**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP AMENDMENT #1 AND**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP#202503032 Development of Regulatory Guidance Materials |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Environmental Protection |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | April 9, 2025 |
| **QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | May 5, 2025 (updated May 13, 2025 as shown in red) |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | May 21, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time (**as amended**) |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | Proposals@maine.gov |
| **Unless specifically addressed below, all other provisions and clauses of the RFP remain unchanged.** |
| **DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES IN RFP:**1. The Proposal Due Date is amended.
2. Part III, C, 3. of the RFP is amended.
3. All references to the “current rate sheet” are removed. Part IV, Section IV is amended.
4. Part V, B, 3 is amended.
 |
| **REVISED LANGUAGE IN RFP:**1. All references to the Proposal Due Date of May 7, 2025 no later than 11:59 p.m., local time are amended to **May 21, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time.**

The revised language issued on 5/5/2025 in #2 below incorrectly stated the RFP number as “202403032.” This has been corrected, and the revised language reads as follows:1. Part III, C. 3. Submission Format is amended to read:
2. **Submission Format:**
	1. Bidders are to insert the following into the subject line of their e-mail proposal submission: **“RFP# 202503032 Proposal Submission – [Bidder’s Name]”**
	2. Bidder’s proposal submissions are to be broken down into multiple files, with each file named as it is titled in bold below, and include:

**File 1 [Bidder’s Name] – Preliminary Information:** *PDF format preferred***Appendix A** (Proposal Cover Page)**Appendix B** (Responsible Bidder Certification)**File 2 [Bidder’s Name] – Organization Qualifications and Experience:***PDF format preferred***Appendix C** (Organization Qualifications and Experience Form) and all required information and attachments stated in PART IV, Section II.**File 3 [Bidder’s Name] – Proposed Services:** *PDF format preferred*All required information and attachments stated in PART IV, Section III.**File 4 [Bidder’s Name] – Cost Proposal:***PDF format preferred***Appendix D** (Cost Proposal Form) and all required information and attachments stated in PART IV, Section IV.1. Part IV, Section IV is revised to read:

**Section IV Cost Proposal** (File #4)* 1. **General Instructions**
		1. Bidders must submit a cost proposal that covers the period starting May 1, 2025, and ending on April 30, 2030.
		2. The cost proposal must include the costs necessary for the Bidder to fully comply with the contract terms, conditions, and RFP requirements.
		3. No costs related to the preparation of the proposal for the RFP, or to the negotiation of the contract with the Department, may be included in the proposal. Only costs to be incurred after the contract effective date that are specifically related to the implementation or operation of contracted services may be included.
	2. **Cost Proposal Form Instructions**

Bidders must fill out **Appendix D** (Cost Proposal Form), following the instructions detailed here and in the form. Failure to provide the requested information, and to follow the required cost proposal format provided, may result in disqualification or reduction in scoring of the cost proposal, at the discretion of the Department.1. Part V, B, 2 and 3 are revised to read as follows. “3. Negotiations” becomes section 4.
	1. **Scoring Process:** For proposals that demonstrate meeting the eligibility requirements in Section I, if applicable, the evaluation team will use a consensus approach to evaluate and score Sections II & III above. Members of the evaluation team will not score those sections individually but, instead, will arrive at a consensus as to assignment of points for each of those sections. Section IV, the Cost Proposal, will be scored as described below.
	2. **Scoring the Cost Proposal:** The total cost proposed for conducting all the functions specified in the RFP will be assigned a score according to a mathematical formula. The lowest bid will be awarded 30 points. Proposals with higher bid values will be awarded proportionately fewer points calculated in comparison with the lowest bid.

The scoring formula is:(Lowest submitted cost proposal / Cost of proposal being scored) x 30 = pro-rated scoreNo Best and Final Offers: The State of Maine will not seek or accept a best and final offer (BAFO) from any Bidder in this procurement process.  All Bidders are expected to provide their best value pricing with the submission of their proposal. |

**Provided below are submitted written questions received and the Department’s answer**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
|  Vendor | Is there an incumbent or current vendor doing this work? If yes, why are you launching this RFP?  |
| **Answer** |
| No incumbent vendor is doing this work.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question**  |
|  Page 32 |  Is the budget of $425K for year 1 or all three years?   |
| **Answer** |
| The budget is for the entire project duration from the award through September 30, 2029. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question**  |
|  Page 6 –“Guidance materials will be in the form of design guides, handbooks, fact sheets, checklists, videos, and slide decks as defined in this Request for Proposals (RFP) document” |  What will the publication platform be for the final materials?  Basic PDFs design guides, handbooks, fact sheets, checklists, and slide decks that learners access and review, or is there an expectation to have these publications be interactive?  Based on our quick review of the links provided, the documents are two dimensional and static documents, which is not always conducive to learning.   |
| **Answer** |
| The format for publications will be a mixture of two-dimensional products that can be viewed on a computer or in print as well as more interactive materials such as videos. However, the Department is interested in creating more interactive materials if the service provider has the expertise to do so.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
|  Page 6 –“Guidance materials will be in the form of design guides, handbooks, fact sheets, checklists, videos, and slide decks as defined in this Request for Proposals (RFP) document” |  For videos, do you anticipate these being eLearning modules with narration, content and images?  How many do you anticipate developing and how long will each be? Has the content for these been firmed up and if not, will the department provide this?  |
| **Answer** |
| The format for the videos and the total number of videos has not been determined. One of the project goals is to create short, 2-, 5-, or 10-minute videos. In total, we anticipate a low end of 10 videos and a high end of 15 videos. Some videos will be introductory to a program or to a regulation that the Department administers. Other videos will be instructional how to information on performing a specific best practice in the field. Videos may be used in other formal DEP NPS Trainings but these information videos will be intended and delivered separately to the general public. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
|  Page 6 –“Guidance materials will be in the form of design guides, handbooks, fact sheets, checklists, videos, and slide decks as defined in this Request for Proposals (RFP) document” |  Will you be using a Learning Management System (LMS), if yes, which one?  |
| **Answer** |
| The Department is not currently using a Learning Management System to deliver training although other formal NPS Trainings will be updated in the next year to make formal certification trainings available in the LMS “Coassemble” licensed by our partner NEIWPCC-JETCC. Currently most training content is delivered through a mixture of PowerPoint slides, downloadable or printed handouts (if in person), and demonstration props (if in person). Some videos have been recorded using PowerPoint slides with recorded instructional speech that are available on the Departments Nonpoint Source Training Center courses. The Department does have Office 365 and Microsoft Teams that it could use for delivering training content. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.3 | Please provide a list of tasks, deliverables, and any onsite staff duties required of the selected contractor for the annual full day of hybrid training.How many satellite in-person events at other locations in Maine are anticipated? |
| **Answer** |
| The awarded bidder would only be anticipated to attend the training in-person in Augusta. Attendance at satellite locations is not expected. Department staff and the Departments contracted facilitator will provide all administrative roles, leading or guiding presentations or interactive activities for the annual training days. The awarded bidder’s primary tasks are to be in attendance in Augusta, to listen to discussion, and to be prepared to respond to questions on draft or final deliverables that are being used in the training (i.e. guides, handbooks, fact sheets, checklists, videos, slide decks).  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.3 | Please provide a list of tasks, deliverables, and any onsite staff duties required of the selected contractor for the annual roundtable. |
| **Answer** |
| Department staff and the Departments contracted facilitator will provide all administrative roles, leading or guiding presentations and discussion for the annual roundtable days. The awarded bidder’s primary tasks are to be in attendance in Augusta, to listen to discussions, and to be prepared to present and take feedback on draft or final deliverables (i.e. guides, handbooks, fact sheets, checklists, videos, slide decks). |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.4 | For the updated *Maine Shoreland Zoning Publication*, could Maine DEP define/provide:* The anticipated number of milestones for technical editing review.
* The desired turnaround time for technical editing of each milestone.
* The estimated number of pages of the updated publication.
* The estimated number of new and revised graphics.
* Requirements for the final format and layout for the final deliverables (i.e., will InDesign be required).
* If the selected contractor will be expected to provide technical editing of, or graphic development for, training materials based on the updated publication. If so, could the length and format of any anticipated training materials be provided?
 |
| **Answer** |
| * The awarded bidder will be anticipated to have an initial meeting with Department staff drafting the content updates, to meet one- or two times during drafting, and to meet once materials are complete. The Department and awarded bidder will revise this publication as needed after initial publication with check-in meetings at inflection points when making revisions to review changes. Please also see answer to question 20.
* The proposal can include an optimal workplan to meet the goal for completing this publication within the initially proposed timeline described in RFP Part II B.
* The *Maine Shoreland Zoning Publication* is currently 42 pages. The updated publication is anticipated to be the same or of similar length.
* There are 15 images and 30 graphics in the current publication. The total number of graphics in the updated version is anticipated to be the same as the outdated version, and each graphic may need minor revisions to meet the new style as determined during the project by the Department and awarded bidder. The images and graphics are effective; however, some improvements to update the look and feel of the visuals would be beneficial.
* InDesign is not required for final format and layout for final deliverables. Please also see answers to Question 3 and Question 33.
* The Department intends to develop technical content, including PowerPoint slides of the updated publication for use in training courses. The awarded bidder is anticipated to support the Department creating video tutorials and training videos with animated visual explanations of these content.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.4 | For the updated *OUR SHORE GUIDE*, could Maine DEP define/provide:* The anticipated number of milestones for technical editing review.
* The desired turnaround time for technical editing of each milestone.
* The estimated number of pages of the updated publication.
* The estimated number of new and revised graphics.
* Requirements for the final format and layout for the final deliverables (i.e., will InDesign be required).
 |
| **Answer** |
| * The awarded bidder will be anticipated to have an initial meeting with Department staff drafting the content updates, to meet one- to two- and no more than three- times during drafting, and to meet once materials are complete. The Department and awarded bidder will revise these materials as needed after initial publication with check-in meetings at inflection points when making revisions to review changes.
* The proposal can describe an optimal workplan to meet the goal for completing this publication within the initially proposed timeline described in RFP Part II B.
* The *OUR SHORE Guide* is approximately 100 pages currently including several support materials including an issue profile, site assessment checklist, planting guide, case studies, and permitting infographic. The final publication is anticipated to be the same or of similar length as the current draft.
* There are over 60 photographs and nearly 60 graphics in the current publication. Most photographs are anticipated to be kept, though some may be changed for a newer or different photograph. Most graphics are anticipated to be kept as is, in some cases they may benefit from minor revisions, and for a smaller group, 3-5, they may be redone or created new by the awarded bidder. Overall, graphics and visuals in the text should meet the final style as determined during the project by the Department and awarded bidder.
* InDesign is not required for final format and layout for final deliverables. Please also see answer to Question 3.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.4 | For the Regulatory Guidance and Permit Checklists, could Maine DEP define/provide:* The anticipated number of milestones for technical editing review.
* The desired turnaround time for technical editing of each milestone.
* The estimated number of pages of the updated publication.
* The estimated number of new and revised graphics.
* Requirements for the final format and layout for the final deliverables (i.e., will InDesign be required).
* The anticipated number and length of video tutorials.
 |
| **Answer** |
| * The awarded bidder will be anticipated to have an initial meeting with Department staff to draft a replicable template, to meet one- or two times during drafting, and to meet once materials are complete. The Department and awarded bidder will revise these materials as needed after initial publication with check-in meetings at inflection points when making revisions to review changes.
* The proposal can describe an optimal workplan to meet the goal for completing these publications within the initially proposed timeline described in RFP Part II B. In general, the drafting and meeting process does not need to be replicated for every deliverable, but instead can be applied to a package of related deliverables.
* These materials are envisioned as short, one- to two- page documents, no more than three or four pages that would include a mixture of text and graphics. The final list of topics and the sequence they will be addressed will be determined based on further discussions with the Department project team and the awarded bidder, and be informed by agency partners, to create a feasible workplan. See Part I.A.3 of the RFP for a list of near term and longer-term topics that these short regulatory guidance materials will cover. While the final number of documents to be produced for this item is currently not determined, a minimum of 10 documents should be assumed, and it is possible there could be as many as 20. An intention for these guidance materials is to raise awareness of permitting requirements and procedures, including permitting thresholds (e.g. those that are exempt versus require a permit or expedited permit), so that the regulated community is able to more easily navigate these processes (e.g. ensure applicants have information needed to submit an application). Please also see answer to Question 4.
* New infographics may be needed for each of these documents. Pictures will be provided or solicited by the Department of partners and provided for use in these materials.
* InDesign is not required for final format and layout for final deliverables. Please also see answer to question 3.
* Video tutorials of these materials with spoken instruction could be beneficial.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.4 | For the *Resilient Design Manual*, could Maine DEP define/provide:* The anticipated number of milestones for technical editing review.
* The desired turnaround time for technical editing of each milestone.
* The estimated number of pages of the updated publication.
* The estimated number of new and revised graphics.
* Requirements for the final format and layout for the final deliverables (i.e., will the final product be delivered in InDesign).
* The anticipated number and length of video tutorials.
 |
| **Answer** |
| * The awarded bidder will be anticipated to have an initial meeting with Department, to meet one- to two- and no more than three- times during drafting, and to meet once materials are complete.
* The proposal can describe an optimal workplan to meet the goal for completing this publication within the initially proposed timeline described in RFP Part II B. Once the first edition of the guide and video are complete, the Department and awarded bidder will revise these materials as needed after initial publication with check-in meetings at inflection points when making revisions to review changes.
* Drafting has not yet begun on the Resilient Design Manual though source materials exist. Please see answer to Question 35 (the total length of the publication is still being determined, but is anticipated to be between 30 and 50 pages). The design manual is envisioned as a broader representation of design selection and implementation practices across infrastructure types rolled up from many different state, municipal, or other sources as provided to the project team. The idea is to help give some information to answer the question what does resilient infrastructure look like in Maine? Or what does it look like when we design for resilience in Maine?
* The Department will work with project partners to solicit and file source content in 2025 and 2026 and anticipates working with the awarded bidder to develop an outline, to populate with images and graphics from source content, and create a cohesive final format and layout.
* InDesign is not required for final format and layout for final deliverables. Please also see answers to Question 3 and Question 16.
* A video tutorial of the guide would be beneficial to create at the time of publication or shortly thereafter. The Department has not determined an anticipated length at this time; however, this is intended an orientation to the guide only, not a lengthy video.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part V.B.2 | Please describe the consensus scoring process for the Cost Proposal. Will the lowest bidder receive 30 points? Will other bids be weighted against the lowest bid to determine points? If so, please consider only scoring responsible and responsive bids. |
| **Answer** |
| Proposals will be evaluated individually and will not be evaluated against each other.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Appendix C | Should the three example projects required by Appendix C be projects which have occurred within the past five years? |
| **Answer** |
| The three examples are not required to have occurred within the past five years. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Appendix D | Should the pricing be just for the Initial Period of Performance or the Initial Period of Performance and both renewal periods? |
| **Answer** |
| Please see Amendment #1, Bidders must submit a cost proposal that covers the entire project period starting May 1, 2025, and ending on April 30, 2030. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A. Page 10 | Can you provide clarification on the level of production quality sought for the video deliverables? |
| **Answer** |
| The video production quality can be basic, semi-professional, or professional as long as the content in the videos is clearly communicated and desired project outcomes are met. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part 2  Section A  Primary Objective | Is it possible to receive a copy of the current brand design guidelines for the Department? |
| **Answer** |
| The current brand design can be seen in these representative examples - [Flood Reference Guide for Municipalities (pdf)](https://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/attach.php?id=6907188&an=1), [Sand Dune Activities FAQ (pdf)](https://www.maine.gov/dep/land/nrpa/dunes-Fact-sheet-8-2021.pdf), [Sand Dune and Storm Repair FAQ (pdf)](https://www.maine.gov/dep/land/nrpa/dunes/faq-sand-dune-storm-repai.pdf), [Maine's Wetlands -- Their Functions and Values](https://www.maine.gov/dep/land/nrpa/ip-wet-fv.html) (issue profile), [Wetlands and Waterbodies Protection Rules](https://www.maine.gov/dep/land/nrpa/ip-wetl.html) (issue profile), and the [Maine Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs](https://www.maine.gov/dep/land/erosion/escbmps/index.html) is an example of a best management practices handbook.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part 2  Section A  Primary Objective | What is the expectation with regards to video tutorials and training.  How many do you anticipate?  What is the average length per video? Will they include voice narration?   |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, videos are anticipated to include voice narration. Please also see response to question 4 in regards to the number and length of videos. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part 2  Section A  Primary Objective | Can you provide direction on how new visuals that have been submitted but agency staff should be leveraged in the development of a new design concept?  |
| **Answer** |
| The Department anticipates working with the awarded bidder on using this content in the final deliverables. In some cases, the new content may be in an acceptable form as is, and other cases it may be a starting concept that the awarded bidder can improve to a final form.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part 2  Section A  Primary Objective | Can you provide overview of the review process that will be required for new design concept and all deliverables? For example, how many rounds of review will be required. |
| **Answer** |
| The review process will differ by deliverable; however, the awarded bidder should anticipate a general outline of meeting with Department staff initially, with between one to three meetings during drafting pending complexity of deliverable, and a meeting when materials are final. Meetings with additional project partners will be ad hoc, approximately 3-4 times per year where the relevant publications to that audience are shared and/or presented for feedback. This process does not need to be replicated for every deliverable, and instead can be applied to a package of related deliverables, for example the *Living Shoreline and Coastal Bluff Design Guidance* together with related Regulatory Guidance and Permit Review Checklists that cover shoreline stabilization. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part 2 Section A 1 *Maine Shoreland Zoning publication* | After publication of revised report in October 2025.  Do you foresee annual updates to the report? |
| **Answer** |
| Revisions will be made as needed in the years 2026 and 2027 as determined by the Department, the awarded bidder, and as informed by project partners. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part I.C (Pg. 9)Appendix D(Pg. 28) | Does the State anticipate the budget referenced in Appendix D should cover all work performed during the Initial Period of Performance as well as the two Renewal Periods, or is there a possibility of the State increasing the budget to cover any needed revisions during the Renewal Periods? |
| **Answer** |
| The State does not anticipate exceeding the stated budget. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part I.C (Pg. 9)Appendix D(Pg. 28) | Will the State allow for rate escalations at the beginning of each renewal period, or will the awardee need to use the proposed rates on their Rate Sheet for the full duration of the possible contract term? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department has a specific amount of funding for this subaward that can be used towards communication, graphic design, and technical writing services. The decision to include a rate escalation part way through the 5-year period is up to the bidder to determine and should be reflected in the Appendix D, Cost Proposal Form. The Department is not able to provide additional funds in an amount that is more than the sub-award amount. Please see Amendment #1 above. Bidders should not submit a rate sheet. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.3(Pg. 13) | What role does the State anticipate the selected contractor playing in the annual training event for practitioners and the annual roundtable? For example, will the selected contractor play roles in preparing presentations, delivering presentations, coordinating event logistics, etc.? |
| **Answer** |
| See answers to Question 6 and Question 7.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.4(Pg. 13) | Will the selected contractor be responsible for assisting during the writing process (for example, providing instructions/guidance to authors and coordinating among multi-author teams), or will they strictly be involved after drafts have been completed? |
| **Answer** |
| Assistance to the Department and Agency Partners during the writing process to guide authors in a manner that would help streamline the work for the awarded bidder while achieving the project goals would be beneficial.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.B.4(Pg. 13) | How extensive a review process does the State anticipate for each product? For example, will draft products be released for public review? Or interagency review? Will the selected contractor be expected to help organize comments from these reviews, triage them, assist in making changes, and/or document responses to comments? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department and the awarded bidder are expected to work closely together throughout the review process, drawing on their collective strengths within their areas of expertise. Draft products will be shared with project staff and partners. At this time the Department does not anticipate the draft being released more broadly than with project staff and partners, but bidders should be aware that all materials developed during the project are considered public documents and can be requested. The general project flow will be expanding circles of review, starting with the Department, followed by interagency review, then project partners, and finally interagency and then Department review. On the technical content the Department is anticipated to be the primary point of contact to receive and respond to comments and make changes to materials. On graphical and overall presentation of materials, the awarded bidder is anticipated to receive and respond to comments and make changes to materials.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.C (Pg. 14)Appendix D (Pg. 28) | The RFP indicates travel is to be included in the bid, will the State reimburse for audited/approved indirect costs associated with necessary ODCs and travel? |
| **Answer** |
| Reimbursement for travel will be paid according to the rates identified by the Office of the State Controller ([link).](https://www.maine.gov/osc/travel/mileage-other-info) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II.C (Pg. 14)Appendix D (Pg. 28) | Should travel costs for attending the meetings referenced in Part 2 Section C be added to Appendix D as a lump sum item or would the State prefer travel costs separated by trip? |
| **Answer** |
| Travel costs for attending meetings can be provided as a lump sum item.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part III.C.3.b(Pg. 16)Part IV(Pg. 18) | Part III.C.3.b (Submission Format) asks for the Certificate of Insurance to be included after Appendix D. However, Part IV (Proposal Submission Requirements) asks for the Certificate of Insurance to be included in Section II.5. Should the bidder include the certificate in both places? |
| **Answer** |
|  Please see Amendment #1 above. Please include in File 2- Organizations and Experience.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part IV(Pg. 18) | The Section IV Cost Proposal general instructions do not mention Appendix D. In Section IV, should bidders include both a rate sheet and Appendix D? |
| **Answer** |
| Please see Amendment #1 above. Bidders should not submit a rate sheet.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part IV(Pg. 18) | Can bidders modify the cost proposal form to include other direct costs (ODCs) if we anticipate any that will be needed?  |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, other direct costs can be provided in the Cost Proposal Form.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part IV(Pg. 18)Appendix D(Pg. 28) | The examples of descriptions of services in Appendix D cover rather broad categories of work that could be performed. Would the State allow for multiple professional level rates within a service type (e.g. Senior and Junior level professional rates)? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, multiple professional level rates within a service type can be included and should be included in the Cost Proposal Form, Appendix D.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| N/A | What contract type does the State plan to award? |
| **Answer** |
| The contract type will be addressed during contract negotiations. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **33** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| 10 | What is the intended final format for the Maine Shoreland Zoning publication? Will it be designed to fit in a binder or produced as a bound book, and will the updated version remain black and white at 8.5x11 or include color? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department last printed this publication as a bound 8.5x11” booklet printed in black and white with a color cover. The final format for the updated Maine Shoreland Zoning publication is still being determined but may be the same as the previous printed version, or could be made in a fully color version.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **34** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| 10 | What is the expected length, quantity, and format of the video tutorials, will they require animation, live-action production, or a combination of both? |
| **Answer** |
| See answer to question 4. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **35** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| 10 | Is there an estimated length and intended final format for the Resilient Design Manual? |
| **Answer** |
| See answer to question 11. The total length is still being determined, but is anticipated to be between 30 and 50 pages. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **36** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| 10 | Is there a specific program these publications need to be created in to ensure they can be easily edited in the future? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, it would be beneficial if the publications were created in a form that the Department can easily edit in the future. The Department primarily works in Microsoft Word, Microsoft Publisher, PowerPoint, Adobe Acrobat, and Vizio.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **37** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A. (pg. 5) | Would the State please disclose any NOAA grant flow downs, if any, that will be included in the awarded contract so that bidders can ensure they can comply with those requirements? |
| **Answer** |
| The State of Maine has a contract for this award with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The state is currently drawing down funds and communicating regularly with NOAA about ongoing implementation of this grant. The Department is not aware of any changes to this funding as of this question and answer summary. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **38** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A. (pg. 5) | Would the State please confirm that the RFP contemplates an award of a contract for the procurement of goods or services as defined in 2 CFR § 200.331(b)(1)-(5)? |
| **Answer** |
| You asked whether the State intends to award a contract, as opposed to a subaward, to the selected bidder. Yes, the selected bidder will be awarded a State of Maine Service Contract, with appropriate riders, for the procurement of the described goods and services, as defined in 2 CFR § 200.331.(b)(1)-(5). As a reminder, contracts are not considered fully executed and valid until approved by the State Procurement Review Committee and funds are encumbered. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **39** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  |  |
| Part I, Section A. (pg. 5) | Would the State further confirm that the selected bidder will not be deemed to be a Subrecipient as defined in 2 CFR § 200.331(b)(1)-(5)? |
| **Answer** |
| You asked whether the State would deem the selected bidder a contractor or a subrecipient as defined in 2 § CFR 200.331(b)(1)-(5). As the selected bidder will meet the parameters for a contractor as defined under 2 CFR § 200.331(b)(1)-(5), they will not be deemed a subrecipient.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **40** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part III, Section C.3.b. (pg. 16) | Would the State please clarify the correct order, or confirm that the certificate of insurance must be part of Section II of the proposal? In addition, would the state please confirm that “*Copy of applicable licensure or any specific credentials*” is an optional item? |
| **Answer** |
| Please see Amendment #1 above. Please include in File 2- Organizations and Experience. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **41** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II, Scope of Services - Primary Objective (Page 10) | Could you clarify the primary target audience(s) for the video tutorials and training videos, particularly in relation to contractors or specific project types that the Department aims to guide with these resources? |
| **Answer** |
| The types of videos will vary as well as the audience for those videos. All together this in anticipated to include a range from general audience videos on regulatory procedures to moderately technical videos showing installed, or how to install, design techniques with interviews of agency staff and project partners. See Part I.A. of RFP for list of target audiences.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **42** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II, Scope of Services - Primary Objective (Page 10) | Could you specify the intended platforms for distributing video tutorials and training videos, such as the Department's website, YouTube, or other channels, to ensure they reach the target audience(s) effectively? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department is open to considering additional platforms. Currently video tutorials are distributed using the Department’s website and YouTube. The Department also has Facebook and Twitter accounts that could be utilized.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **43** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II, Scope of Services - Primary Objective (Page 10) | What specific call-to-action or outcomes does the Department anticipate from viewers after engaging with the video tutorials and training videos? For instance, are there specific actions or behaviors that the Department wishes to encourage? |
| **Answer** |
| The work under this grant is supporting strategies to build enduring community resiliency, to reduce climate impacts through nature-based solutions and investments in green infrastructure, and to strengthen the resilience of working waterfronts. Situated in these larger strategies, regulatory guidance materials should provide actionable information to property owners so they can more easily understand potential strategies and how to implement those strategies with respect to designing and implementing infrastructure and improvements to their property in a manner that will reduce the likelihood of negative impacts from natural hazards.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **44** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II, Scope of Services - Deliverables (Page 10) | Are there opportunities to film the permit guidelines in action, and can the Department facilitate connections with permit holders or project sites that exemplify best practices for filming purposes? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, the Department is open to this concept; however there hasn’t been any action to date to put this concept in motion. The Department would anticipate discussing this idea with an awarded bidder to determine how this could be done and then develop and implement it if found to be worthwhile. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **45** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II, Scope of Services - Deliverables (Page 10) | Regarding the use of social media as an outreach tool, is its application limited to video content related to the NRPA Permit By Rule, or is there potential for broader social media engagement, covering other areas outlined in the RFP? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, the Department is open to other uses of social media as an outreach tool across work areas in the RFP. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **46** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Part II, Scope of Services - Engagement Events (Page 11) | Could you kindly provide additional detail regarding expectations for the awarded bidder's participation in the in-person engagement meetings, such as the annual training and roundtable events? We understand that real-time interaction may be valuable for addressing practitioner feedback. However, we would appreciate guidance on whether there are specific roles or team members from the bidder's team that you anticipate should attend these events. Additionally, are there any circumstances where feedback could effectively be collected by Department staff and communicated to the bidder through alternative means such as email or video call? |
| **Answer** |
| See answer to questions 6 and 7 for expectations for awarded bidders participation in in-person training and roundtable events. The Department is open to considering other means of communicating feedback, if the awarded bidder is not present in-person. Other means will need to be included in the proposal and evaluated.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **47** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| RFP Section & Page Number: Part II, Project Tasks (Page 11) | Could you please clarify the expected method of delivery for the final products, such as whether master files, digital PDFs, or hard copies are required? Relatedly, will the awarded bidder be responsible for managing any printing, or will that be handled separately by the Department? |
| **Answer** |
| The expected delivery for final products is digital master files and pdfs with the intention that the Department would be able to maintain these files into the future. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **48** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
|   | Has Maine DEP contracted for prior support services (e.g., graphic design, project facilitation) for this project? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department does not have a contract with other support services for this project. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **49** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
|   | Can Maine DEP confirm our understanding that the services requested are focused on supporting Maine DEP with preparation of manuals and public facilitation and not technical support (e.g., coastal engineering, geotechnical guidance)? |
| **Answer** |
| This request for services is for assisting the Department prepare regulatory guidance materials in the form of written and video content. The Department is not requesting services for facilitation with this RFP. The services are also not for technical support on engineering.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **50** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
|   | Can Maine DEP confirm if the requested services will require expertise and measurable content development from Maine regulatory or coastal engineering practitioners or if that technical expertise and content will be provided on each subject by Maine DEP? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department and its agency partners in this project will provide subject matter expertise for the technical writing. The awarded bidder can assist with improvements with the technical writing to ensure it is effective at reaching target audiences. The awarded bidder is not required to have regulatory or coastal engineering subject matter expertise. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **51** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
|   | Can Maine DEP confirm that the $425,000 subaward as referenced in the RFP remains available and can be allocated to support this project and the awarded contractor? Is Maine DEP aware of any potential threats to the availability of funding for the awarded bidder?   |
| **Answer** |
| See answer to question 37.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **52** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Pg 5 Part 1A | Is the $425,000 budget the total for the project for all 5 years? Does that amount cover any state staff time or other components of the work? |
| **Answer** |
| The $425,000 budget is for the total project length from award to completion in September 2029. The budget does not cover any state staff time. The funds are intended for this request for services awarded to the successful bidder. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **53** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| N/A | Do you see web development (either written content or graphics) as separate components to the development of printed materials? |
| **Answer** |
| The awarded bidder is not anticipated to do any web development as part of this scope of work. Providing examples and advising the Department on best practices to present the developed materials on the Departments website can be included in the scope of work.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **54** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Pg 12-13 Part II B2 and Pg 14 Part II C | Can you clarify meeting expectations? There seem to be some areas where what is written in one section doesn’t agree with other sections. |
| **Answer** |
| Part II C virtual meeting hours refer to meetings under Part II B2 meetings. Part II C annual full day in-person events refer to Part II B3 engagement events. Part II C additional time refers to Part II B4 drafting guidance materials and Part II B5 final guidance materials. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **55** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Section 1A, p. 5 | Re: “The Department will receive a subaward of $425,000 of the available grant funds to develop content for the following deliverables.” Is the $425,000 subaward designated specifically to cover the costs of the communication, graphic design, and technical writing services contract discussed in this RFP, or will the Department also be using the subaward to cover other costs associated with producing the regulatory guidance materials (e.g., printing and distribution of final communication products, expenses for venues and food at full-day in-person events, agency/partner staff time)? |
| **Answer** |
| See answer to question 52. The Department has other funding in this same grant award to print and distribute the products, and to convene project partners at events throughout the project duration.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **56** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Section IIA, p. 10 | Could you provide additional information about the “video tutorials and training videos with animated visual explanations”? e.g., approximate number of videos, video duration (e.g., 3 minutes or 30 minutes), animation style (e.g., cartoon, diagrammatic, photorealistic), and any need for live action along with animation. Do you see the videos as a substantial part of the project, or a minor add-on?  |
| **Answer** |
| The videos are an essential part of the project and have been requested by agency staff and partners. See answers to Question 4 for more information about number, duration and style. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **57** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Section IIB, p. 11 | Could you clarify if the expected “in-person attendance at focus groups, training workshops, and roundtables” is included in the time estimates for the meetings and events listed in Section IIC Bidding Assumptions? If not, do you have time estimates for them? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, this in-person attendance is included in the time estimates for meeting and events listed in Section II C. Please note though that under Part II B2 iii focus groups and workshops will either be held in-person or held remotely by video call, to be determined, whereas Part II B3 annual training and roundtable engagement events will be in-person.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **59** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Appendix D, p. 27 | Given the current unknowns about the precise scope of work to develop and revise materials, what level of detail should be included in the cost proposal form? For example, is it sufficient to provide an estimated total quantity (hours) of graphic design for the entire project, or should a more detailed breakdown of graphic design hours be provided? |
| **Answer** |
| A total quantity (hours) of graphic design for the entire project can be provided; however, if desired, the proposal can describe in more detail the anticipated costs for the level of quality to be achieved for the types and amounts of materials developed. This could include a description of more than one scenario of cost to achieve different levels of quality and/or types and amounts of materials developed.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **59** | **RFP Section & Page Number**  | **Question** |
| Appendix D, p. 27 | Could you please clarify “cost forms should reflect what the bidder can provide within this budget range”? Does this mean the Total ($) in the form should equal $425,000, showing the total amount of services that can be provided within that budget? Or do you intend for proposals to potentially have total budgets below $425,000 with lower-cost proposals being more competitive during the review process? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department included the allotted budget for transparency. The budget is not intended to prescribe the total amount the proposal should meet. Proposals will be evaluated using scoring weights across all criteria in Part V, B.1 – organization qualification and experience, proposed services, and cost proposal.  |