

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gardiner

**DATE:** 2/28/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>53</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>98</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Gardiner**

**DATE: 2/28/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - No

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
  - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - No
  - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
    - This grant will be completed 100% by the approved Efficiency Maine Vendor within 90 days of the notice to proceed and not impact the timing of the current grant project.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gardiner

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- No
- County:
  - Kennebec
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Medium
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - High

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score:   15**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: City of Gardiner Municipal Building Heat Pump Installation
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned B4

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   53**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from inclusion of subtasks to outline the steps to install heat pump systems within each location.
  - Would benefit from more information about current heating system at the Radio Tower.
  - Task 1- Install Heat Pump at City Office
    - Install 1 (one) 9 BTU; 4 (four) 24 BTU; 1 (one) 32 BTU; and 1 (one) 36 BTU Heat Pumps plus all necessary labor, mechanics, brackets, drain lines, wiring and surge protectors

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gardiner

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- Reducing the fossil fuel consumption of this building by approximately 7,000 CCF of natural gas per year and a reduction of roughly \$13,870.00 in fuel expenses.
  - Task 2- Install Heat Pump at Library
    - Install 4 (four) – 36 BTU Heat Pumps, all necessary labor, mechanics, brackets, drain lines, wiring and surge protectors
    - Library is use as a warming/cooling emergency shelter
    - Reducing the fossil fuel consumption of this building by approximately 6,300 CCF of natural gas per year and a reduction of roughly \$12,640.00 in fuel expenses.
  - Task 3- Install Heat Pump at Public Works
    - Install 2 (two) – 9 BTU Heat Pump, all necessary labor, mechanics, brackets, drain lines, wiring and surge protectors
    - Reduce the fossil fuel consumption of this building by approximately 4,830 gallons of propane per year and a reduction of roughly \$8,000.00 in fuel expenses.
  - Task 4- Install Heat Pump at Radio Tower
    - Install 1 (one) – 12 BTU Heat Pump, all necessary labor, mechanics, brackets, drain lines, wiring and surge protectors
    - Reduce its energy usage by roughly 1/3 its current energy consumption
  - Task 5- Install Heat Pump at Wastewater Plant
    - Install 3 (three) 12 BTU Heat Pumps, all necessary labor, mechanics, brackets, drain lines, wiring and surge protectors
    - Reduce the fossil fuel consumption of this building by approximately 8,600 gallons of oil and 830 gallons of propane per year and a reduction of roughly \$25,500.00 in fuel expenses.
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
    - Reasonable
    - Would benefit from more detailed subtasks, with start and end dates for all, such as contracting, installation, testing, etc. However, this is a simple and straightforward project.
    - 3 months to complete all installations
  - 12 or 24 months
    - 12 months

**Need**

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - City wishes to lead by example through reducing fossil fuel dependency at City owned buildings
    - This reduction will lessen climate change impacts by improving air quality, lowering GHG emissions, and helping to protect water quality and wildlife
    - City, businesses, and residents have experienced an increase in detrimental storm events and because of this feel strongly that the City should lead by example through fossil fuel reduction and energy efficiency
  - Given financial burden of recent storms, the City needs this grant funding to install the heat pumps in order to avoid raising taxes for the cause and putting additional burden on residents
  - Units installed at the Library will help support the use of the building as a warming/cooling center during emergencies and those at the City Hall/Public Safety Building will support use of this building as emergency operations center
    - With increase in significant weather events, this heating/cooling center is a community priority

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gardiner

**DATE:** 2/28/25

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Outcomes include reduction of City's fossil fuel consumption for municipal heating appliances by about 8,600 gallons of oil, 5,660 gallons of propane, and 13,300 CCF of natural gas annually, and \$60,000 annually
    - Breakdowns for each building are provided in the Project Description
    - Additional outcomes include the improvement of the Library to support the use of the building as the community's emergency heating/cooling center
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - John Cameron, Director of Public Works, will oversee installations and serve as POC for contractor
  - Melissa Lindley, Economic Development Director, will oversee grant admin
  - Kokernak, LLC, will perform installation

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Well-designed
  - Identified as a community priority
  - Use social media, email notification lists, flyers website and issue press releases to provide project updates and highlight energy efficiency upgrades in City-owned buildings, promote Efficiency Maine program and rebates, and make printed materials available at City Office.
  - No interruption to services
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Somewhat
  - Would benefit from a more robust engagement plan that directly advertises to vulnerable or disadvantaged community members to ensure they are aware of these upgrades and resources
  - Units installed at the Library will help support the use of the building as a warming/cooling center during emergencies and those at the City Hall/Public Safety Building will support use of this building as emergency operations center

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25**

**Score: 25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gardiner

**DATE:** 2/28/25

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Grant will be used to support full installation, equipment, labor, inspection, and permitting costs for all of the installations, except will only fund part of the Radio Tower installation with the City covering the remaining cost
  - Vendor estimates provided
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - Confirmed that no EMT rebates are available
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes, \$4,289 for the Radio Tower heat pump installation and in kind staff time for all locations
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gorham

**DATE:** 2/28/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>0</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>38</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>24</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>77</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Gorham**

**DATE: 2/28/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Gorham Town Manager

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
      - No
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
      - Prior grant project has been completed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 0

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gorham

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- County:
  - Cumberland
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Large
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Low

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won’t Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score:   15**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won’t Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Gorham Municipal Buildings Lighting Retrofit Project
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with B2

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   38**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Replace 468 T8 fluorescent lights with LED fixtures at Gorham municipal center and little falls activity center
    - Will use this opportunity to raise public awareness of the benefits of lighting upgrades through comm channels and signage
    - RFP issued and Seabee Electric selected
  - Would benefit from more details on the two buildings (Gorham Municipal Center and Little Falls Activity Center) including the relative breakdown of lighting fixtures between the two locations and if both buildings will have all lighting replaced

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gorham

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- Would benefit from more details on the signage that will be posted and the outreach to be conducted
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from start and end dates
  - Would benefit from more details around when each of the two buildings will be completed
  - Would benefit from describing the timeline for community engagement
- 12 or 24 months
  - 12 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Step to reduce energy consumption to help support the initiatives to lessen the impacts of climate change; will provide lighting at public facilities that support extensive community activities and functions
  - Reduce the universal waste stream associated with disposal of fluorescent lamp tubes
  - Would benefit from detailing current energy expenditures and specifically how reducing energy consumption supports Gorham's climate and resilience goals

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - "The outcome of the project will be improved energy efficiency and reduced carbon footprint and energy costs for the upgraded buildings."
  - Would benefit from including an outcome related to community engagement
  - Would benefit from more details to support the desired outcomes, including estimated savings in kWh, cost savings, or CO2 equivalent.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from clarifying and fully describing if the facility coordinator will handle all project management responsibilities including grant management responsibilities
  - Would benefit from identifying who will conduct the community engagement

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Outreach will consist of a press release via town communication channels and signage at the upgraded buildings.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Gorham

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- Two posts via town communication channels at initiation and completion
- Would benefit from more specific details around the existing town communication channels, what the signage will entail, and what will be communicated
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Minimally considered
  - Note that this project will benefit all members of the public by reducing costs and improving functionality
  - Would benefit from identifying vulnerable populations and noting how this benefits them, or how this project will specifically be communicated to vulnerable groups

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 24**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$56,077
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Spare fixtures not discussed in project scope or narrative
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - Yes - \$11,103 EMT lighting rebate included
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes, in-kind time for outreach and oversight
- Other notes
  - To receive pre-approved EMT rebate, must complete project by May 15<sup>th</sup>.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hallowell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>58</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>103</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hallowell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Mr. George Lapointe – Mayor of Hallowell
  - Mr. Nick Lacasse – President, Hallowell Area Board of Trade; Water Street property owner and resident; and local small business owner
  - Mr. Chris Walsh – President, Front Street Property Owners Association –
    - No letter attached
  - Ms. Allison Michaud – Water Street business owner
  - Mr. Chris Vallee – Water Street business owner
  - Ms. Maureen AuCoin – Vice President, Vision Hallowell
  - Ms. Rosemary Presnar – Chair, Hallowell Conservation Commission

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
      - No
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
      - Prior grant project is now closed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hallowell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

**Total Points Available: 5**

**Score:   5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Kennebec
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - 2628
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - High

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15**

**Score:   15**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Planning for Nature-based Stabilization of Hallowell's Kennebec River Shoreline: Community Engagement and Design in Support of Policy Development and Implementation
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with E8

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60**

**Score:   58**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hallowell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

### Project Description and Timeline

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate thoughtful selection for both the steering committee and the stakeholder group
  - Displays clear understanding of potential nature-based solutions that may be used
  - Provides clear plan for both outreach and engagement and development of a final engineering design
  - Task 0:
    - Form a steering committee to include municipal staff and elected officials, downtown business owners and employees, Front Street property owners and residents, Hallowell Conservation Commission, Hallowell Climate Action, Hallowell Tree Board
    - Hire expert consultants to perform following tasks: 1) an outreach consultant and 2) a professional geologist or professional engineer (environmental consultant)
  - Task 1 – Introduce project and engage stakeholders.
    - Action 1A: Identify stakeholders
    - Action 1B: Develop communications plan
    - Action 1C: Inform stakeholders and receive initial input
  - Task 2 – Develop nature-based options for riverbank stabilization.
    - Action 2A: Assess site
    - Action 2B: Design site-specific nature-based options for bank stabilization
    - Action 2C: Receive community input on stabilization options
  - Task 3 – Develop design recommendations.
    - Action 3A: Develop final recommendations for nature-based solutions
    - Action 3B: Identify permitting requirements
    - Action 3C: Develop monitoring recommendations
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Provide clear and detailed timelines with appropriate intervals for all tasks and subtasks
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Hallowell's riverine shoreline is already experiencing dramatic erosion which will be magnified by climate change
    - Devastating Kennebec River flood of December 2023
  - Hallowell's downtown buildings are positioned immediately on the shoreline and susceptible to flooding and potential risk of riverbank failure
  - Identified as a priority within Hallowell's Comp Plan (2022) and within public workshops led by Hallowell Climate Action around the state's list of community actions

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hallowell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Provide both short- and long-term outcomes, including key project deliverables and long-term resiliency to erosive forces and enhanced ecosystem and improved riverine water quality
- Would benefit from including an implementation strategy to come after the plan development
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Steering committee (10-person committee chaired by the Mayor of Hallowell) will oversee the project.
  - Committee Chair will act at the project manager.
  - Outreach consultant to develop and implement communications plan and incorporate feedback into the initial design and final report.
  - Environmental consultant will direct all technical work to develop a final report

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Robust and well-designed
  - Provides both an advertising plan and an in-depth participation plan to incorporate public input into the project, as demonstrated in the provided Scope of Work
  - Appreciate the use of one on one stakeholder interviews and the preliminary identification of key groups to include in both the stakeholder group and the steering committee
  - An outreach consultant will be hired to develop a communications plan, lead and facilitate public workshops, and incorporate public feedback into the design recommendations and final report.
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Yes/somewhat
  - Identifies stakeholders who are vulnerable based on their proximity to the eroding riverbank or use of this space
  - Would benefit from identified of additional vulnerable groups – older, low income – and identification of key community-based partners to assist with outreach to vulnerable groups
    - Are any social services need the downtown/riverbank area?



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hallowell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$74,736
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Budget narrative was incorporated into the budget worksheet
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes, in-kind time
- Other notes
  - Detailed vendor estimate included

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harpswell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>3</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>35</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>22</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>75</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Harpswell**

**DATE: 1/31/25**

\*\*\*\*\*  
**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*  
**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Maine Coast Fisherman's Association
  - Holbrook Community Foundation
  - Dolphin Marina and Restaurant
  - Harbor & Waterfront Committee
  - Harpswell Aging at Home
  - Sen. Mattie Daughtry
  - Rep. Cheryl Golek

\*\*\*\*\*  
**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*  
**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
      - No
  - No
- How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
  - Prior grant project will be complete before proposed project start date.

\*\*\*\*\*  
**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 3

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harpswell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Cumberland
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Medium
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Low

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: \_\_15\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Develop Maps that Combine Sea Level Rise and Storm Surge to help the Town, Working Waterfront Community and Residents with Resilience Planning.
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with F9 and F10

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_35\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Detailed interactive mapping tool to estimate and map future flooding from sea level rise and storm surge

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harpswell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Builds upon CAG grant which supported analysis of Harpswell's 5 most vulnerable roads
  - Would benefit from more details on how the results of this project will be incorporated into future planning and how it interacts with Harpswell's previous flood mitigation studies
  - Would benefit from more clarification as to how community engagement will be embedded in this work
  - Would benefit from subtasks to support work to be completed within each task.
  - Will the map give the Town the tools that they need to make decisions regarding vulnerable infrastructure to inform the capital improvement plan?
    - Cost estimates for adapting/replacing infrastructure are not included as a deliverable.
  - Appreciate that the maps will show multiple SLR scenarios.
  - Task 1:
    - Engineering firm to attend kickoff meeting with town staff to review scope, objectives, and project goals
    - Engineer with knowledge of Harpswell's Flood Insurance Study (FIS) will review coastal hydraulics, estimate future flood zones, and update GIS shapefiles to reflect flood zones.
    - The engineering firm will create a wave runup tool to calculate runup at high variability along the Harpswell shoreline.
    - The engineering firm will re-calculate wave conditions around Harpswell by re-running wave models and updating the wave statistics across Harpswell and provide an interactive map.
    - The engineering firm to produce maps showing predicted levels of sea level rise will be available at the Town Codes Office, and on line for use by the working waterfront, residents living on private roads and the townspeople.
  - Task 2:
    - A concise data report, corresponding to save points located offshore throughout the Town of Harpswell. The report will explain how to use the data and have appendices containing data from all save points.
    - The town will prepare and distribute/advertise public notices, print handouts and maps and provide a location for stakeholder public meetings.
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Minimally described
  - Would benefit from start and end dates and milestones for each task/subtask throughout the duration of the project.
- 12 or 24 months
  - 12 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Coastal peninsular community that will be vulnerable to sea level rise. Harpswell has a number of one way in and out roads and businesses and homes which are susceptible to flooding events.
  - Roads are already experiencing flooding during windstorm/king tide events
  - Existing Harpswell July 2024 floodplain maps incorporate wave action runup and storm surge but do not take into account sea level rise impacts.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harpswell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Access to a working waterfront is vital for sustaining the livelihoods of commercial fishermen, inform emergency services, and support vulnerable groups.
- Town vulnerability study determined that 5 major roads will be vulnerable to 2 feet of SLR, cutting off access to residences and businesses.

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from forward-looking statements, such as the inclusion of priority actions within the CIP, which address how this project will inform long-term planning and outcomes in Harpswell
  - Map tool will be used to:
    - Identify vulnerable coastal homes of older adults who may need transport or medical intervention, support the working waterfront in identifying and improving vulnerable infrastructure, and support road owner associations as they plan for sea level rise and flooding so that single access points are passable for evacuation.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Somewhat
  - Would benefit from clearly articulating what additional information is needed to identify priority actions that were not already determined within the last study to determine the effectiveness of this mapping exercise.

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from a primary point of contact to oversee the project at the Town
  - Contractor to analyze and prepare SLR models
  - Town Administrator and Deputy Town Administrator to review and pay invoices, prepare quarterly reports
  - Resilience and Sustainability Committee to plan and lead public engagement

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Note a variety of partner organizations: Holbrook Community Foundation, Maine Coast Fishermen's Association, Harpswell's Harbor and Waterfront Committee, Harpswell Aging at Home, and road associations
    - Hold meetings to review the tool and how best to use it
  - Would benefit from engaging these groups to not just to learn how to use the tool, but to inform outcomes and future planning based on the tool
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Yes
  - Identify elders and commercial fishermen as the most vulnerable populations to flooding/SLR
    - 3 working wharves were lost in the January 2024 storms
  - Partnership with Harpswell Aging at Home to share information with older adults

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harpswell

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Would benefit from more opportunities to engage these residents to identify how this project will impact them, or provide ways for them to access the results.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 22**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000 grant funds
  - Total project cost of \$85,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Budget narrative would benefit from subtasks and/or hourly breakdown by task
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes – in-kind time
- Other notes
  - Vendor estimate included

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harrison

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>48</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>10</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>68</b>



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harrison

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Lakes Environmental Association

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - Yes
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - No
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harrison

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Cumberland
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Medium

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score:   5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Stream Smart Crossings for Flood Resilient Roads in Harrison
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Somewhat aligned with G5
  - Proposed project will utilize Stream Smart Crossing Guidelines but the applicant makes no reference to adopting the guidelines for future projects.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:  48**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Match funding for Municipal Stream Crossing Program
    - \$200,000 each for two culvert projects, already approved
    - Requested funds are described as match funding but required match funding amount is not included within the project description.
      - Per MaineDOT, match funding must be raised and appropriated by the Town.
  - Task 1: Design, engineering, and environmental permitting for the project.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harrison

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Task 1.1: Complete initial designs
  - Task 1.2: Geotechnical evaluations
  - Task 1.3: Submit permit applications
  - Task 1.4: Finalize construction documents
  - Designs will meet DEP's Stream Smart Crossing Guidelines
  - Design will be a joint process between LEA and Wright Pierce.
  - Would benefit from demonstrating that projected climate impacts will be incorporated into the design.
- Task 2: Stream-crossing construction
  - Task 2.1: Bidding
  - Task 2.2: Begin construction
  - Task 2.3: Complete project evaluation
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from more detailed milestones for each subtask and start/end dates
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - These crossings have routinely flooded due to more frequent and intense rain events, leading to overtopping of the roads and erosion of materials under the roadway, necessitating frequent repair
  - Town has spent nearly \$10,000/year on maintenance over the past three years
  - Closure of these roadways affects road maintenance and emergency response vehicles
  - The brook is also of significant environmental and recreational significance, for brook trout passage, etc.
  - Identified as a priority within 2022 survey completed by Resilience Harrison Maine

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Includes, improved resilience to severe storms, improved fish passage, and a reduction in the maintenance time and budget at these locations, and greater public understanding of the importance of well-designed stream crossings
  - Partnership with LEA will result in new relationships to further support lake and river health
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harrison

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Town manager to oversee the project in collaboration with the PW department
- Wright-Pierce will lead development of design plans and assist with permitting
- LEA will offer TA, assist with fieldwork and the design of the culverts to ensure fish passage and water quality improvements, and assist with community education and engagement
- Construction firm to be selected through formal public bidding process

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Includes project updates through select board meetings, newsletter, and LEA's communication channels
    - Would benefit from more detail on what LEA's communications channels are
  - Would benefit from a more robust outreach and engagement plan, which includes an advertising strategy to encourage community participation
  - Would benefit from more detail on when public meetings will occur throughout key moments in the scope of work to incorporate public input
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Minimally expected
  - Improvements will reduce the risk of isolation during severe storm events
  - Would benefit from an outreach and engagement plan which specifically advertises to and seeks to engage vulnerable or disadvantaged community members
  - Mentions services for Harrison Food Bank, but it is unclear how this project will support this organization

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   10**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Would benefit from a breakdown of all funding sources supporting this project
  - Would benefit from the inclusion of vendor estimates to support estimated costs
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - DEP Stream Smart Grants - \$200,000 per culvert; \$400,000 total

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Harrison

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes
- Other notes
  - Would benefit from identifying match amount required for Stream Crossing Grant
  - Grant funds cannot fund any work that started prior to the grant period
  - Community Action Grant Funds may not be used to directly fund the construction of a culvert per the CAG2024-5 Program Statement
  - Design/engineering costs for Stream Smart Crossings are eligible for grant funds. Confirm with applicant the funds needed to complete design/engineering.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hartford

**DATE:** 3/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>30</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>13</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>63</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Hartford**

**DATE: 3/3/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - No

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
  - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - No
  - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
    - Prior project has been completed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hartford

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- No
- County:
  - Oxford
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - High

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score:   15**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Weatherize the Harford Town Hall for heating efficiency.
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with B1, B3

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   30**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from detailed subtasks to outline the steps needed to complete deliverables
  - Would benefit from more detail on what models are expected to be installed, including any energy efficiency ratings, especially for the doors, insulation, and stove
  - Task 3 Would benefit from more detail around the need for reinforcement of walls and what that will entail
  - Task 4 would benefit from more detail on what will be included
  - Task 5 would benefit from more detail on the current use of the stoves



## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hartford

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Task 1: replacement of 12 windows with energy efficient windows in the Town Hall.
  - Task 2: replacement of the two double front entrance doors to the Town Hall
  - Task 3: install insulation in the basement, walls, and ceiling of the Town Hall
    - Currently no insulation in the main section of the hall
    - Walls will need to be reinforced as part of this project
  - Task 4: remodel the bathroom in the Town Hall to for heating reasons
  - Task 5: replace the two electric stoves with one energy efficient commercial stove
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Minimally described
  - Would benefit from more detailed tasks and subtasks, including start and end dates for all
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Tasks 1-3 are well-aligned
  - Tasks 4-5 is somewhat aligned
  - Would benefit from a more clear climate/emissions reduction need for the bathroom remodel and stove upgrade
  - Town Hall is used for meetings, elections, town meetings, dinners, rental clinics, and other events
  - Heat in main section of the hall is currently turned off when not in use due to lack of weatherization
  - Building is being used more than it was in the past, and it is not cost efficient to heat the main section each time an event is held
  - Bathroom currently cannot be heated by the heat pumps due to location and size and need to be remodeled to correct for this
  - 2 electric cook stoves located in the kitchen trip the electrical box when in use, and will benefit the hall when used for event
  - Currently heat pumps are not being used to capacity due to lack of weatherization in the main hall

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from more metrics around anticipated annual cost savings, emissions reductions, and fuel reductions
  - Would benefit from identifying current heating sources (is it totally electric?)
  - Would benefit from more detail on how the current solar system is used
  - Outcomes include lower heating costs and improved ability to use the heat pumps to their total capacity, increased energy efficiency, utilization of solar energy credits
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hartford

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Tasks 1, 2, 3, and 5 are likely to achieve outcomes
- Task 4 is unable to determine.
- Would benefit from a more clear scope of work, including expected models for all upgrades, in order to determine the effectiveness of each upgrade in reducing GHG emissions and costs

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from knowing more about the project scope in order to inform how the project will be managed
  - Hartford Board of Selectmen – determine all aspects of project
  - Treasurer – review and prepare payments

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Minimally expected
  - Would benefit from more robust outreach and engagement plan to make residents aware of upgrades and how to use/maintain the new appliances
  - Town Hall is used by majority of residents and improvement will benefit all, including through lower cost to taxpayers to heat the building
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Minimally
  - Would benefit from a more robust engagement plan that specifically advertises to vulnerable or disadvantaged groups
  - Would benefit from a more robust emergency shelter plan that enables the building to function as a reliable heating/cooling center/space of refuge
  - Town Hall has been used by residents during power outages to retrieve water, charge devices, and cook food
  - During outages, town generator provides power to the buildings

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25**

**Score: 13**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hartford

**DATE:** 3/3/25

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Worksheet not completed by task
  - Would benefit from a more detailed budget narrative, that includes costs for material and labor, identifies specific models, and provides vendor estimates
  - No vendor estimates provided
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - N/A
- Other notes
  - Insufficient scope of work provided for the bathroom remodel to receive grant funds; application was scored with this task removed.
  - To receive grant award, vendor estimates or other support for cost estimates must be provided, plus specific scopes of work for each project task.
  - Applicant must provide additional data to show that by replacing the two existing electric stoves with one larger stove will reduce energy usage

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hollis

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>3</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>53</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>96</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Hollis**

**DATE: 1/31/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Southern Maine Planning and Development Commission
  - Hollis Conservation Commission
  - Hollis Selectboard

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - Yes
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - No
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 3

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hollis

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- No
- County:
  - York
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Medium
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Low

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won’t Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: \_\_15\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won’t Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Town of Hollis Open Space Plan and Hollis Resilient Trails
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with E1 and E4.
  - Somewhat aligned with E5, E6, E10 if project location is within a floodplain or wetland area.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_53\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Hollis Open Space Plan
  - Appreciate that this work builds off of prior projects; detailed tasks and subtasks demonstrate knowledge of the process and steps involved.
    - Task 1: Open Space Project Administration

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hollis

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Task 2: Open Space Plan
    - Task 2A: Inventory and Analysis
    - Task 2B: Public Engagement
    - Task 2C: Plan drafting and review
    - Task 2D: Plan revision and adoption
  - Hollis Resilient Trails
    - Would benefit from a discussion around how these trail improvements will address climate and resilience goals.
    - Task 3: Resilient Trails Project Administration
    - Task 4: Indian Cellar Trailhead Restoration
    - Task 5: Googins Woods Parking Area Improvements
    - Task 6: Indian Cellar and Googins Woods Trail Improvements
    - Task 7: Resilient Trails Community Engagement
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Task and subtask start/end dates clearly demonstrated
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

**Need**

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Hollis Open Space Plan
    - Well-aligned
    - Hollis is just outside of the Portland Metro Area and has seen 100 new homes built in the last two years and is part of the expanded study area of the Maine Turnpike's Gorham Connector project. Open Space plan allows for proactive planning.
    - Would benefit from discussion on the need of more compact development to preserve open space while also allowing for development.
  - Hollis Resilient Trails
    - Somewhat/minimally
    - Would benefit from a discussion around how these trail improvements will address climate and resilience goals.
    - Educational activities and materials would benefit from a clearer climate focus.
  - All projects are supported by the community through CRP enrollment community resilience workshop

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Hollis Open Space Plan:
    - Open Space Plan will allow the Town to deepen its understanding of the existing open space in Hollis, identify specific areas for future conservation, and establish goals for open space and conservation efforts throughout the community.
    - Could benefit from addressing how the Open Space Plan will be incorporated into long-term comprehensive planning.
  - Hollis Resilient Trails:

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hollis

**DATE:** 1/31/25

- Trail improvements will allow for increased accessibility and resilience of trails, allowing community members to benefit from local open space.
- Restoration activities would benefit from a greater focus on climate impacts
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Open Space Plan – Likely
  - Resilient Trails – Somewhat, lack of a long-term management plan will decrease likelihood of long-term resiliency of the trails.

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Would benefit from inclusion of Conservation Corps member role and oversight for, which was included within Task 6 of the budget
  - Hollis Open Space Plan:
    - Madison Moody, Conservation Commission Chair, will lead project coordination for the Town, develop public engagement strategies, and complete grant reports
    - James Torres, SMPDC Project Manager, will serve as the project manager, overseeing all aspects of the project
    - Brookelyn Tilton, SMPDC Project Staff, will assist with the project tasks
    - Hollis Conservation Commission will advise the Open Space Plan process and support public engagement
  - Hollis Resilience Trails
    - Madison Moody, Conservation Commission Chair, will lead project coordination for the Town, develop public engagement strategies, complete grant reports, and service as Project Manager
    - Hollis Conservation Commission will assist in project coordination and support public engagement

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Would benefit from more specific types of partner organizations, number of workshops, accessible times, etc.
  - Online surveys, in-person comment boxes, community workshops, partnering with local organizations
  - Resilient Trails project intends to work with students to create educational materials and host student field trips
  - Would benefit from engaging with broader populations to increase awareness of the projects
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Somewhat
  - Would benefit from determining local partner organizations to reach underserved populations
  - Would benefit from identifying more potentially vulnerable populations and how to increase their use of trails and open spaces



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hollis

**DATE:** 1/31/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$72,975
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Appreciate inclusion of estimated hours and hourly rate
  - Would benefit from a more detailed narrative that aligns the budget details with the scope of work
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - N/A
- Other notes
  - Application is scored for Tasks 1 and 2 to receive a partial award.
  - Tasks 3-7 would require further demonstration of alignment with MWW strategies and actions to be funded, including how projected climate impacts will be addressed to meet resilience goals.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hope

**DATE:** 2/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>47</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>20</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>87</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Hope**

**DATE: 2/3/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Hope Elementary School

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - Yes
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - No
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hope

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Knox
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Low

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: \_\_15\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Hope Community Sustainability & Resilience Plan: *Laying the Groundwork for a Stronger Future*
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned
  - C1, D1, H1, H2, H4, H5

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_47\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from more detail around an equitable selection process to select community members for the energy task force, community garden working group, school garden coordinator, and community liaison.
  - This proposal places a large focus on equity but would benefit from further inclusion of the mechanisms needed to achieve that vision.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hope

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Would benefit from explanation around why the focus for energy efficiency is only for the elementary school. Are there other public facilities that would benefit from energy efficiency improvements?
- Could benefit from using planning processes to determine what buildings to perform energy audits on.
- This is an ambitious scope of work that requires a strong plan to onboard the consultant serving as project manager to ensure timely progress.
  
- Task 1: Contracting a Project Manager to Oversee and Manage the Community Sustainability & Resilience Planning Process
- Task 2: Establish Community Working Groups
- Task 3: Complete a Level 2 Energy Audit of Hope Elementary School
  - 3a. Contract with a Qualified Energy Auditor
  - 3b. Conduct Level 2 Energy Audit
  - 3c. Review Energy Audit Findings; Decide on Recommended Implementation Steps
- Task 4: Access Technical Assistance to Recommend and Guide Renewable Energy Use Strategies
  - 4a. Contract with a Qualified Energy Firm to Provide Technical Assistance and Energy Expertise
  - 4b. Consult with Contracted Energy Firm
- Task 5: Plan and Pilot Sustainable Food Systems and Community Resilience Initiatives
  - 5a. Design and Plan Community Garden and Composting Pilot
  - 5b. Pilot Demonstration Projects
  - 5c. Host Community Education Programs
  - 5d. Engage the Community to Identify Additional Priorities
- Task 6: Compile Final Community Sustainability & Resilience Plan
  - 6a. Synthesize Data, Findings, and Recommendations
  - 6b. Develop the Final Community Sustainability & Resilience Plan
  - 6c. Present the Final Plan to the Community
- Task 7: Identify Funding Sources and Develop Grant Proposals
- Task 8: Reporting and Grant Management
  
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed
  - Identified task/subtask start and end dates and clearly outlined timeline.
  - Would benefit from a Gantt given the number of project components.
  - Task 1 would benefit from more clarity on what has been done in preparation to hire the project manager consultant to ensure this essential part of the project gets off to a timely start.
  
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

**Need**

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Demonstrates project need through:
    - Energy performance challenges at Hope Elementary School
    - Lack of effective utilization of existing solar credits through Hope's 76.8 kW solar array and need for additional clean energy strategies related to EVs and EV charging

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hope

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Community's interest in improving local food system resilience in terms of sustainability and emergency preparedness
- Desire to build local skills and knowledge around sustainable food system
- Would benefit from more detail on energy efficiency landscape of all municipal buildings, and more specific detail on the elementary school, such as examples of how the efficiency of the building is experienced as lacking
- Would benefit from more detail on the existing solar array and how it is used
- Would benefit from specific examples of what public input processes informed these identified needs, as this is mentioned but without specific reference

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Outcomes include both short and long term outcomes related to energy efficiency, renewable energy, and resilience and community connection, as well as foundational outcomes related to how the plan will position the town for success
  - Might benefit from more specifics on expected outcomes in terms of energy efficiency and clean energy; however, the town likely does not have access to these numbers yet
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - This is an ambitious project with many components and success will be very dependent on the chosen consultant to lead much of the work
  - Might benefit from examples of past larger projects led or funded by the town

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Would benefit from Town Administrator managing RFP process to select contractors
  - Might benefit from an organizational chart to show a clear chain of command
    - Contracted Project Manager
    - Town Administrator will provide oversight and admin support
    - Energy auditor will conduct audit
    - Energy firm will provide technical expertise
    - Energy task force – will provide advisory support
    - Community Garden working group – serve as guiding body
    - School Garden Coordinator (school staff or stipended)
    - Community Liaison (stipended) – support community outreach and engagement
    - Youth Volunteers (stipended) –
    - Community Member (volunteers)

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Well-designed
  - Includes outreach through Hope Elementary school, local stores and community bulletin boards, ambassadors, town office and library, and digital and print media

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Hope

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Includes direct engagement through community workshops and meetings, hands on pilot project, and education programs, many of which are outlined in detail in the scope of work
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Somewhat
  - Identifies vulnerable populations, including older adults, low-income residents, families with young children, small businesses and natural resource workers, and students and youth
  - Uses ambassadors to engage with these populations and located outreach materials in places that may serve these groups
  - Would benefit from a plan that directly addresses inclusion of these populations in the working groups, task forces, and funded volunteers, as well as partnership with community-based organizations that already exist to further the goals of this project

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   20**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$60,150
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Task 1 grant funds/in-kind costs are switched in worksheet – total is \$59,975 with that revision
  - Appreciate inclusion of estimated hours by task/subtask and hourly rate
  - Would benefit from further detail on how consultant and volunteer hourly rates were determined.
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - N/A
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Howland-Enfield

**DATE:** 2/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>10</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>33</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>14</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>62</b>



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Howland-Enfield**

**DATE: 2/3/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Town of Howland
  - Town of Enfield
  - EMDC

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
- Has an extension ever been requested?
  - Yes
- How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
  - Town of Howland's engineer is managing prior grant project.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Howland-Enfield

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - Multi-community
- County:
  - Penobscot
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small, small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - High (Howland), Low (Enfield)

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score:   10**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Howland & Enfield Shared Wastewater Lagoon Valve Pit Rehabilitation Project
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Somewhat aligned with G3 and F13

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   33**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from tasks and subtasks describing the steps required to replace the lagoon valves. Subtasks were included in the project timeline but would still benefit from more detail on what each subtask includes.
  - Replace four failing lagoon valves at the Howland wastewater treatment facility
    - Lagoon valves allow the wastewater operator to control the level of each lagoon, increasing or decreasing discharge flows to compensate for rising lagoon levels, which

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Howland-Enfield

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- is important as climates change and there more frequent and severe weather-related events.
  - Secure contractor
  - Acquire valves/valve stems, generators rentals
  - Plant shutdown & lower lagoons
  - Divers to plug pipes and isolate valves and valve pits
  - Construction
  - Open lagoons and start discharging
- Howland and Enfield share a wastewater treatment facility
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Timelines provided for each subtask.
- 12 or 24 months
  - 12 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Lagoon wastewater treatment systems can provide low maintenance, energy efficient, and reliable wastewater treatment for small rural communities
    - These systems are increasingly vulnerable due to the impacts of climate change, especially frequent heavy rain events and storms
  - During extreme rain events and high water tables, both municipalities have experienced excess flooding of roadways which causes navigational difficulties for emergency vehicles
    - Sewage backups into residential homes causes health risks
  - The higher flows have caused sediments to enter the pipes and slowly restrict flows from one lagoon to another. While trying to adjust lagoon flows through valves it was determined that the valves and pipes have severe blockage from the higher levels of the lagoons.

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from an increased focus on detailing beneficial climate/resilience outcomes (i.e. preserving critical infrastructure functions during climate emergencies)
  - Would benefit from more detail on what prior planning occurred to inform the climate considerations for this project, and to determine that this is the best long-term solution to this problem.
  - Wastewater treatment is critical for a healthy community and the environment and will contribute to public health improvements
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Somewhat
  - It is unclear what climate impacts were factored into the design of these engineering upgrades, such as what level of storms and flooding the communities are preparing to manage through this wastewater treatment facility.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Howland-Enfield

**DATE:** 2/3/25

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from describing the relationship between Howland and Enfield and noting a primary point of contact who will handle grant administration
  - Howland Wastewater Operator to oversee project
  - AE Hodsdon engineers will be responsible to construction management oversight, design/bidding, inspection and quality control
    - Already contracted with the communities
  - Plan to contract with Commercial Divers to complete underwater work
  - Will hire another contractor to perform the lagoon valve repair
  - Howland and Enfield Town Managers to oversee budget

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Social media, public meetings, and project status reports
  - Would benefit from more details on potential community participation opportunities and an increased commitment to reporting on the outcomes of this project and how it enhances climate resiliency
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Minimally
  - Would benefit from including more specific vulnerable/disadvantaged populations and strategies to engage them about climate resilience and wastewater system best practices.
  - The poverty level in Howland is 18.1 % which is substantially higher than the rest of Penobscot County at 13.2%.
  - Improvements to wastewater system will benefit all community members and reduce risk of public health issues.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25**

**Score: 14**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Howland-Enfield

**DATE:** 2/3/25

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$130,300
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Task 2 is miscalculated – should be \$17,780
  - Task 4 is miscalculated – should be \$20,840
  - Unsure how the Total Summary is calculated
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Total project cost in the budget narrative does not match the budget worksheet
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - N/A
- Other notes
  - Unclear whether the estimate provided is from a vendor; if not, proposal would benefit from a vendor estimate to support estimated costs
  - Proposal is not well-aligned with the CRP List of Community Actions and would benefit from more detail on what prior planning occurred to inform the climate considerations for this project, and to determine that this is the best long-term solution to this problem.
  - Suggest the development of a Climate Adaptation Plan through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to better understand and plan for long-term climate impacts on the wastewater system.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Islesboro

**DATE:** 2/3/35

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>47</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>92</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Islesboro

**DATE:** 2/3/35

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Sunrise Ecologic
  - Devin Domeyer, Maine Coastal Program
  - Nathan Robbins, DEP
  - Christopher Meaney, US Fish and Wildlife Service

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
  - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - No
  - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
    - Prior grant project is complete.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Islesboro

**DATE:** 2/3/35

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Waldo
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Low

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: 15**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Community-Driven Nature-Based Solutions for Adaptation of Vulnerable Life-Line Coastal Infrastructure
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned
  - E9, F2, G1, H2

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: 47**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

Project Description and Timeline

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Islesboro

**DATE:** 2/3/35

- Appreciate context of what has been completed to date and next steps related to this planning process; however, proposal would benefit from clearly distinguishing between what has already been completed, and the specific work *will be* completed using this grant funding.
- Will FEMA BRIC application include funding for a project manager to continue this project into the next phase?
- Task 1: Project Administration and Direct Support for SLRC
- Task 2: Advisory Committee Engagement
  - 2.1 Case Study
  - 2.2 Letters of Support
  - 2.3 Clear Project Messaging
  - 2.4 Intertidal Habitat Survey
  - 2.5 Monitoring Plan
- Task 3: Hazard Mitigation Planning (HMP)
  - 3.1 Coordinate with HMP development and required documentation.
  - 3.2 Scope coastal hazard-prone infrastructure projects.
  - 3.3 Coordinate with MEMA.
- Task 4: Education, Outreach & Community Engagement
  - 4.1 Community update materials (scripts, one-pagers, social media, press releases, newsletters, timelines)
- Task 5: Permitting Process
  - 5.1 Army Corp Individual permit (anticipated)
    - 5.1.1 NEPA, Section 7/ESA included
  - 5.2 DEP NRPA permit (anticipated)
  - 5.3 Town Shoreland Zoning permit (anticipated)
  - 5.4 Respond to any additional permitting needs (unanticipated)
- Task 6: Engineering Project Management
  - 6.1 Draft scopes of work for GZA and the bridge engineering firm to advance Phase I design and integrate Phase II concepts, ensuring alignment with the 2027 construction timeline.
- Task 7: Grant Applications
  - 7.1 Submission of the FEMA BRIC application by late summer/early fall 2025, using the 90% engineering design milestone from Task 6 to strengthen the proposal.
  - 7.2 Identification of additional grants suitable for project progress in Spring-Summer 2025
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Timelines and milestones provided for all tasks, subtasks, and deliverables.
  - Appreciate the inclusion of a Gannt chart
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

**Need**

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - The Narrows is a low lying road on Islesboro which faces increasing vulnerability due to high tide storm events and rising sea levels

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Islesboro

**DATE:** 2/3/35

- It is a critical piece of infrastructure and is a main access route for vehicles, including emergency vehicles
- Sea level rise will exacerbate flooding and isolate the community

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Outcomes included reduce flood risk, strengthened coastal defenses, increased habitat resilience, strategic planning, data driven decision making, community driven climate resilience, regulatory compliance, and sustained funding
    - Increased resilience of the road against coastal erosion and storm damage
    - If reef balls are selected as a nature-based solution, would serve as enhanced estuarine habitat
    - Ability to secure future funding through hazard mitigation planning
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Somewhat
  - Would benefit from a more concrete plan to acquire funding to progress to a 90% design by the FEMA BRIC grant deadline.

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Chair of Islesboro SLR Committee and Selectboard will co-direct the project and provide oversight
  - Town Manager to co-direct the project, review progress reports, and ensure timelines and budgets are met
  - Sunrise Ecologic to lead the project
  - Contracted engineers to lead project design and ensure compliance
  - Advisory Committee Members to provide support in the form of technical expertise and providing letters of support.
  - Note that the project management overview doesn't include lead point of contact for the Hazard Mitigation Plan

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Robust and well-designed
  - SLRC Communications Subcommittee with consultant support will host regular workshops and presentations, as well as small group discussions and community updates through multiple channels
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Somewhat
    - Will partner with local organizations and advocacy groups
    - Project will give special attention to ensuring measures enhance safety and accessibility of vulnerable populations

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Islesboro

**DATE:** 2/3/35

- Would benefit from identifying potential groups to partner with, especially those that work with the identified vulnerable community members
- Identifies vulnerable community members as those living on the north half of the island and those with limited mobility or access to resources.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Appreciate breakdown of hours and hourly rate by subtask.
  - Funding will support project manager
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes
- Other notes
  - Grant funding cannot cover any activities that have started prior to the grant period.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Jay

**DATE:** 2/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points <u>Awarded:</u>
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>3</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>40</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>83</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Jay**

**DATE: 2/3/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Franklin County EMA

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
  - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - No
  - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
    - Prior project is complete.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 3

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Jay

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- No
- County:
  - Franklin
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Medium
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Low

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: \_\_15\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Preparing for High Priority Culvert Improvements to Increase Resiliency
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned G3.
  - Somewhat aligned with G5.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_40\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - In preparation to apply for other funding sources for implementation, the Town of Jay is looking to complete designs and permitting for two critical culverts
    - Davenport Hill Road and Alden Hill Road
  - Would benefit from adopting Stream Smart crossing guidelines as standard practice as part of this scope
  - Would benefit from more details around the specific tasks the engineering firm is to complete

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Jay

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Task 1: Hire engineering firm.
  - Task 2: Engineering firm complete base mapping for 2 culvert locations.
  - Task 3: Engineering firm complete preliminary design of 2 culverts.
  - Task 4: Engineering firm undertake permitting for 2 culverts.
  - Task 5: Apply for funding for improvements to 2 culverts.
  - Task 6: Engineering firm finalize contract documents for 2 culverts.
  - Task 7: Engineering firm undertake bid administration for 2 culverts.
  - The final deliverables will be the base mapping, preliminary design, permitting preparation, contract preparation and the solicitation of a contractor to implement the culvert improvements.
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Timelines provided for each project task. Would benefit from inclusion of subtasks and timelines.
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

**Need**

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Enhance safety for community members and strengthen roads' resilience to climate impacts in the face of more extreme storms and heavier rainfall
    - Town of Jay experienced FEMA-declared storms in May, June, and December of 2023 which required millions of dollars of repairs
  - Project aligns with updated County Emergency Action Plan which forecasts increasing severe weather

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from inclusion of grant application to fund the implementation of the culvert construction.
  - This project will result in greater resiliency in the face of increased impacts on local infrastructure due to climate change and continued extreme weather events as Stream Smart crossings better allows for fish passage and can handle large storm flows and floods.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from details on how John Johnson and Shiloah LaFreniere will distribute the workload
  - Would benefit from addressing who will support community engagement

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Jay

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Public Works Director John Johnson and Town Manager Shiloh LaFreniere will manage the project
- Jay Selectboard to support
- Contract with an engineering firm
- AVCOG to provide support

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - The town will communicate the project's benefits to the community and provide information to those interested about the State's stream smart standards.
    - Share information online (website, social media) and at physical locations
    - Share project updates at Selectboard and Comp Plan Committee meetings
  - Would benefit from planning opportunities to provide information about Stream Smart standards
  - Would benefit from identifying specific opportunities or plan to provide public engagement and to provide updates and outcomes on the project
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Minimally considered
  - Would benefit from addressing how improved resilience and lower taxes would benefit vulnerable populations
  - Would benefit from specific actions designed to engage vulnerable populations

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Budget narrative doesn't mention the cost share for Task 7
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal "direct pay" option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Jay

**DATE:** 2/3/25

- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes
- Other notes
  - Vendor estimate provided

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunk

**DATE:** 3/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>3</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>43</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>86</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Kennebunk**

**DATE: 3/3/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - No

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
      - No
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
      - Prior grant project is complete (aside from the final report).

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 3

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunk

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- No
- County:
  - York
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Large
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Medium

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score:   15**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Waterhouse Center Rooftop Solar
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with C7.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   43**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from describing in more detail the steps required for installation and including any relevant subtasks related to contracting and pre-installation requirements, including connecting with utility on grid connection process
  - Task 1: Solicit bids via RFP for solar array installation
  - Task 2: Install 124 panel (38kw) solar array on the Waterhouse Center's roof
    - Array is estimated to produce 43,902 kWh annually
    - Solar array will support high electricity costs at the center due to skating rink

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunk

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from including community engagement initiatives and project subtask start and end dates
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

**Need**

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Waterhouse Center serves as a community hub for multi-generational educational, athletic, cultural, and civic-oriented activities year-round; Ice-skating rink electricity costs are 3x the cost of all other electricity
  - Aligns with Climate Action Plan adopted in May 2024 and the Town's goals of making climate-friendly decisions
  - Lead by example: The successes and lessons learned from this project will inform future efforts and help demonstrate to the community the Town's commitment to reducing Greenhouse Gas emissions and reaching other climate goals.

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - 43,902 kWh annually and reduce the costs of chilling the ice-skating rink by half. Estimated \$400,000 in savings over 40 years
  - "The successes and lessons learned from this project will inform future efforts and help demonstrate to the community the Town's commitment to reducing Greenhouse Gas emissions and reaching other climate goals"
    - Would benefit from describing in more detail how these successes and lessons will be documented and tracked
  - Energy generated could be reallocated to other Town buildings in the future
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from including marketing and communications specialist mentioned in Community Engagement section
  - Principal Project Manager – Christopher J. Osterrieder, P.E. – Project Oversight, Quality Control and Management, invoice and requisition review.
  - Project Manager – Lee Jay Feldman, Deputy Director or Community Development –Facilitation of RFP, proposal review and recommendation.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunk

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Assistant Project Manager – Hannah Watson, Town Planner – project coordination, Town staff will manage the administration of the grant

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Note multiple points in the scope where community engagement will occur; note that community engagement preceded this project during the development of the Climate Action Plan
  - Would benefit from more specific opportunities to educate the community around the benefits of solar
  - Communications about the project will include:
    - Press releases
    - Committee alerts
    - Post on Town website and regional construction bulletins (RFP)
    - Ribbon cutting ceremony
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Minimally
  - Would benefit from identifying and addressing how this project, and its benefits, will be communicated to and realized by vulnerable populations in Kennebunk

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Would benefit from addressing if additional funds are available to meet any funding gaps that could arise
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - Yes
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - N/A
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunkport

**DATE:** 2/3/35

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>55</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>22</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>97</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Kennebunkport**

**DATE: 2/3/35**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - GEI Consultants
  - Town of Kennebunkport
  - SMPDC

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
  - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - No
  - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
    - Prior grant project is complete.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunkport

**DATE:** 2/3/35

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - York
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Medium

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: \_\_15\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Adaptation and Flood Mitigation Designs for Increasing the Resilience of Coastal Riverfront Areas in Kennebunkport
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with G1, F2, H4

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_55\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate inclusion community workshops and specifics around what will be discussed in each
  - Appreciate inclusion of Kennebunk community in the community engagement, as this project affects their community as well

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunkport

**DATE:** 2/3/35

- Builds upon the results of the Hydrology Study modeling for the Kennebunk River being developed through separate grant funding
    - Would benefit from more detail in the scope of work and timeline for the hydrology study currently underway.
  - Task 2: Identify Potential Adaptation Strategies
    - a) Baseline Assessment
    - b) Community Brainstorming Workshop
    - c) Identify Potential Adaptation Strategies
    - d) Community Workshop - Possible Adaptation Strategies
  - Task 3: Create Concept Designs for 2 – 5 Adaptation Strategies
    - a) Concept Design Development
    - b) Feasibility Assessment
    - c) Community Workshop – Concept Designs
  - Task 4: Enhance 1 Concept Plan and Identify Next Steps and Funding Options
    - a) Draft Enhanced Concept Plan
    - b) Community Meeting – Draft Enhanced Concept Plan
    - c) Community Meeting – Final Enhanced Concept Plan
  - Task 5: Community Engagement
- 
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
    - Detailed and reasonable
    - Appreciate clear narrative and Gantt Chart, with start and end dates for all tasks
    - Might benefit from inclusion of Subtasks or inclusion of more deliverables in the Gantt Chart
  - 12 or 24 months
    - 24 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Dock Square area, located along the Kennebunk River, includes water dependent businesses, working waterfront, coastal access points, regionally significant transportation infrastructure that is also an emergency evacuation route, and nearby saltmarsh habitat
  - Dock Square experiences regular flooding with extreme high tide events and coastal storms, including extensive damage caused by the January 2024 storms
  - Area has been identified as highly vulnerable and a top priority for targeted adaptation by local and regional planning studies, including Climate Ready Coast – Southern Maine and the Economic and Resilience Plan for Coastal York County, as well as through Kennebunkport's Comp Plan and Climate Action Plan
  - CAG funding was previously used to facilitate community conversations concerning this area between Kennebunk and Kennebunkport and the Climate Initiative
  - Will build upon current efforts, including Kennebunkport, Kennebunk, and SMPDC's hydrologic modeling project, which has been funded and begins in January 2025

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunkport

**DATE:** 2/3/35

- Outcomes include the Town and communities being better informed on the potential risks, limitations, and adaptation strategies, and will have a roadmap in order to move forward with a single design to improve resilience
- The effort will serve as a model and case study of coastal adaptation planning and action that can inform other coastal communities in Maine
  
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and Reasonable
  - Town Manager will be the project lead with support from:
    - Director of Planning and Development
    - Code and Planning Coordinator
    - Communications Specialist
  - GEI Consultants to manage their scope of work
  - SMPDC will provide project management, consultant coordination, grant administration support, and lead many community engagement efforts

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Robust and well-designed
  - Incorporated in the Scope of Work, demonstrating that community engagement is a priority
  - Appreciate inclusion of community members from the town of Kennebunk
  - Appreciate inclusion of youth in the brainstorming workshop (Task 2)
  - Will include tracking project progress on a public facing platform, such as the town website
  - Will gather insight from previous projects to strengthen engagement for this process
  - Might benefit from more specifics around how these opportunities will be advertised and the success of these engagement events in the past
  
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Somewhat
  - Would benefit from a plan which specifically advertises to and encourages participation from the vulnerable populations identified in this section, such as partnering with Community Based Organizations
  - Will include virtual and in person options for community engagement events
  - Identifies vulnerable populations, including older folks and those with disability, as well as 34% of households below the EPA's climate change and social vulnerability income threshold
  - Would benefit from specific strategy to invite participation from community members and businesses that most rely on Dock Square
  - Would benefit from more information on transportation impacts for vulnerable populations if this area becomes less accessible.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Kennebunkport

**DATE:** 2/3/35

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   22**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Would benefit from estimated hours and hourly rate for technical consultants
  - Vendor estimate is provided but it does not include a cost breakdown
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes
- Other notes
  - The hydrology model is funded through the Broad Reach Fund Grant

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lincoln

**DATE:** 2/5/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>32</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>11</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>63</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lincoln

**DATE:** 2/5/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Lincoln Lakes Innovation Corporation
  - Lincoln Lakes Region Chamber of Commerce

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - Yes
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - No
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lincoln

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- County:
  - Penobscot
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Medium
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - High

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score:   15**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Lincoln Assessment and Planning for Stormwater Management
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with G3

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   32**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from more details on what will be included in the engineering study and development plan.
  - Would benefit from subtasks under the stormwater management planning and development task to better outline the discrete steps that will be taken.
- Develop and implement an infrastructure construction plan to advance sustainable stormwater management, starting with three failed storm drainages. This project will support the Town of Lincoln to move forward with stormwater infrastructure mapping and construction.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lincoln

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Tasks
  - Stormwater management engineering study
  - Stormwater management planning and development
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from more detail, such as subtasks under the stormwater management plan development and start and end dates
- 12 or 24 months
  - 12 months

**Need**

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Four stormwater drain failures in the past year due to extreme weather events. Each drain is critical in proximity to Mattanawcook Pond, a critical water body for the region.
  - Lincoln received a broad quote of \$5,000,000 to improve stormwater management infrastructure; plan to use this grant to identify a pathway forward and prioritize these improvements
  - Would benefit from an increased climate connection to this project need throughout the application.

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Appreciate the systems lens and note that stormwater management failures impact the ecological health of the Mattanawcook Pond which is critical for tourism industry.
  - Would benefit from outlining longer-term resilience outcomes and more extensive considerations as to how these outcomes will be incorporated into long-term planning within the town.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Ruth Birtz, Economic Development Administrator will lead the project, coordinate consultants, and work with town planners
  - Lincoln Lakes Innovation Corp will consult with Town to determine an engineering consultant
  - Would benefit from further describing the roles within Task 2, especially related to town planners and other responsibilities.



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lincoln

**DATE:** 2/5/25

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Previous community engagement in the form of the enrollment workshop where stormwater management was noted as a key issue.
  - Lincoln will conduct community outreach through social media posts, town newsletters, local newspapers, physical flyers, and word-of-mouth
  - Would benefit from specific public meeting opportunities and a more robust commitment to engagement by including it in the developed scope and indicating who will support engagement during the project.
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Somewhat/minimally
  - Lincoln's underserved populations-- namely elderly and low-income residents-- will be included in discussions throughout the project and the ecological benefits will serve to protect local economies, industries, and private properties.
  - Will work to make meeting times accessible to vulnerable populations
  - Would benefit from more specific opportunities and the potential identification of local partners to support engagement with vulnerable populations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   11**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$74,940
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Task 1 is miscalculated –  $140 \times 195 = \$27,300$ 
    - 2.5 hours/week does not total 195 hours
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - No – Task 1 total is inconsistent, costs in budget narrative put project total over \$75,000
  - Would benefit from a vendor estimate for the engineering study to support estimated costs
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lincoln

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - N/A
- Other notes
  - Over half of the project cost is supporting Town Staff time and lacks detailed scope of work with steps/deliverables to achieve each project task and desired outcomes.
  - Issue a partial award and ask the applicant to update scope of work, deliverables, and budget to reflect award amount.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Livermore Falls

**DATE:** 3/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>45</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>20</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>85</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Livermore Falls

**DATE:** 3/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Budget Committee Chair
  - Comprehensive Plan Committee Chair

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - Yes
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - No
    - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Livermore Falls

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- County:
  - Androscoggin
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - High

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won’t Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: \_\_15\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won’t Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Town Office Building Envelope Upgrade for Energy Efficiency
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with B1

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_45\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from a more clear understanding of the anticipated costs in order to determine the ability to fund the additional scope of the transom windows
  - Task 1: Solicit bids to install 11 sets of double hung windows, insulate the new construction, install new exterior siding, and sheetwork
  - Task 2: Installation of windows
  - Deliverable: At least 11 sets of new Energy Star V7 windows installed.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Livermore Falls

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from including start and end dates for all subtasks
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Town Office is an important community gathering place, used for public meetings and hearings and community events. It houses the clerk's office, treasurer, code enforcement, town manager, and police (a 24/7 department open to the public)
  - Building was built in 1974 and still has the original windows, which are old technology and have broken seals, contributing to significant heat loss and air leakage
  - It is the desire of the select board, planning board, and budget committee to facilitate economic development, which cannot be accomplished without capital investments and addressing inefficiencies in infrastructure
  - Currently town is funding only required services and capital projects and needs additional funding (through CRP) to make this project possible
  - Based on CRP enrollment and recent comp plan process, it is clear the town must look to expand energy efficiencies

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from measurable outcomes directly related to the intended improvements, such as expected reduction in heating/cooling cost and reduction in gallons of oil
  - Updated windows will reduce heat loss and energy use and improve efficiency
  - Building is currently heated with oil fired hot air system and air conditioning is provided by rooftop condenser units, and average electric bill in the summer is over \$800
  - Provides nationwide estimates that US annual energy use could reduce by 1.7% through improved window performance
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - Would benefit from a CIP or next steps to identify further improvements to make the building more energy efficient, as windows are likely the first step in a greater process

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Town Manager – oversee
  - Head of Buildings and Grounds

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Livermore Falls

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Selectboard – support
- AVCOG – support
- Window Installer – contractor – may likely be Mark Chretien, Chretien's Construction

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Would benefit from a more robust and well defined engagement and outreach plan that identifies specific actions that will be taken to update the community on this project and encourage participation
  - Would benefit from a more robust strategy to encourage/educate community on how to do similar upgrades on their own homes
  - Identified as a community priority through enrollment
  - Leading by example will help residents prepare their own homes
  - Town can create information documents to be shared with people interested in learning more
  - Town will continue to discuss resilience and efficiency at public meetings, host public hearings, and promote opportunities for input online
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Somewhat
  - Would benefit from a more robust engagement plan that specifically advertises to and encourages participation from vulnerable or disadvantaged community members
  - Project will allow Town to save money to invest in other energy efficiency upgrades and offer new services to priority populations – would benefit from describing a mechanism to achieve this outcome

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   20**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Would benefit from more detailed budget narrative, and better alignment between narrative and worksheet

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Livermore Falls

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Reference a verbal estimate from vendor – would have benefited from providing the vendor estimate
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes, in-kind time
- Other notes



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lubec

**DATE:** 2/5/35

\*\*\*\*\*

**DEPARTMENT NAME:** Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future

**NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR:** Ashley Krulik

**NAMES OF EVALUATORS:** Ashley Krulik, Casey Zorn, Sy Coffey

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMMARY PAGE**

		Points Awarded:
<b><u>Numerical Score:</u></b>		
Criteria 1: General Information and Eligibility	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 2: Previous Community Action Grant Status	(Pass/Fail)	<b>Pass</b>
Criteria 3: Community Characteristics	(Max: 5 Points)	<b>5</b>
Criteria 4: Maine Won't Wait Strategy and Action(s)	(Max: 15 Points)	<b>15</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>40</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>20</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>80</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE: Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant**

**APPLICANT: Lubec**

**DATE: 2/5/35**

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 1 –Eligibility and Applicant Information**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 1 – General Information, Eligibility, and Applicant Information**

- Applicant's Organization is a:
  - Municipality
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - County Manager of Washington County
  - Sen. Marianne Moore
  - Lubec merchants and business owners

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

**Total Points Available:** Pass/Fail

**Score:** Pass

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 2 – Previous Community Action Grant Status**

- First-time applicant (y/n):
  - No
- Has the community ever received a CAG (y/n):
  - Yes
  - Has an extension ever been requested?
    - No
  - How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
    - Prior grant has been completed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lubec

**DATE:** 2/5/35

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Washington
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - High

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

**Total Points Available: 15                      Score: \_\_15\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 4 – Maine Won't Wait Strategy and action(s)**

- Project title: Lubec Resilience Districting and Capital Investment Planning
- The proposed scope of work is [*well-aligned, somewhat aligned, minimally aligned*] with the stated MWW strategy and/or actions? (i.e., will the project lead to reduced emissions or improved community resilience to climate impacts?)
  - Well-aligned with G2 and G5
  - Minimally aligned with A8, E1, E5, E9, E10, F5, F9, F10, F11

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_40\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**

**Project Description and Timeline**

- Specific tasks to be undertaken and the final deliverables (for example, number of heat pumps installed) resulting from the work [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Appreciate clear subtasks and description of what will be included and/or considered in each deliverable
  - Would benefit from more detail on the intended use of the multi-layered zoning map, particularly in relation to potential policy implications

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lubec

**DATE:** 2/5/35

- This will include designation of commercial, residential, historic and resource protection districts based on updated flood zone, aquifer and critical habitat maps.
- Would benefit from a stronger commitment to aligning ordinance development with MWW strategies and recommendations and making clearer climate connection.
  - How will it be determined which land use ordinances are “appropriate” for Lubec?
- CIP would benefit from inclusion of more detail around how the assets/infrastructure updates will be prioritized. Has a vulnerability assessment been completed to determine the most vulnerable infrastructure?
- Task 1 Develop and Update Maps
  - a. Engage mapping consultant
  - b. Determine and develop mapping for new districts town-wide
  - c. Re-map Resource Protection districts to align with the new Comprehensive Plan
  - d. Update flood zone mapping (include an interactive map on town website)
  - e. Update mapping of the public water source aquifers
  - f. Update the maps in the 2024 Lubec Comp Plan with suggestions from the state review
  - Final deliverable will be a multi-layered interactive zoning map
- Task 2. Develop Capital Investment Plan
- Task 3: Develop Land Use Ordinances
  - a. Research appropriate land use ordinances including the potential for first floor restrictions on residential use on Water Street's commercial district and Stream Smart Guidelines
  - b. Draft land use ordinances
  - c. Invite public comment on draft land use ordinances
  - d. Adoption of land use ordinances
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from more detailed tasks and subtasks timelines with start and end date for each
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

### Need

- Does the project need align with MWW? [*well-aligned, somewhat, minimally*] (i.e., is the climate connection strong enough to merit funding?)
  - Well-aligned
  - Low lying, economically challenged oceanfront community
  - Infrastructure is very vulnerable to sea level rise, with 1.2 ft of sea level rise isolating the southern portion of the town with several blocks of homes underwater
  - Zoning will help manage residential expansion and protect natural resources
  - CIP will help identify and manage improvements that are needed due to rising sea levels and increasing and intense storm events
  - Might benefit from more clarity of how the specific project tasks and deliverables align with MWW and show a climate connection

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable/partially described

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lubec

**DATE:** 2/5/35

- Provides outcomes, including key deliverables, such as a capital investment plan and suite of land use ordinances
  - Provides some broader outcomes related to a more clear long term approach to manage the town's exposure and option to respond to sea level rise, including efficient budgeting and allocation of funds for capital projects
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - Would benefit from a clearer climate connection in the Outcomes, especially in terms of the long-term outcomes

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from identifying a primary point of contact to oversee entire project
  - Would benefit from identifying who will lead ordinance development, as this is identified as a contracted role in the budget but is not identified as a supported task within the project management structure
  - Lubec Comp Planning Committee to coordinate and oversee project
  - Town of Lubec will provide fiscal management of the grant and assist with community engagement
  - SCEC consultant will develop multi-layered districting map and CIP
  - Town of Lubec Public Works Supervisor to supply data to the CIP
  - Facilitation consultant with support community meetings

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Provides a broad outreach approach that would benefit from more specific activities and details that support a more robust and targeted approach
  - Outreach and engagement will include mailings, newspaper and digital media, as well as public meetings
  - Appreciate use of a facilitation consultant, as mentioned in the Project Management section; application would benefit from more detail on the benefit of this approach to improve engagement
- Does the proposal describe how vulnerable or disadvantaged groups will participate in the project and/or benefit from the project's outcomes? (*yes and well-designed, somewhat, minimally/not expected*)
  - Minimally
  - Intend to engage with a "broad swath of community voices"
  - Identifies community challenges around employment, housing, transportation, and public services
  - Would benefit from specific activities that advertise to and support participation of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups
  - Would benefit from a plan for how to engage residents who are "skeptical" – how will facilitator be selected to support these populations?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

**RFA TITLE:** Community Resilience Partnership Community Action Grant

**APPLICANT:** Lubec

**DATE:** 2/5/35

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 20**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$38,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Unable to determine if the budget worksheet and narrative match
  - Budget narrative would benefit from further detail around how costs were calculated and a breakdown of costs by task, especially for tasks that include consultant support.
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - N/A
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes
  - Budget narrative does not include detail around what is included within the cost share estimates
- Other notes
  - Would benefit from a scope of work/estimate from SCEC to support the estimated costs for mapping and ordinance development
  - Appreciate letter of support from diverse set of local merchants and business owners