|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP #202505076 Inventory of Critical Maine Working Waterfronts |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Marine Resources |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | July 16, 2025 |
| **QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | July 22, 2025 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | August 11, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time (**as amended**) |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | [Proposals@maine.gov](mailto: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 submission deadline is amended. 2. Part II.A.3 (page 8) and Part IV, Section IV.1.c (page 13) were clarified for consistency  * Language was added to Part II.A.3 (page 8) to clarify that Deliverable 3 will be informed by Deliverables 1 & 2. * Part IV, Section IV.1.c (page 13) was removed. The proposal team wants the future cost estimate to be a deliverable for future use and do not need it as part of the RFP proposal. | |
| **REVISED LANGUAGE IN RFP:**   1. All reference to the proposal submission deadline of August 4, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m. local time are amended to **August 11, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m. local time**. 2. Part II.A.3 (page 8): Provide cost and time estimates to do similar statewide inventories of other types of working waterfronts if additional funding becomes available (**Deliverable 3**). These estimates will be informed by Deliverables 1 & 2.   Part IV, Section IV.1.c (page 13): Text deleted for c. | |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Question** |
| When are questions due? |
| **Answer** |
| 11:59 pm on July 16, 2025 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | **Question** |
| Many of us do a variety of projects with DMR. Does this RFP and selection to do the project preclude my company’s ability to apply for other projects in the future? |
| **Answer** |
| No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3** | **Question** |
| Deliverable 2 has funding allocated to it. Is there additional funding for the other deliverables, or is $40,000 the total for the whole project? |
| **Answer** |
| $40,000 is the total for the whole project, not the second deliverable. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | **Question** |
| Regarding the definition of working waterfront for commercial fishing and marine use. Does that definition include aquaculture as well, or just commercial fishing? |
| **Answer** |
| Aquaculture is included. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5** | **Question** |
| A steering committee and an advisory committee are referenced. Are they the same? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, they are the same. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6** | **Question** |
| Has the steering committee already been created? |
| **Answer** |
| Not yet. The RFP team has some ideas, but the makeup will depend a bit on the final bidder chosen for the project and the assistance and guidance they need. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7** | **Question** |
| How large will the steering committee be? |
| **Answer** |
| We aren’t sure yet. The group won’t be overly large but will have representation of knowledgeable groups in the working waterfront space. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8** | **Question** |
| Is tourism something the RFP team is interested in when we discuss economic relevance – beaches, port towns, or are we just focused on ports, working waterfronts, and other industrial purposes? |
| **Answer** |
| We are more focused on the commercial and industrial areas for this project, but realize activities often overlap. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9** | **Question** |
| In Appendix C, where bidders list their project experience, can the subcontractor’s experience be listed, or can it only be the bidder’s experience? |
| **Answer** |
| If a subcontractor is named, their experience can be referenced. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **10** | **Question** |
| For the certificate of insurance, does it need to be included in the proposal, or is it due upon signing of the contract? |
| **Answer** |
| The certificate of insurance is due with the proposal submission. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **11** | **Question** |
| Question about potential contract extension, or the possibility of an extension: does that include an extension of the funding, or is it just a matter of extending the time until the deliverables are due? |
| **Answer** |
| It would be an extension of the funding as well as the time. The total amount, $40,000, wouldn’t change. The money for the RFP is on a grant that ends at the end of December, but it will be extended into 2026. However, because the funding hasn’t officially been extended, the contract can’t be written past the end of December. Once the extension is official, the contract can be amended to extend the project and funding another six months. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **12** | **Question** |
| Does the RFP team have a set of GIS attributes that we want to obtain? Are we hoping for proposals to include attributes? Are we expecting the attributes to be developed along with the steering committee? |
| **Answer** |
| We are expecting the attributes to be developed along with the steering committee. We are trying not to pre-determine what should be measured. We do want the new data to be compatible with existing datasets, and workable with other data, and this may influence the final attributes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **13** | **Question** |
| The RFP references a steering committee and advisory committee. Are those the same? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, see answers to questions 5 & 6 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **14** | **Question** |
| Is match required for this grant? |
| **Answer** |
| No. Match is not required. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **15** | **Question** |
| For Deliverable 3 – providing cost estimates for similar work is listed as an outcome, but it is also listed in the cost proposal. Do we need to provide estimates as part of the proposal submission? |
| **Answer** |
| The RFP has been amended to clarify this. See Amendment 1 for this RFP with changes to Part II, Section A.3 and Part IV, Section IV.1.c. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **16** | **Question** |
| Are indirect costs accepted as part of the proposal? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, they are accepted, as long as the total is no more than $40,000. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **17** | **Question** |
| If the questions are already written down for submission, should they be sent in as well as asked verbally? |
| **Answer** |
| Feel free to submit in writing as well so they can be answered thoroughly. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **18** | **Question** |
| With the cost proposal forms, do they need to be followed strictly? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes. Follow the provided format. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **19** | **Question** |
| There doesn’t appear to be a requirement for individual resumes as part of this RFP. Is that correct? |
| **Answer** |
| Project personnel descriptions and an organizational chart are required, but individual resumes are not required. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **20** | **Question** |
| Are project graphics, descriptions, or visual outlines of the proposal accepted? |
| **Answer** |
| A narrative description is expected, but visuals will be accepted if they help clarify the narrative response. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **21** | **Question** |
| The RFP mentions “types” of working waterfronts. A question earlier distinguished between commercial, and tourism uses, and the RFP mentions commercial fishing and marine activities and the primary focus. Is there a conceptualization of the different types of working waterfronts that the RFP team is already working with? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes. There are a lot of distinctions. Public versus private ownership, walk-in access path versus a piece of fixed infrastructure like a boat launch, etc. A town fish pier might operate differently than a small, family wharf, and differently than a large co-op. The size of properties, ownership, and presence of infrastructure are big categories, but there are others as well. The level of threat to a property is hard to measure but it is important to consider. This could include sea level rise as well as social and economic factors affecting the property owners, which may impact whether the working waterfront stays as a working waterfront over time. There are many factors to consider when describing working waterfronts and what may happen to them in the future. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **22** | **Question** |
| For future inventories, would other sectors like shipping be included? |
| **Answer** |
| Shipping isn’t a huge focus right now, but it is important to think about what activities may exist in the future. Shipping could be considered. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I. A. Purpose & background, last paragraph, p. 5 | Would the anticipated 6-month extension beyond 31 December 2025 be a no-cost extension or a costed extension? |
| **Answer** | |
| It would be a no-cost extension. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II. A. Overview & deliverables 1.b. and 2.a. p. 8 AND B.1 and B.1.a. p. 9 | Is the Department’s steering committee the same entity as the Department’s advisory team or are they two different entities? If two entities, how are their roles and functions different? |
| **Answer** | |
| They are the same entities. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II. A. Overview & deliverables 2.b.ii. p. 8 | Is the $40k referenced under Deliverable 2 the ceiling amount for this award? I.e. is the cost of completion of all four Deliverables to be at or below $40k? Is the $40k the anticipated cost solely for the completion of Deliverable 2? |
| **Answer** | |
| $40,000 is the total cost for the entire project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D, Proposed cost for Deliverable 3, p. 23 | Re cost proposal, Deliverable 3: Please confirm that Deliverable 3, *“Provide cost and time estimates to do similar statewide inventories of other types of working waterfronts if additional funding becomes available”* should be provided/ delivered at time of proposal submission (as part of the cost proposal) rather than as a deliverable, **post-award**. |
| **Answer** | |
| An estimate should be provided with the proposal submission and a refined estimate will be submitted as a post-award deliverable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D, Cost estimates by budget category, p. 23 | Re cost proposal: Can indirect costs be included in the cost proposal under the Cost Category: Other? |
| **Answer** | |
| While indirect costs are allowed in the project, any indirect costs must be shown in line 4 (the line for indirect costs) of the “Cost Estimates by Budget Category” table in Appendix D. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Re cost proposal: Please confirm that no match is required. |
| **Answer** | |
| Correct. There is no match requirement. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II A.3pg 8 | This is a clarification after the bidder’s conference. During the Bidder’s conference it sounded like you said you wanted applicants to include cost and time estimates to do all the statewide inventories for other types of working waterfront not collected in Deliverable #2 as part of the proposal and then Deliverable #3 would refine those numbers.  It seems like Deliverable #1 would have to be complete to provide a full assessment in Deliverable #3 and that the work of Deliverable #2 would certainly inform those estimates.  So, I think I am misunderstanding what was said during the bidder’s conference and that the only thing the proposal needs to say is how we would develop those estimates and the costs to do that work. Not actually develop a preliminary product required by Deliverable #3. |
| **Answer** | |
| The RFP has been amended to clarify this. See Amendment 1 for this RFP with changes to Part II, Section A.3 and Part IV, Section IV.1.c. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II A.2.a page 8 | On page 8, Part II A.2.a, it states "The awarded Bidder will work with the Department's advisory team to identify the subset of working waterfront types to inventory." Given that the subset is unknown at the time of this proposal, will the number and types of working waterfronts included in the subset inventory be established based on the budget amount provided in this RFP for Deliverable 2? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the available budget will be considered when determining the scope of the inventory. Please see the answer to Question 3 as well. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II A.7 page 9 | What is the expected level of fieldwork required for Deliverable 2? |
| **Answer** | |
| Fieldwork may be required to identify the locations of and confirm details about certain working waterfronts and to sufficiently complete the inventory. The amount of fieldwork will depend on what attributes are included in the inventory. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II A.7 page 9 | The RFP indicates that there may be some travel time. The Cost Proposal Form indicates that the proposed cost must be a fixed amount and asks for a breakdown by budget category. Since the subset has not been created and we don’t know at this time where we would be travelling, can we indicate that cost as TBD? |
| **Answer** | |
| Some amount of statewide travel will be expected. While the exact travel locations are not known, please provide enough travel budget to be able to travel. The total costs cannot exceed $40,000 for the entire project. | |