|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFA# 202504061, Focused In-Stream Habitat RCPP Instream Habitat #3137- Design Phase Fiscal Year 2026 |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Marine Resources (DMR) |
| **BIDDERS’ CONFERENCE LOCATION:** | DMR Augusta Office (Marquardt Building, 32 Blossom Ln, Augusta, ME 04330) Room 118 |
| **BIDDERS’ CONFERENCE DATE/TIME:** | May 21st 10:00am to 12:00pm |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | June 2nd, 2025 |
| **QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | June 10th, 2025 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | June 18th, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time. |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | Proposals@maine.gov |

**Below are questions received and the responses provided at the Bidders’ Conference.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Question** |
| What caused streams in Maine to lose habitat for Atlantic salmon and other coevolved sea-run and resident species, specifically stream straightening? |
| **Answer** |
| Many streams in Maine were altered to accommodate the region’s historic log drives and mills. To increase the efficiency of moving the logs, boulders, instream wood, and other habitat features were removed, stream channels were straightened or moved, and side channels and flood plain access were blocked or bermed. These operations degraded instream habitat by decreasing the overall quantity and quality of pools, removing in-stream structure and cover elements beneficial to fish, and altering substrate composition.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | **Question** |
| What demands are there for the designs to account for sinuosity, erosion, and moving sediment? |
| **Answer** |
| This is a project specific question as it depends on the system and restoration being completed. Funded projects have three main deliverables, 30%, 60%, and final designs stamped by a licensed engineer in the State of Maine. Throughout the design process the dynamic nature of the site should be accounted for.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3** | **Question** |
| Is there a preference for using rock or wood in these habitat improvements? |
| **Answer** |
| This question is project specific as it depends on how the materials are being placed, what NRCS practice is being used, and what is the best approach for the location. These technical details are, in part, project and site specific. We recommend working with an engineer, if awarded, to determine the best approach for the project to meet the program goals.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | **Question** |
| What is the reasoning behind the $45,000 budget to develop engineering designs? |
| **Answer** |
| We anticipate having a cap for projects of $45,000 as this has proven successful in previous years. In 2024, we awarded three projects funding for engineering designs with this budget. However, project budget may be negotiable depending on how many projects and applications we receive. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5** | **Question** |
| What are the target species? |
| **Answer** |
| The target species for Project FISH are Atlantic salmon and Brook Trout. However, projects that will improve habitat for one of the target species as well as other sea-run species will be prioritized.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6** | **Question** |
| Are rivers not connected to the ocean at a disadvantage?  |
| **Answer** |
| Rivers that are not connected to the ocean may not contain Atlantic salmon, one of our priority species, and may therefore not rank as high as other projects. We are looking to support projects that will improve habitat for Atlantic salmon and other coevolved sea-run and resident species including Brook Trout. Projects that improve habitat for multiple sea-run species will be prioritized.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7** | **Question** |
| If the applicant is also the landowner, what documentation do they need to provide to document written landowner support? |
| **Answer** |
| If the applicant is also the landowner, the application should still provide written documentation of landowner support (i.e., landowner support letter, MOU, etc.). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8** | **Question** |
| How long do you expect contracting to take for awarded projects? |
| **Answer** |
| Typically, State contracts can take four to six weeks. To allow for some flexibility we anticipate eight weeks.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9** | **Question** |
| Why do the designs require a Professional Engineer (PE) stamp? |
| **Answer** |
| The PE stamp is required to ensure the stability, safety, and effectiveness of the instream structures. The designs must be developed and certified by a licensed engineer to confirm they meet standards, specifications, and will perform as intended. Improperly designed structures can fail, shift, or cause unintended consequences and by requiring a PE stamp, we ensure the designs will minimize these risks and comply with both state and NRCS standards.  |

**Below are submitted, written questions from bidders and the Department’s responses.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part V, Application Form, Page 6 | Under site photos it’s looking for inlet/outlet, road berms, etc. which are for road stream crossings. Since my project is just instream work, should I just put NA for those? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, you can put NA and please add any site photos with labels that are relevant in your project area for the proposed restoration. Site photos are still helpful for the review committee to familiarize themselves with your proposed site. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part V, Application Form, Page 6 | Under the cultural resources section, it says to describe existing conditions at the ‘Four Corners’. Can you elaborate on what you mean by that?  |
| **Answer** |
| Please include any cultural resources that are known to exist or suspected to exist at the project site. Presence of historical/prehistorical artifacts, fill or evidence of overtopping, historic dam, dug channel, bridge, rock walls, blocked side channels, etc. |