Brook, Old Orchard Road), most stations met standards.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco

DATE: 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Chloride – five subwatersheds showed slightly elevated.

P: Clear understanding and data presented to demonstrate the impairments of

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- Bacteria – 5 subwatersheds – sewer and septic's are likely sources
- Chloride – 7 subwatersheds – winter road salt and groundwater contamination
- Habitat – 5 subwatersheds - Stream corridor assessment, geomorphic reconnaissance survey and Fish barrier study – 72 stream habitat problems (streambank erosion, inadequate buffer, waste dumping sites, fish barrier, stream alteration)
- Toxics – 3 subwatersheds – toxics due to high IC and land uses. 2015 stormwater retrofit survey identified 58 projects (28 high priority)
- Nutrients – 6 subwatersheds – septic/sewer, runoff, fertilizer
- Property surveys to ID septic issues / investigations of sewer and stormwater infrastructure – OOB & Saco → OOB dye testing at 68 homes
- Two previous phases, several more additional phases

P: Very thorough summary of the various surveys, monitoring and assessments conducted, providing a deep understanding of the issues and what needs to be addressed

Feasibility for Success

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

- In stream work will restore 625' of habitat, 7lbs/year of TN and 450 lbs/yr of sediment is estimated to be removed from SWR projects
- Stakeholders: City of Saco, YCSWCD, BSCC, Town of OOB, OOB Conservation Comm, Saco Conservation comm, Ocean Park Conservation Society, Loranger Middle School, Thornton Academy, DOT, MHB, DEP, EPA
- Tasks: SC mtgs 4x, NPS Projects – 7 buffer sites, 2 SWR projects (high priority) – treat total of .58 acres IC, WQM – follow up to Phase I BMPs, BSCC – all four seasons, DO, temp and SpC, E & O – flyers, 2 press releases, one buffer workshop, SWR private priority matching grants – 2 properties

P: Overall, great well rounded and well -sequenced tasks, strong and varied stakeholder involvement, environment outcome statement is strong – strong proposal.

N/P: Waterbody not to be restored, but continued strong progress is being made.

Q: Native debris removal? What does this mean – is this the riprap in the stream? Not sure if this would be eligible to fix someone else's riprap job? Permitting for this?

Q/N: WQM – Would we support all 4 seasons? Should the Audubon certificate information be taken out, as to not be flagged by EPA – Additionally – TP, ammonia and nitrates – is that included in the grant or separate? “will be sampled as part of their Audubon Certificate”

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: City of Saco

DATE: 6/8/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: good return for investment – 72% of project for installation/construction

P: Very strong match from City of Saco \$30,100

Q: BSCC \$7154 – what is this breakdown? WQM match is \$4298, what is the remainder? Buffer plantings?

Q: YCSWCD intern \$35/hour?

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Notes

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- Since 1956 – mission to protect and improve the ecosystem of Watchic Lake watershed, all volunteer organization
• Owen Smith (2010) – WQM, dam. Paul McNulty (2013) – strategic plan, fundraising & membership – WBP & Risk assessment, WQM. David Bradbury (2010) – engineering review. Agnes Wiggin (2016) – treasurer, oversee financial admin – corporate finance specialist.
• Experience – Road runoff issues, flooding issue – designed & managed construction, 13 BMP installs in 2000-2004
• Consultant – project management. Quals: has 319 experience, knowledge of Watchic Lake watershed, NPS issues, & environmental planning, monitoring, assessment, etc. experience.

P: While it doesn't appear that any of the individuals listed have direct involvement in an Implementation Grant, but together there is financial and technical knowledge, in additional to a Consultant experienced in 319 implementation grants.

N: While many grants were mentioned, it is not clear that anyone described was involved in the BMP installs from 2000-2004. Appears that FBE was hired for the WBP, therefore did the members listed assist or lead in the development of the plan? David Bradbury – current engineer or retired? If retired, likely can't provide engineer stamp for projects.

N: Missing CCSWCD experience / quals – according to VII they are providing engineering and construction oversight

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- 5.5 miles of shoreline – 175 developed parcels with shoreline frontage – half year round.
• Recreation – boating, fishing, swimming, wildlife viewing – no public launches. Kiwanis Beach – public access.
• Aquatic and Terrestrial benefits – warm water fisheries – small and largemouth bass, white and yellow perch, pumpkinseed sunfish, others. Deer wintering area and wetland habitat, State Listed Animal Habitat – Lilypad Clubtail. Rare species habitat
• Public well on northern portion of lake.

P: Valuable to the residents, and had aquatic and terrestrial habitat value.

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

N/Q: No public access for free & Proximity to Sebago Lake would take away from outsiders using it potentially?

Q: Do all residents get drinking water from lake?

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Coldwater fishery habitat depleted due to decline in water quality
- Threatened – Risk from New Development. P load – internal and stormwater runoff
- Monitoring since 1974 – SDT continued. Temp, DO, Color, pH... ceased in 2006. 2016 monitoring bouy- temp, DO. Chemical analyses – within acceptable range
- SDT average 5.2, Epi tp 6-18, mean 9.6, ChA 3.9, low DO , less than 5ppm.
- N and P elevated in Page and Paine brook ?, and low DO/low pH

P: Proximity to greater Portland area – puts it at risk for continued development

P: Supportive data indicating a concern for possible water quality decline currently/ into the future

Q/N: mention of internal loading – is there data/analysis to support this?

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- Thorough description of causes/potential threats in *general*
- 2019 – watershed survey → 26 sites, town roads and private roads are high priority (59% erosion issues- surface, road should, ditch erosion), 21% culvert issues, 8% buffer issues, 5% roadside plow/grader berm, 3% new development and 3% animal nutrients. 44% town road, 22% private road, 13% residential and commercial, 13% state road, 4% logging operation, and 4% boat or beach access
- 2019 - Shoreline survey – 175 parcels, scored based on buffer, bare soil, shoreline erosion, distance of structures and slope. 17 high priority
- 2016 – Watchic Lake Risk Assessment Report / Hotspot sources ... and more
- Anticipated 3 project phases – for high/medium and LakeSmart and WLA to address the low in the future

P: Recent and thorough understanding of NPS issues, between watershed survey and shoreline survey – it is clear what issues need to be addressed

Q/N: Watershed survey seems low?

Q/N: How much development is happening?

Feasibility for Success

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

- Environmental outcome – 2.5 tons of sediment and 2.3 pounds of P / year
- Stakeholders – DEP, EPA, WLA, Town of Standish, Consultant, CCSWCD, contractor
- Tasks: 3 S.C. mtgs, 5 NPS sites – 2 town roads, 3 private road association sites, residential matching grants – up to 10 residential cost-share (60/40), up to \$600 per site, E & O – webpage, mailings, 3 press releases, brochure, LakeSmart evals 2-3 sites/year, 2 presentations, educational signpost at lake access, buffer planting,

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P: Overall, the NPS sites chosen for this phase are good, educational component is very thorough and should reach many watershed residents – project will help to continue to protect the lake.

Q: is CCSWCD going to be a subgrantee? Especially since they will be providing engineering designs and construction oversight → They should have been listed in Quals/Experience if so

Q: Site A9: Rock sandwich – the best option?

Q: LakeSmart can be counted as match?

Q/N: Whats the current size of the clogged culvert? Perhaps site A6 should have an 18" culvert instead – is that the min. requirement?

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Overall I think there is a good return for the investment, with reasonable cost estimations and significant match contribution from WLA, and great to see Town of Standish involvement via labor match and commitment letter.

P: Significant match in the education and outreach task, which I think is a larger/expensive task but very important as it's the first phase and will help get the community informed and engaged to continue to be successful into future phases

Q/N: Match for Task 2 seems low for the amount that are planning to attend.

Q: Task 1 includes contractual and salary and fringe – but salary and fringe is actually volunteer match, correct?

N: Task 4, only 20% match

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / **N=**Negative / **Q =** Question / - Notes

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- YCSWCD – managed 35 similar land/water grants. Project manager and program manager
- Consultant – environmental planning/assessment, monitoring, etc. Experience with both YSSWCD and Long Pond, managed 319 grants, NPS and Long Pond knowledge.

P: Good collaborative approach between YCSWCD and a consultant to execute all the tasks together.

N: repeating from previous YCSWCD proposal evaluation notes – concerned about the number of projects they will be managing.

Q/N: Was YCSWCD involved in the Long Pond WBP development?

Relative Value of the Waterbody

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

- Recreational value: two commercial children's camps, boat launch at WEH Camp for public(fee?), swimming beach owned by WEH Camp- open to public. Fishing, non-motorized paddling(?), snowmobiling, XC skiing.
- 58 shoreline properties
- Habitat benefits: native fish, plant, birds wildlife. Species of special concern– winterberry holly. Wetland habitats,
- Drinking water – two public wells

P: Smaller pond, but appears to be valuable at least to the shoreline property owners and some habitat value, with species of special concern and wetland habitats.

Q/N: Public wells – just lakefront owners or serves more?

Q/N: unclear how much the public uses the Camp for boating and beaching – and if there is a fee to use.

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Threatened List – negative water clarity trend

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Monitoring – LPA – since 1983. Data – SDT consistent until 2009, reduction in clarity in 2010/2011.
- Declining significantly:
 - 2017- SDT= 0.8m and aver 2.48m, TP 16ppb, 23.75ppb ChA
 - 2018 – SDT 3.72m, TP 13.5ppb, 12.75 ppb ChA
- DEP sediment core– results indicate may be naturally low in Al relation to Fe, and development in last century may have increased both Fe and P loading → likely internal loading
- Cyano bloom 2006,2017,2018 → “Impaired imminent”

P: Great summary of data, and clear indicators that water quality is declining – especially in recent years. On DEP “Impaired Imminent” internal watch list

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- Description of general NPS issues included
- Cyano – presence indicated elevated TP, external and internal
- 2019 NPS Survey – 33 NPS sites – 7 private roads, 19 residential, 3 driveways and 4 at summer camps. 2 high priority, 12 medium and 19 low.
- LakeSmart Program – LPA – culvert replacements, erosion control, rubber razors.
- 2020 – Long Pond Watershed-Based Protection Plan – locally funded
- Septic Survey

P: Watershed survey provides understanding of what actions are needed to address these NPS issues.

Q: results of septic survey?

Q/N: How many LakeSmart certified properties? How many evaluations? How many residents have implemented suggestions?

Feasibility for Success

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

- Stakeholders – DEP, EPA, YCSWCD, LPA, Consultant, consulting engineer
- Tasks: 4x S.C mtg, 10 NPS Sites: 6 private roads, 4 summer camp properties,
- Candidate sites: all sound like strong candidate sites, with good BMP suggestions, 10 residential NPS Sites 50/50 and up to \$500 per site. E & O – newsletters, webpages, student signs, rain garden building remonstrations, tour of BMPs, two select board meetings, education presentations for 5 groups, two LPA meetings.

P: Overall these actions seem like strong initial steps in addressing declining water quality trend and getting the residents involved/ informed.

P: Environmental Outcome – reduce load by 3.1 tons of sediment, 2.7 pounds of P, and 5.4 pounds of N through 9 (Task 3 says 10) NPS abatement sites

P: Anticipated Future phases – very helpful as its clear that both internal and external loading will be evaluated, as both seem necessary to understand and protect this waterbody

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P: Task 4 – landowner interest has been gauged – interest by at least 6

Q: "One additional private road site was ID'd and already addressed – take this line out – part of the 10 total or not? can't be counted as match here)

Q/N: Town involvement/concern?

N: Hesitant to focus on internal loading yet.

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Overall a little over half of project cost spend on BMP installations. Good return for investment overall.

P: Match - Good match on Task 3. LPA providing significant match.

Q/N: Contractual/Engineer for S.C. is almost ~\$1000 per s.c which seems very high. Contractual/Engineers \$21,732.50 – does that seem high?

N: Task 4 contractual cost is very high as residential sites are not that complicated.

Q: Little unclear of using student time as match is appropriate - \$1387

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Notes

Applicant Qualifications and Experience

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- YCSWCD – managed 35 similar land/water grants. Project manager and program manager
• CCSWCD – Chris- engineering
• ASYCC – David Burns & Mark Phelps, Betty Smith – Mousam Lake Watershed Survey and Protection Plan

P: Good group for a collaborative effort with varied expertise.

P: Section IV indications YCSWCD has been involved since at least 1997

Q/N: Mark Phelps – has worked in watershed, but does he have BMP design/installation experience?

Betty Smith- doesn't work for ASYCC anymore? But is volunteering time?

Q/N: YCSWCD and/or CCSWCD involved in Phase I –that should be included here, and how did that go?

N: repeating from previous YCSWCD proposal evaluation notes – concerned about the number of projects they will be managing.

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Good

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

- Recreation: Mousam Lake Beach, and one public boat launch – attach locals from southern maine and NH tourists, 5500 boats inspected . Bass fishing.
• 950 year round and season residents
• Habitat IF&W manage for warm and cold-water fishery. Wild Brook Trout Habitat. Deer-wintering, 2 square miles of IWWH. Freshwater wetlands. Preserve . Focus area of statewide ecological significance.
• 4 conservation lands, 2 conservation easements

P: Overall highly valuable waterbody for the 950 local residents, and tourists, draw for fishing & provides significant habitat.

Q: Assuming it's drinking water for residents as well?

Water Quality Problem

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

- Monitoring since 1974.
• Threatened – "Most at Risk for New Development"

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Significant decline in transparency between 1986-1997 → need to reduce P by 150kg/year. Improved since mitigation efforts beginning in 1999, taken of impaired list.
- Data Overview: Station 1 – SDT 6.7m, TP 6ppb. Station 2 – SDT 6.6m, TP is 7ppb, Chl-a 4.0ppb. DO depletion in deep areas of lake. Moderate potential for internal P loading. Al/Fe rations reported as below vulnerability thresholds → more vulnerable to internal loading, critical to limit external P loading.

P: Great summary of past and present data and trends – clear that lake is vulnerable and efforts are needed to continue to maintain current state

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- 1997 – 50% of lower, 30% upper, 70% Goose Pond – 115 sites
- 2003 – PCAP (upper and lower basin into account) and TMDL – upper basin. Shoreline Survey – 65% inadequate buffers. Septic System model – est. 124.7kg/yr for upper (29.4%load) and 76.5 kg/yr lower basin (24.1% load) Camp Road survey – 8.1% upper basin load. 6.7% lower basin load
- 2017- watershed survey – 189 sites – 60% residential and 28% roads
- Multiple additional phases – to continue to protect

P: Good summary of historical efforts, and clear direction of continued work/efforts needed from more recent summary.

Q: What part of the lake did the 2017 survey cover – what was the breakdown of high, med, and low priority sites?

Q: is there an idea of how many kg/yr has been reduced since action has been taken (of the 150kg/yr)?

Feasibility for Success

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

- ~213lbs/year of TSS will be removed from proposed catch basin.
- Stakeholders – YCSWCD, ASYCC, Mousam Lake Region Association, Town of Shapleigh, Town of Action, Tattle Street Road Association, Landowners, Three Rivers land trust, engineer.
- Tasks: 4 S.C mtgs, 4 NPS sites, E & O- BMP workshop, project brochure, two presentations two press releases, Matching grants – 15 up to \$400 (at least 50% match),

P: Strong stakeholder involvement – great to see municipalities, conservation organizations, landowners and others collaborating.

P: Well sequenced tasks –

Q: Catch basins? MS4?

Q: Task 3 lists 4 NPS sites, but then states 6 NPS Site reports?

Q: Is Mousam I closing out or extending this year?

Q: Site 1-10: is plunge pool a temporary fix? Not understanding the wording – more funds needed to stabilize – in addition to a plunge pool?

Cost Effectiveness

Good return for investment?

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

P: Fairly good return for investment. 48% spent on construction

P: 44% match – Acton, Shapleigh providing Signiant and quality match.

Q/N: what is the breakdown of the 408 volunteer hours? – just for buffer workshop? For attending or teaching? This seems high and unclear what they're from. \$9432.96 (Task 4 only has \$7,267 (*in-kind match*)).

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

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

P= Positive / N=Negative / Q = Question / - Note

Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Good to Very Good

Financial, admin, technical, personnel – past performance. Subgrant eligibilities, consultants?

- YCSWCD – managed 35 land/water grants over the years- project manager and program manager – according to Plan – they have been involved since 2007 with Square Pond.
• CCSWCD – Chris- engineering
• ASYCC – David Burns & Mark Phelps, Betty Smith

P: Good group for a collaborative effort with varied expertise.

P: Square Pond Plan states YCSWCD has been involved since at least 2007

Q/N: Mark Phelps – has worked in watershed, but does he have BMP design/installation experience?

Betty Smith- doesn't work for ASYCC anymore? But is volunteering time? Or is she a consultant?

N: repeating from previous YCSWCD proposal evaluation notes – concerned about the number of projects YCSWCD will be managing.

Q: Was YCSWCD involved in writing the plan?

Relative Value of the Waterbody – Good

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

- 500 residences
• Recreation/Public access – public beach in Shapleigh, public boat launch. Boating (over 900 boats inspected in 2019). Bass fishing
• Habitat – 65-acre wetland meadow – significant wildlife habitat, protected IWWH, Town forest – 300 acres, listed as a Focus Area of Statewide Ecological Significance due to rare plants. Bald Eagles. Warm and cold-water fishery – bass, landlocked salmon, brook, lake and brown trout.

P: Fairly valuable to both residences, and tourists in southern maine/NH for recreational uses– and feeds into Mousam which is also threatened, additionally has wetlands and habitat benefits for significant species.

Q: drinking water supply?

Water Quality Problem – Fair to Good

Informed understanding of issues? Severity, and nonattainment in future

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

- Data since 1983, SDT above average (7.5m), Phosphorus average 5ppb, ChlA average 2.6ppb
- 3 stations monitored. Clarity: Station 1 – stable. Station 2 – stable. Station 3 – stable to increasing → Average water quality and low potential for blooms
- Vulnerable to internal recycling due to sediment chemistry – Low DO (bottom 6-9 feet). Below both sediment chemistry thresholds.
- Threatened – Sensitive sediment Chemistry

P: Overall good summary of water quality data, and historical assessment, no current severe threat, but proactive steps should be taken due to sediment chemistry and risk.

Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Good

Understand of what actions are needed to address NPS issues?

- 2007 – watershed survey – 207 erosion sites
- 2019 – 128 erosion sites – 73% residential sites, town roads 7%, private roads 5%, driveways 8% and beach/boat/trails/ROW/construction 7&.
- 2020- Approved protection plan
- 2009 Phase I- 30 high and medium sites. Phase II – 22 high and medium. ASYCC 145 sites since 2001
- Anticipating two more phases – to address high and medium sites

P: Good understanding of erosion sites, and actions need to address the issues on these sites.

Q: What was the breakdown of 2019 survey for high, med, low priority sites?

Q/N: Elaborate on Septic and road socials – any action/studies on septic issues?

Feasibility for Success – good to Very good

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

- BMPs at 8 significant sites on town and private roads, 15 residential matching grants, at least 23 BMPs
- Stakeholders – YCSWCD, ASYCC, CCSWCD, Square Pond Improvement Association, Town of Action, Town of Shapleigh, Three Rivers Land Trust, MDEP, USEPA
- Tasks: 5 S.C. mtgs, 40% cost-share on 8 high and medium priority erosion sites – 2 town roads, 2 private roads, one public beach, one residential property. Residential matching grants – 15 awarded up to \$300 (50/50 cost-share). E & O – two press releases, newsletter articles, website postings, fact sheets, presentations, brochure.

P: Strong collaborative approach, that brings together all major resources in the area.

Support/commitment assumed from Towns and given by Road association, private landowner, Town of Acton. Climate change considerations included. Efforts will continue to protect pond. Well planned tasks.

Q: Task 3 - 8 erosion sites, but only 6 described.

Waterbody protected – Planning for two more phases – since the chemistry can't change, any effort to protect is good.

Cost Effectiveness - good

Good return for investment?

Cost estimates are reasonable? Quality of proposed match

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD

DATE: 6/9/2020

EVALUATOR NAME: Addie Halligan

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DEP

P: Strong in kind construction match from Town of Acton, and cash match from both Acton and Shapleigh. Good return for investment - strong BMP install projects.

P: Construction is 52% of project.

Q: how is \$50/hr determined for ASYCC – is that for crew leader and crew members?

Q: Town cash match – is that just YCC, or also CBI?

Q: Site 1-7 seems similar to 2-3 – but \$3500 cheaper, wonder if 1-7 is underbudgeted.

Comprehensive Plan

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Biddeford – Thatcher Brook

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P – BWH focus area
P – Fairly simple implementation
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Good Relative Value of the Waterbody - Good Water Quality Problem – Very Good Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good Feasibility for Success – Very Good Cost Effectiveness

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Boothbay Region Water District – Adams and Knickerbocker Ponds

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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:

Smallest ask
? – Two watersheds – common?
N – No discussion about town's annual funding and road maintenance. This must be done every few years. Ongoing CIP funds.
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Poor
Relative Value of the Waterbody - Fair
Water Quality Problem - Fair
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Fair
Feasibility for Success - Good
Cost Effectiveness – Very Good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Highland Lake

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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:

? - \$30,000 for a manure pile?
N – No boat trailer access
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Good
Relative Value of the Waterbody- Fair
Water Quality Problem – Very Good
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good
Feasibility for Success - Good
Cost Effectiveness- Good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: CCSWCD – Pleasant River

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P – Large developing watershed
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair Relative Value of the Waterbody – Very Good Water Quality Problem - Fair Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Fair Feasibility for Success - Fair Cost Effectiveness

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Town of Eastbrook – Abrams Pond

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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:

? – Extremely convincing photos
? – Any need to consider blueberry fields
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Poor
Relative Value of the Waterbody- Good
Water Quality Problem - Good
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Very Good
Feasibility for Success – Very Good
Cost Effectiveness

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Lewiston – Hart Brook

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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:

N – Very small watershed
N – Budget questions
P – Severe NPS coverage
Applicant Qualifications and Experience – Very Good Relative Value of the Waterbody - Poor Water Quality Problem - Good Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Very Good Feasibility for Success - Fair Cost Effectiveness - Poor

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Conservancy – Damariscotta Lake

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P – multiple clearly erodible project sites
? – Heavy staff \$ when so much of the work is construction
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair Relative Value of the Waterbody- Good Water Quality Problem – Very Good Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good Feasibility for Success - Good Cost Effectiveness- Good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD – Lake Anasagunticook

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P – Drinking water source 90 homes and 10 commercial
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Good Relative Value of the Waterbody- Good Water Quality Problem - Fair Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Fair Feasibility for Success - Good Cost Effectiveness- Good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: OCSWCD – Lake Penesseewassee

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P – 75% of total funds are for construction
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair Relative Value of the Waterbody- Good Water Quality Problem - Fair Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Fair Feasibility for Success - Fair Cost Effectiveness- Very Good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Portland Water District, Sebago Lake

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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:

? – Why porous pavement ‘test site’? 20+ years old
N – Should have more info on threats of NPS
Applicant Qualifications and Experience – Very Good
Relative Value of the Waterbody- Very Good
Water Quality Problem - Good
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems – Very Good
Feasibility for Success - Good
Cost Effectiveness- Good

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Saco – Goosefare Brook

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P – Rachel Carson
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair Relative Value of the Waterbody- Very Good Water Quality Problem – Very Good Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good Feasibility for Success - Poor Cost Effectiveness

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: Watchic Lake Association – Watchic Lake

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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:

Proposal seems to make weak case
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Poor Relative Value of the Waterbody- Poor Water Quality Problem - Poor Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good Feasibility for Success - Good Cost Effectiveness- Fair

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Long Pond

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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:

N – Extremely small, remote watershed
P – Southern Maine habitat
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair
Relative Value of the Waterbody- Poor
Water Quality Problem - Good
Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Poor
Feasibility for Success - Good
Cost Effectiveness- Poor

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Mousam Lake

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P Excellent projects to be undertaken
P Excellent project sites Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair Relative Value of the Waterbody- Good Water Quality Problem Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Good Feasibility for Success – Very Good Cost Effectiveness- Fair

STATE OF MAINE - INDIVIDUAL EVALUTION NOTES

RFP #: 202003056

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

BIDDER NAME: YCSWCD – Square Pond

DATE: 6/3/20

EVALUATOR NAME: Tom Miragliuolo

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DACF

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

Individual Evaluator Comments:

P Plans future phases II and III
N 50% is construction
Applicant Qualifications and Experience - Fair Relative Value of the Waterbody- Fair Water Quality Problem - Fair Nature, Extent and Severity of NPS Problems - Fair Feasibility for Success - Good Cost Effectiveness- Fair



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Gerald D. Reid
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202003056
RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects
Watershed-based Plan Implementation

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

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

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

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

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

Addie Halligan

5/20/2020

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Gerald D. Reid
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202003056
RFP 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 (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

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

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

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

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

Amanda Pratt

5/18/2020

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Gerald D. Reid
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202003056
RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects
Watershed-based Plan Implementation

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

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

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

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathy Hoppe".

5/19/2020

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Gerald D. Reid
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202003056
RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects
Watershed-based Plan Implementation

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

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

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

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

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

Tom Miragliuolo
Signature

6/3/2020
Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Gerald D. Reid
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202003056
RFP TITLE: Grants for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Projects
Watershed-based Plan Implementation

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

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

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

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

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

Wendy Garland

5/19/20

Signature

Date