

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Machias

**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>35</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>16</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>71</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Machias

**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:
  - N/A

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** 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:** Machias

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- 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: Machias Resilience Planning and Storm Water Systems Mapping
- 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, F1
  - Somewhat aligned with G1, E3, F2
  - Minimally aligned with E4, E10, G4, and G5

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 for Tasks 1 and 2, partially described for Task 3
  - Would benefit from describing how the Comprehensive Plan Committee will be formed and of whom it will be comprised.
  - Would benefit from more discrete subtasks under Task 1, including opportunities for public participation

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Machias

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Would benefit from further exploring how the three tasks are interrelated; in what ways will the results of tasks 2 and 3 inform the Comprehensive Plan?
- Task 2 would benefit from providing more detail on how this project intersects with the community vulnerability assessment, also being developed by SCEC.
- Would benefit from a clearer climate resilience approach to Task 3, as well as an explanation for how these projects/topics were identified
  - Why is additional funding needed to complete this project?
- Would benefit from further detail around how Upper Machias Bay Master Plan final recommendations will be determined.
- TASK 1 - Comprehensive Plan Update
  - Community will examine emerging threats from climate change effects, and incorporate the suggested checklist items from *Municipal Climate Adaptation Guidance Series: Comprehensive Planning* by Stephanie Carver (2017).
  - Climate resilience planning to inform comp planning is eligible for Community Action Grant funding, all other comp planning-related actions are not eligible for funding. These include:
    - Creation of a Comprehensive Plan Committee
    - Work with the Machias' Comprehensive Planning Committee to update the 2006 Machias Comprehensive Plan. This update will include all requisite content and format for submission pursuant to Title 30-A, Chapter 187: Planning and Land Use Regulation to the Municipal Planning Assistance Program at DACF and will incorporate resiliency throughout.
    - Produce any additional maps required by the comprehensive plan. This will include:
      - Floodplain maps and management scenario mapping.
- TASK 2 - Storm Water Systems Mapping, Impact Study, and Design
  - Map current systems to understand vulnerabilities, and develop a plan to manage and expand systems to reduce damage from severe weather events to Machias' downtown
- TASK 3 Upper Machias Bay Master Plan
  - Series of public meetings to lead to decision-making process
  - Development of final recommendations to inform the Master Plan
  - Would benefit from further detail on the work completed to date to develop the Master Plan.
  - Why is additional funding needed to complete this project?
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Minimally described
  - Project timeline incomplete or illegible
  - Would benefit from more specific start/end dates and inclusion of project 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
  - Downtown is less than 6 feet above sea level on a filled floodplain at the base of a steep ledge. In January 2024, Machias recorded two one-hundred-year flood events; and rising sea level contribute to increased Blue Sky flooding.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Machias

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Without a climate perspective, “the community’s vulnerability increases with the number of unknowns”
- Comp Plan hasn’t been updated in 18 years (since 2006) and CRP enrollment process identified comp planning and stormwater management as priorities.
- Stormwater system backs up with sea water during high tide and other portions are “blowing out of the ground.” There is a lack of understanding of the makeup of the stormwater system and which components are town-, DOT-, and privately- owned.
- Would benefit from further describing the need for some of the actions listed under Task 3

### 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 further details regarding how these project deliverables will work together to inform future planning and implementation efforts.
  - Would benefit from an increased focus on regional collaboration and the outcomes of the Upper Machias Master Plan
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant’s desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely, for Tasks 1 and 2
  - Somewhat for Task 3

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from identifying primary point of contact to oversee entire project.
  - Would benefit from specifying that UMaine students will fill the role of mapping/engineering consultants, which is included in the scope of work.
  - Comp plan committee will:
    - Host community visioning session
    - Work with SCEC on developing the comprehensive and emergency operations plan updates
  - Town of Machias will:
    - Handle fiscal management of the grant
    - Communicate with the community
    - Participate in Upper Machias Bay Master Plan Leadership Committee
  - SCEC will:
    - Assist comp plan committee to develop the comprehensive and emergency operations plan updates
    - Assist with community engagement
    - Lead the development of the final recommendation for the Upper Machias Bay Master Plan
  - Mapping and engineering consultants:
    - Assist Machias in the development of stormwater systems map
    - Produce report scoping upgrades and repairs needed
      - This should align with the deliverables included for the Impact Study and Design within the scope of work.
    - Lead a series of facilitated public meetings

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Machias

**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
  - Comp planning processes require extensive community engagement to ensure that all voices are heard and information is shared. This process would benefit from additional public meetings and outreach methods to reach more diverse populations.
  - Project will include an online survey, every door direct mailing, public visioning session (with a virtual option and an outreach campaign using mailing, newspaper, radio, and digital media).
  - Would benefit from the inclusion of community engagement around tasks 2 and 3.
- 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
  - Appreciate the recognition that all members of Machias must be included in the process, but do not specifically address how vulnerable populations will be engaged.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score:   16**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$72,922
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Unable to determine Task 3 grant fund request – is it for the 149.3 volunteer hours?
  - Budget narrative would benefit from estimated hours/hourly rate to support costs.
  - Need to include a breakdown of costs by task.
  - Would benefit from a detailed scope of work and vendor estimate from SCEC to support estimated costs.
  - Appreciate Machias' investment in technology to allow for more virtual meetings to engage more community members.
- 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:** Machias

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes
- Other notes
  - Grant funds may be used to support resiliency planning efforts to be woven into the comp plan chapters, not the full development of a comprehensive plan. .
  - Proposal scoring removes Task 3 (Upper Machias Bay Master Plan) from score due to lack of detail.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mariaville

**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>42</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>18</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: Mariaville**

**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:
  - Mariaville/Otis Volunteer Fire Department
  - Town of Mariaville
  - Aurora Volunteer Fire Department
  - Rep. Mathew McIntyre

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 now 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:** Mariaville

**DATE:** 2/5/25

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Hancock
- 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: Mariaville Otis Volunteer Fire Department Fire-Fighting Water Cistern
- 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: 42**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 subtasks to detail the steps within the scope of work – subtasks were included within the timeline section.
  - Install a 30,000 gallon fire-fighting cistern at the Mariaville Fire Station
    - Determine exact location of Cistern Marked-out with Fire Department

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mariaville

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Excavation Site measured and marked
  - Planning Board Approval
  - Dig - Safe cleared
  - Site work specifications gathered (American Concrete Specs)
  - Site work Bid Package assembled
  - Request for Bids and Dates posted in Newspaper
  - Open Bids / Award Sitework Contract
  - Cistern installed
  - Punch list/final inspections
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from including subtask start and end dates
  - Timelines provided for each project 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
  - Have experienced recent hazards of unreliable water sources, which are worsening due to climate impacts
    - Dry hydrants are failing and filling with silt at a greater rate, due to greater fluctuations in weather
    - Unreliable, low water means a lack of access to the water or increased time to pump the water during emergencies
  - The community's primary water source, a dry hydrant, will be removed due to a RT 181 Tannery Brook Bridge Replacement, and will require an alternate
  - A longer mud season also makes access to certain launch ramps unstable
  - A cistern is a more resilient option to drought and other climate concerns
  - Population growth within the community is also putting strain on infrastructure
  - Wildfires are getting bigger, growing faster, and becoming more frequent as a result of climate change, threatening wildland-urban interface in rural areas

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Outcomes include a more reliable source of water which will aid in preparing for the effects of climate change and increasing resilience to extreme weather events.
  - Fire Department Personnel can use discussions about the cistern to inform and educate people about public safety issues.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mariaville

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Might benefit from an associated plan to increase overall resilience to wildfires, such as an updated EMO plan or plan to improve fire and other infrastructure or vulnerability assessment and adaptation plan with CIP

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from one primary point of contact to manage the project
  - Selectboard to oversee the project management, grant management
  - Planning board to confirm location
  - Fire Chief to confirm cistern specs
  - American Concrete to provide cistern
  - Contractor to install

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Identifies past community participation, such as during CRP enrollment, CRP site visits, and community conversations
  - Would benefit from a more robust engagement and outreach plan that includes activities during the grant performance period
  - Mentions that the fire department engages in community conversations around the cisterns and wildfire fighting regularly
  - Missed opportunity for community engagement around wildfire risk, climate impacts, and solutions to increase resiliency in the face of climate change.
- 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*)
  - Minimal
  - "a Cistern provides a Water Source (therefore increased Fire Protection) to Everyone in the Community no matter what their economic status may be."
  - Would benefit from a more concrete plan that identifies vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and provides concrete ways to engage these groups.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available:** 25

**Score:** 18

\*\*\*\*\*

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mariaville

**DATE:** 2/5/25

**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 more detail to support the estimated costs for each 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, 10% match
- Other notes
  - Vendor estimate provided from American Concrete
  - Would benefit from vendor estimate/supporting documentation for Taks 4 and 5
  - Provided letters of support from neighboring communities that rely on mutual aid

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Millinocket

**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>0</b>
Criteria 5: Scope of Work	(Max: 60 Points)	<b>28</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>58</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Millinocket

**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:
  - Sharon Klein, UMaine
  - Our Katahdin

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 now complete.
- Community currently has an EEPG grant in progress.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Millinocket

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- No
- 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:   0**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

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

- Project title: Resilient Millinocket: Enhancing Community Preparedness through Digital Sign Technology
- 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?)
  - Minimally aligned with H3
    - Digital signage is not an eligible action for community action grant funding.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:  28**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Installation of a double-sided digital sign on Central street to enhance communication of public health advisories and weather alerts
    - Already have a sign installed on Penobscot Ave.
  - Would benefit from outlining specific tasks that will be included within this scope of work (contracting, installation, community engagement, etc.)



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Millinocket

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Minimally described
  - Would benefit from the inclusion of tasks and subtasks and specific dates/timeline
- 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?)
  - Somewhat
  - Sign will reach a broad and diverse set of residents being located on a busy street
  - Social media and local newspapers have proven to not be reliance for timely, emergency information
  - Would benefit from further exploring how this can be used during climate emergencies and how it will be used in combination with other communication methods to ensure timely communication reaches the entire community

**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 detailing how this sign will assist during climate/weather emergencies (where will it direct residents? What will it say? Etc.)
  - Would benefit from further describing the communication network; are there other methods besides the signs to address the dissemination of information during emergencies.
  - Would benefit from describing how the sign will be used during non-emergency situations and how those uses align with climate and resilience goals.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Somewhat
  - Project would benefit from an accompanying integrated community engagement strategy or emergency preparedness plan

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate inclusion of performance metrics and monitoring.
  - Project Oversight: Amber Wheaton, Community Initiatives Director
  - Installation and Maintenance: Digital Sign Vendor and Installation Contractors
  - Content Management: Town of Millinocket Staff
  - Promotion and Feedback: Local Community Organizations

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Millinocket

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- Moderately expected
  - Prioritized strategy H3 during enrollment workshop
  - Would benefit from further describing how community participation determined the location for this sign.
  - Would benefit from describing why a second sign was chosen over other communication methods; was there a planning process?
  - Would benefit from strategies to engage residents on how the signs will be used.
  - Would benefit from a plan for how feedback will be gathered at the end of the project (as mentioned in the Project Management section), such as through surveys, workshops, etc.
- 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
  - Sign will prioritize messaging to low-income families, seniors, and individuals with disabilities
    - Would benefit from further exploring how this will be accomplished, especially addressing how residents who are aging in place, or otherwise limited in mobility will benefit from this project
  - Appreciate the note on disproportionate climate impact on most vulnerable community members.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$54,120
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Provided a vendor estimate for the sign
  - Installation costs based on prior sign 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
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Millinocket

**DATE:** 2/5/25

- N/A
- Other notes
  - Digital signs are not an eligible activity for community action grant funds.
  - Grant funding can be used to support an integrated community engagement and outreach plan that furthers the goals of H3:
    - Amplifying public health advisories for climate-related health and weather events, such as air quality advisories, extreme heat or cold events, extreme storms, power outages, waterborne disease outbreaks, harmful algal blooms, vector-borne disease trends, etc.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Monhegan Plantation

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>50</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal (Max: 25 Points)		<b>22</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (Max: 105 Points)		<b>92</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Monhegan Plantation

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Plantation
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Monhegan Plantation Assessors
  - GEI Consultants, Inc.
  - Island Institute
  - Lincoln County Regional Planning Commission (LCRPC)

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?
      - The plantation will utilize the work of the island fellow to ensure both grants are completed on time

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Monhegan Plantation

**DATE:** 2/7/25

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Lincoln
- 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: Resiliency Improvements to Monhegan's Breakwater
- 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
  - Somewhat aligned with F10

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_50\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Would benefit from including what level of SLR the project will commit to manage.
  - Task One: Coastal Wave Modeling Study
    - Conduct a coastal wave modeling study to understand wave conditions at and around the Breakwater

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Monhegan Plantation

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Task Two: Concept Design Development
    - Develop concept alternatives for rehabilitating or rebuilding the Breakwater
  - Task Three: Regulatory Review
    - Review applicable local, state, and federal regulatory requirements.
  - Task Four: Funding Strategy
    - Develop a funding strategy for Monhegan to pursue future grants to support preliminary design/final design of the proposed Breakwater improvements and eventual construction
  - Task Five: Grant Management/Reporting
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
    - Detailed and reasonable
    - Provide start and end dates for all tasks
  - 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
  - The structural integrity of the Breakwater is threatened by increasingly severe weather and flooding events caused by climate change
    - Unbridged year round island that relies on harbor access for fuel, food, emergency medical transport, commercial fishing access, and other goods and services
  - Fuel delivery is especially critical as the island relies on diesel generators to produce electricity
  - Breakwater also provides protection to homes, businesses, and critical resources, such as the community's aquifer which provides access to clean water and is threatened by SLR
  - Breakwater is within a high risk flood zone (AE-10 bounded by a VE-15)
  - Repair work was performed in 1991, 2011, and 2015 to make improvements, but not aimed at long term solution, as well as a 2024 shore up grant to repair damage caused by January 2024 storms

### 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 the inclusion of long-term outcomes beyond immediate project deliverables related to this project.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely to achieve the applicant's list of deliverables.
  - Would benefit from more detail to determine if this plan will offer the long term solution that the quick fixes to the Breakwater have not provided.

### 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:** Monhegan Plantation

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Municipal Administrator to oversee entire project
- GEI Consultant – Tasks 1, 2, 3
- Island Fellow – Task 4
- Monhegan Plantation (Assessors and Municipal Administrator) – Task 5
- Lincoln County Regional Planning Commission to support development of funding resources (Task 4)

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Well-designed
  - Currently conducting a community survey to help generate community-driven solutions for the project consultant and will collect specific demographic information to ensure all voices are heard
  - Will hold presentations and discussion throughout the project, as mentioned in the Scope of Work
  - Will include updates at Assessors meetings, which are hybrid to allow involvement for off Island community members
- 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
  - Would benefit from identifying vulnerable residents and ensuring their direct participation and engagement
  - However, applicant makes a good case that as a small island community, the vulnerability of the breakwater makes the whole island vulnerable
  - Will provide hybrid options for engagement and will collect demographic data to ensure all community voices are included in the survey

\*\*\*\*\*

**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



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Monhegan Plantation

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Cost will cover consultant fee for Tasks 1, 2, 3
  - Would benefit from estimates hours and hourly rate
- 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)
  - Will provide in-kind time for island fellow and LCRPC
- Other notes
  - Vendor letter of support provided, would benefit from vendor scope of work/estimate
  - Notes from LUPC:
    - There is a need for the two engineering studies required to permit a breakwater project, these include:
      - Ensure the proposed breakwater will withstand flood forces and accomplish its goal without increasing flood risk, and
      - Determine if the proposed breakwater will change any aspect of FEMA’s mapped flood zone in the area, such as the base flood elevation or the flood hazard boundary line
      - Ask the applicant to confirm if these studies will be included within this project’s scope of work or addressed via another scope of work.
    - If Monhegan is awarded the grant, there should be a conversation among the Plantation, the consultants, and LUPC before Task 1 (wave study) is started so that Task 1 can suitably lay the groundwork for Tasks 2 and 3.
    - Suggest reorganizing the tasks to put the regulatory review (Task 3) first so that the Plantation and consultant can use the permitting requirements to inform Tasks 1 and 2.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Montville

**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>56</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>101</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Montville

**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:
  - MCOG

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?
      - Both grants are independent of one another in climate action goals and intentions. The projected timelines for completion are planned accordingly without overlap or interruption.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Montville

**DATE:** 3/3/25

**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: Solar Capacity Increase with Heating Retrofit to Offset Municipal Costs for all Town Buildings
- 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, B4

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score: \_\_56\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 the specificity of the proposed project, includes clear and concise tasks and deliverables.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Montville

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Task 1: Contracting with Installer – Revision Energy
  - Task 2: Solar Installation
    - Installation of a 19.78 kW roof-mounted solar system with 46 Silfab Solar Modules on the Town Sand Shed Building.
    - Installation of 46 SolarEdge S500B DC Optimizers
    - Installation of 1 SolarEdge Home Hub 11.4 kW grid-tied inverter with Revenue Grade Monitoring
    - Installation of 1 SolarEdge Home Hub 3.8 kW grid-tied inverter with Revenue Grade Monitoring
    - Upon completion of the above installations, the Revision Energy electrician will interconnect the inverter to the grid.
  - Task 3: Heat Pump Installation – Revision Energy
    - **Fire Department**
      - Installation of (2) Mitsubishi Single-zone Outdoor Units - 18,000 BTU/hr (MUZGS18NAHZ- U1) with corresponding Mitsubishi wall-mounted ductless heat pump indoor units - 19,000 BTU/hr (MSZ-GS18NA-U1)
      - Installation of (2) Mitsubishi Single-zone Outdoor Units - 12,000 BTU/hr (MUZFS12NA) with corresponding Mitsubishi wall-mounted ductless heat pump indoor units - 12,000 BTU/hr (MSZ-FS12NA-U1) (Kitchen)
    - **Town Office**
      - Installation of (2) Mitsubishi Single-zone Outdoor Units - 9,000 BTU/hr (MUZFS09NA) with corresponding Mitsubishi wall-mounted ductless heat pump indoor units - 9,000 BTU/hr (MSZ-FS09NA-U1)
  - Task 4: Community Engagement
- Project Timeline is *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
    - Partially described
    - Would benefit from a more detailed outline which includes start and end dates for all listed tasks and outlines the overlap(s) between tasks and deadlines
  - 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
  - Town is struggling with rising electricity (up 13% from 2022-23) and heating (up 25%) cost
  - Town has already demonstrated a commitment to, and realized savings from, a solar installation in 2010
  - Reduces tax burden and GHG emissions
  - Reducing tax burden for electricity and heating allows the Town to focus on other priorities, such as road maintenance due to increased flooding and precipitation events
  - “Using solar to the town’s advantage also sets an example for residents to see that Montville supports solar energy and serves as a model for homeowners and businesses to entertain this alternative energy source.”

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Solar project: ROI of 6.4 years with savings of \$154,470 and 25,849 pounds of CO2 in 25 years

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Montville

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Heat pumps: savings of \$291,783 in fuel costs and 647,020 pounds of CO2 in 25 years
  - Support a local business; expands community awareness and perception of solar
  - Solar panel tracking system data will be shared with community
- 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 identifying one clear project lead from the Select Board
  - Would benefit from detailing who will conduct the community engagement
  - Montville Select Board will oversee the project
  - Revision Energy to install solar panels and heat pumps

**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
  - Community mailing; town meeting presentation attended by approx. 100 residents; website and email (to 280 resident listserv) updates; community-wide grand opening; tracking output and cost savings information
  - Build on Comp Plan committee outreach which formed informal communication networks (transfer station engagement and working with Montville Grange to engage hard to reach and vulnerable residents)
- 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 and well-designed
  - Reduced tax burden addresses Montville's: relative economic fragility 20% of population works in natural resources and 20% are self-employed; Montville is ranked in the 98th percentile for expected agriculture loss rate; high energy burden (93rd percentile); and aging population, who have less financial flexibility to respond to higher taxes
  - "The community outreach for this project is designed to reach the broadest possible segment of the population and specifically reduce barriers to participation for vulnerable individuals, who are often underrepresented at in person meetings. By providing a range of styles of engagement, from mailings, emails, and website (designed to engage those without access to internet or devices as well as those with mobility or scheduling challenges) to in person formats (town meeting and grand opening event) for those who prefer face to face communication as well as for building community connections and real time discussion around resilience efforts."
  - Identified a key community organization (Montville Grange) to engage

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Montville

**DATE:** 3/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - Yes – applied for Efficiency Maine for the Municipal Electrification Retrofits CIPI FON-019-2025
- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - Applicant opted to not apply for direct pay tax credits given that the entire solar project cost will be covered by the grant.
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - Yes – cash match
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mount Vernon

**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>44</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>89</b>



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mount Vernon

**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:
  - Selectboard
  - Town Clerk
  - Fire & Rescue Department
  - Community Center
  - Dr. Shaw Memorial Library
  - Resident

\*\*\*\*\*

**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):
  - 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:**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mount Vernon

**DATE:** 3/3/25

**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+):
  - 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: Build 50-Kilowatt Solar Array to Generate all Current Municipal Energy Used Yearly
- 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: 44**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 detailed subtasks, including those within the Timeline
  - Task 1: Site preparation and regulatory paperwork

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mount Vernon

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Task 2. Install racking system - using APA ground screws and Ready Rack system
- Task 3. Install Solar Panels - 90 - 545 watt panels
  - Size determined through conversations with two vendors
- Task 4. Install Inverters and tie into electrical grid - 7 Tesla inverters tied to CMP grid
- Task 5. Startup Activities - begin power production.
  
- Solar array will be installed at transfer station
  
- Solar panels will power:
  1. Mount Vernon Town Office - 1997 North Road
  2. Mount Vernon Community Center - 2 Main Street
  3. Mount Vernon Fire Department buildings at 7 Belgrade Rd
  4. Mount Vernon Library - 344 Pond Rd
  5. Mount Vernon Transfer Station - 57 Mooar Hill Rd
  6. Mount Vernon Athletic Field
  
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  
- 12 or 24 months
  - 12 months
  - Expected to be completed by August 2025

**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 has already invested in building efficiency upgrades, including LEDs, heat pumps, and windows
  - This project will provide economic advantage by lowering cost of electricity for the next 20+ years, decreasing contribution to fossil fuel-based electricity generation, and by educating community on benefits of solar
  - Having a working solar farm will help lead by example to the greater community
  - Will have capacity to power all of municipal energy used yearly
  - Anticipate adding battery backup so that offices can continue operating without needing fossil fuel backup generators

**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 savings of about \$13,000 per year over 20+ years (\$500,000 over 20 years), decrease in CO2 produce of nearly 100,000 lbs per year, and health outcomes through decrease in burning of fossil fuels
  
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - Appreciate town's commitment to provide reports indicating the amount of power generated vs used to track these outcomes

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mount Vernon

**DATE:** 3/3/25

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - One selectboard member will serve as primary liaison/project manager
  - Selectboard and volunteers will support
  - Contractors will complete on the ground work
  - Vendor will work with CMP to connect the project

**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 engagement and outreach strategy that enables community updates and participation
  - Community benefit of reduction of taxes for municipal electricity use
  - Community stakeholders will be provided with project updates provided in Selectboard meetings, via our town website and our newsletter.
- 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*)
  - Minimal
  - Would benefit from an engagement strategy that specifically advertises to and engages vulnerable or disadvantaged community members
  - Cost savings will allow for a reduction in taxes

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
- 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

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Mount Vernon

**DATE:** 3/3/25

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

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Naples

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>30</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>22</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>67</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT: Naples**

**DATE: 2/7/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - GPCOG

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Naples

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- 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:   10**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

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

- Project title: A Municipal Fiber Network for Resilience and Emissions Reduction
- 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 A10
    - A10 supports broadband planning while this project is for broadband implementation

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Partner with Sebago Fiber to build out a dark fiber network between municipal buildings and through the village—marks the next phase of a years-long community-driven regional planning process (Cumberland Oxford Lakes Area Broadband Initiative)
  - Tasks
    - Task 1: installation of municipal fiber network (5 miles connecting municipal buildings)
    - Task 2: regional collaboration (bi-weekly meetings with other COLAB members)
  - Would benefit from subtasks, in particular under Task 1 to detail the specific steps to be undertaken to accomplish this task



## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Naples

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Would benefit from including a task related to public outreach and education
  - Would benefit from more detailed explanation for why MCA will not fund this first phase of expansion
    - How have other COLAB towns funded this
  - Could benefit from the development of a lessons learned/best practices from this initial installation project to share with COLAB
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from discreet subtasks and start/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
  - Installing municipal broadband reduces IT operating costs and allows them to invest in emissions-reduction programs such as remote work
  - Enabling remote work is important for recruiting new municipal employees
  - Current internet provider loses service when the grid goes down, which happens more frequently due to increasing extreme weather events; enhances emergency response
  - 95% of residents believe that broadband access is important to community

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Increase internet access during power outages, improve emergency communications and response
  - Reduce VMT by enabling telecommuting, telehealth, and remote education
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely/somewhat
  - Would benefit from a plan, or addressing the need for a plan, to implement municipal remote work policies and other emission reduction opportunities

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Would benefit from further describing who comprises the Broadband Committee
  - Would benefit from addressing who is responsible for community engagement
  - Town manager to serve as the primary point of contact and oversee project with support from:
    - GPCOG
    - Naples Broadband Committee

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Naples

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Select Board
- Sebago Fiber to install the municipal fiber network
  - Collaborate with COLAB and GPCOG to develop regional connections
  - Work with MCA to seek funding for expansion

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Minimally considered
  - Would benefit from a community engagement strategy to increase awareness of municipal fiber network, how it will improve emergency communications, and how residents will benefit from 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/minimal
  - Appreciate the notes around digital equity throughout application
  - Would benefit from exploring ways to communicate the outcomes of this project to vulnerable community members and identify ways in which they will benefit from increased public internet access

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$75,000
  - Total project cost \$240k-\$290k
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Unable to determine – municipal fiber proposal was incomplete when application was submitted
  - Anticipate a maximum municipal match of \$215,000
- 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 - \$215,000 match
- Other notes
  - Would benefit from more detailed vendor estimate

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Newcastle

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>98</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT: Newcastle**

**DATE: 2/7/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 Newcastle Fire Chief
  - LCRPC

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Newcastle

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- County:
  - Lincoln
- 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: Battery Storage Systems for Strengthening Community Resilience and Sustainability in Newcastle
- 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, F3, F14, H3, H5
  - Somewhat aligned with H2

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Appreciate identified considerations included in the Preliminary Coordination for the battery lending program
  - Would benefit from more detail on the website platform upgrade and how this approach was developed and prioritized.
    - Would benefit from an accompanying communications plan.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Newcastle

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Would benefit from more discussion on why battery lending program is the best option for their community's needs
  - Task 1: Municipal Battery Based Storage System
    - 1.0 Notifying Selected Vendor of grant award
      - Town to select vendor prior to grant award
    - 1.1 Installation
    - 1.2 Filing Federal IRA Direct Pay 30% Solar Tax Credit
  - Task 2: Battery Lending Program
    - 2.0 Preliminary Coordination
      - Selected Bluetti AC180 Portable LiFePO4 Power Station | 1800W, 1,152Wh as the potential battery to purchase.
      - Develop battery lending program:
        - Creating a battery request system, establishing check-out/check-in procedures, and creating plans for transporting batteries to/from households in need, when necessary.
        - Identifying any use restrictions that may be appropriate; establishing user expectations; ensuring access to the user manual; and providing technical assistance—including how-to demonstrations—if requested.
        - Scoping out liability waivers and/or disclaimers to ensure the Town is not held responsible for any mishaps, technical problems, or misuse.
        - Advertising the availability of the battery lending program to residents with a deliberate focus on including vulnerable community members.
        - Maintaining fully charged batteries at each site at all times when not in use.
        - Prioritizing those who are most vulnerable.
        - Periodically reviewing the adequacy of the battery lending program to ensure community needs are being met, and developing and implementing improvement strategies if and when they are deemed necessary.
    - 2.1 Determining & Prioritizing Vulnerable Groups
      - Preliminary ideas for determining and prioritizing vulnerable groups include:
        - Advance Self-Reporting
        - Strategic Community Outreach
    - 2.2 Sourcing Batteries
  - Task 3: Community Engagement and Education for Newcastle's Resiliency
    - 3.0 Website Platform Upgrade: Purchase new town website platform or upgrade existing website to increase capability to have alerts and be a hub for resources and emergency communications
    - 3.1 Press & Awareness
    - 3.2 Resource Magnet Creation & Distribution: magnets will include contact information and general information around the warming and cooling center at the Newcastle Fire Station, the lendable battery program, contacts for heating and fuel assistance, and other relevant information around community resilience.
  - Task 4: Grant Reporting & Management
- Project Timeline is *[detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described]*.
    - Detailed and reasonable
    - Timelines provided for all tasks, subtasks, and deliverables.
    - No end date provided for website platform upgrades.
  - 12 or 24 months
    - 12 months

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Newcastle

**DATE:** 2/7/25

**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
  - Community is a riverine and heavily forested community that experiences frequent power outages, which will increase in frequency due to more frequent and severe storms
  - Fire Station serves as the community's heating and cooling center and will be more resilient with battery backup
  - Lincoln County's Maine Sea Grant's countywide Vulnerability Project identified a concern of how to support vulnerable residents who cannot go to warming and cooling centers who are experiencing outages
  - Would benefit from more detail on how often Newcastle experiences outages and for what length of time

**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 both short and long term outcomes for all tasks and deliverables
  - Outcomes include:
    - Reliable source of power during emergencies or natural disasters to ensure continuity of service for Fire Station and allow for location to serve as warming/cooling shelter
    - Enhanced energy reliable and integration of renewables
    - Reduced reliance on fossil fuels
    - Reduced food waste and cost burdens from food spoilage
    - Reduce environmental and human health risks associated with fossil fuel generators
    - Increased equity during emergencies and extended outages
    - Enhanced capacity to support resilience on the household level
    - Improved resilience to climate change through communications
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - Would benefit from more detail on level of outages experienced by community to demonstrate how far 7 batteries will go in terms of supporting households

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Provide lead, contractor, and support for all tasks and subtasks
  - Would benefit from more specificity in terms of contractors and vendors where already identified, such as for the battery installation at the fire station
  - Overall project lead Town Manager, with support from Town Clerk, EMA Director, Fire Chief, and Town Treasurer, as well as Selectboard and LCRPC

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Newcastle

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Reasonable
  - Engagement is emphasized through its inclusion in both Task 2 and Task 3 within the Scope of Work, and includes creation and distribution of resources magnets, updates to the town website, social media, and email
  - Would benefit from discussion of past community engagement and how this project builds on lessons learned, as the survey results for the townwide climate survey represented 4.5% of the population
  - Would benefit from a more robust communications plan which identifies mechanisms to ensure success of new website and solicit community feedback on use
- 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
  - All components of the project would benefit from a strategy that encourages vulnerable and disadvantaged community members to provide input on how these projects will be formed; for example, when developing the policies for the battery lending program, or when deciding on the best ways to communicate with residents through the new website
  - Would benefit from identifying potential community based organizations to partner with to engage vulnerable and disadvantaged groups
  - Both battery programs support vulnerable community members during emergencies and are designed with these community members in mind
  - The Fire Station will serve as a heating/cooling center and is ADA compliant and centrally located near resources
  - Provide important demographic information identifying vulnerable residents, such as 4.1% poverty rate, 22.6% older adults, and 12.2% with disabled ability
  - Provides important equity considerations when developing the battery lending program

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 further detail on what the costs for Task 3 include.
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - N/A



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Newcastle

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Does the applicant make use of the federal “direct pay” option for tax credits? (yes, no)
  - Yes
  - Community should be aware of the “no excess benefit” rule and be aware of this when they file for the credit.
- Is the cost share provided, if required? (yes, no, n/a)
  - No
- Other notes
  - Estimates were based on research
  - Would benefit from more detail on what the optimal number of batteries is to support a lending program
  - Task 3 lacked sufficient detail to receive funding. Would benefit from additional information around specific upgrades to be made and how these upgrades will support the community's engagement goals. Application scoring does not include this task.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** North Haven

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>50</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>23</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>93</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** North Haven

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Select Board

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 anticipated to be complete in early 2025.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** North Haven

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- County:
  - 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: Design and Scoping: Mitigating Saltwater Intrusion Risk in Fresh Pond
- 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 and E7
  - Somewhat-aligned with E3

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   50**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 noting the specific considerations (priority habitat designations) for this site
  - Appreciate noting who will comprise the review committee
  - Would benefit from clarifying to what extent Task 4 is included in this scope and if the retained consultants are expected to assist in this process
  - Task 1 – Competitive Review Process
  - Task 2 – Scoping & Design

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** North Haven

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Analysis of existing Town data and freshwater studies, sea level rise and storm surge projections, and additional datasets as needed.
    - Compare costs, feasibility, and permitting requirements for all design alternatives
    - Site visits, stakeholder meetings, site surveying and data collection
    - Formulate a set of formal design recommendations
  - Task 3 – Community Engagement and Education
    - Present the findings of this study and proposed design to the following: the Select Board, a coalition of relevant stakeholders and the community-at-large for feedback and questions.
    - Community education opportunity
  - Task 4 – Final Approval and Exploring Implementation Funding
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
    - Detailed and reasonable
  - 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
  - With current culvert, engineering firm has determined that *there is almost a 100% chance of a flood with an elevation exceeding 8 feet [compromising the culvert] in the next 20 years. There is approximately a 50% chance of a flood exceeding 10 feet [overtopping that section of Middle Road] in the next 20 years.*
  - Primary source of freshwater upon which critical community infrastructure is reliant
  - Demonstrated commitment: CRP enrollment process noted saltwater intrusion as a key concern; two previous grants analyzed freshwater resource analysis and risk assessments of saltwater intrusion from 2022 through the present

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Partially described
  - Deliverables were very clear but would benefit from inclusion of long-term project outcomes – these were touched on within the Project Need section.
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - Would benefit from more concrete plan to fill funding gap.

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from more clarity around the potential project consultant or full-time planner and how that scope of work will be addressed if funding is not found.
  - Would benefit from a clearer chain of command and who the primary project manager will be.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** North Haven

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Island Institute Fellow – project support, community engagement and facilitation support
- Town Administrator – project and grant management
- Road Commissioner and Crew – meet with engineering firm, review proposed plan
- Water department – meet with engineering firm, review proposed plan
- Contracted engineering firm – project management, proposal development
- Volunteers - Climate and Sustainability Working Group and North Haven Select Board
- Town is aiming to contract with a project consultant or full-time Town Planner to oversee and support the design and approval process, community engagement, and identifying additional funding sources for this project.

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Well-designed
  - Demonstrated history of public engagement
  - Public involvement throughout process; consultants will include a site-visit and interviews while developing scope; will present proposals to select board, coalition of stakeholders, and town at large for feedback; will hold a more general climate change and freshwater resource presentation
  - Would benefit from identifying how “key stakeholders” were determined (i.e. who is on the Sustainability Board) – are most vulnerable populations represented?
- 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
  - Robust engagement with a variety of relevant groups but does not specifically identify vulnerable populations nor address how they will be engaged.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 23**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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)
  - Budget worksheet needs to be updated to have total grant funds requested equal \$75,000 and any potential overage included within the cost share column.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** North Haven

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- 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, but would benefit from more specific strategy to meet funding gap.
- Other notes
  - Vendor estimates provided

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Northport

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>90</b>



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT: Northport**

**DATE: 2/7/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Northport Village Corporation
  - Rep. Janice Dodge
  - Sen. Chip Curry

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?
      - Anticipate the completion of the prior grant in Summer 2025.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Northport

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- 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: Shoreline Stabilization, Landscape Architecture, and Project Management in Bayview Park
- 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, E9 and G1.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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*].
  - Partially described
  - As the specific site is known and already engineered and designed for, would benefit from more specific details related to this site for all tasks and deliverables, such as what nature based solution will be used and where.
  - Project assumes that design and permitting process is complete.
  - Task 1: Contact and engage with property owners abutting the project area.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Northport

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Town will contact the private property owners abutting the project area to ensure that they have input in the process and that their properties are not adversely affected by the Town's project.
- Task 2: Develop Request for Proposal (RFP), interview candidates, and enter into contract with a firm to implement stabilization design.
- Task 3: Implement the stabilization plan with engineering oversight.
  - Shoreline is approximately 125 feet long with significant erosion at the toe of the slope,
- Task 4: Community outreach and engagement.
  - Town meetings to inform residents about the impacts of climate driven weather events and solution to reduce harm to residents and infrastructure
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from more detailed timeline, which includes start and end dates 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
  - Would benefit from inclusion of projected climate-related risks and potential impacts on public infrastructure with less focus on the project outcomes.
  - 2023 and 2024 storms accelerated the rate erosion to Bayview Park – pictures provided in appendix
  - This project is a community prioritization because it centers around erosion control, stabilizing slopes through nature based solutions, protecting infrastructure, enhancing resilience to climate change, long term cost savings, and a sustainable economy for Waldo County

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Provides clear short- and long-term outcomes related to the project and project deliverables
  - Outcomes include:
    - Protect the infrastructure from sea level rise
    - Protect access roads from extreme weather events
    - Yield long-term cost savings
    - Strengthen the Local Economy
    - Enhance Recreational Opportunities
- 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:** Northport

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Town Administrator – project lead
- Northport Village Corporation Infrastructure Committee chair – engagement
- Garley & Dorsky – oversee project implementation

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Hosts regular public community meetings and engagement events, including the annual town workshop related to climate, the Northport Village Infrastructure Committee's public meetings, Donuts and Dialog meetings in the summer, and will continue to update the community and solicit input through these existing structures
  - Community input was provided at past events
  - Would benefit from discussion of past success of these engagement events
  - Would benefit from more detail on how these events are advertised
  - Would benefit from acknowledging how this project will engage/benefit Northport residents who do not reside in Bayside – is this public park utilized by residents outside of the Village?
- 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
  - NVIC will reach out to abutting properties and others affected by this project
  - Would benefit from more detail on vulnerable or disadvantaged groups and how they will be specifically advertised to and encouraged to participate in the project, such as by partnering with community-based organizations

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 identifying sources for gap funding, have these funds already been secured?
  - Would benefit from funding plan for all four sites to help explain why CAG funding is needed for this site, instead of other eligible funding sources.
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Northport

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- 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, \$55,000
- Other notes
  - Vendor estimate provided
  - Appreciate detailed explanation of NBS in attachment – would benefit from incorporating this information into the scope of work

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Ogunquit

**DATE:** 2/7/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>22</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>95</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT: Ogunquit**

**DATE: 2/7/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - SMPDC
  - Ogunquit Select Board
  - GEI Consultants

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?
    - Staff has extensive experience in grant management and available capacity to oversee multiple grants at one time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Ogunquit

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- 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):
  - 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: Enhancing the Resilience of Ogunquit’s Main Beach Natural and Physical Infrastructure through Design and Implementation of Nature-Based Strategies
- 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 E9 and H2
  - Somewhat aligned F1, F2, G2

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Appreciate the development of a monitoring protocol and maintenance plan to enhance the longevity of this project
  - Would benefit from identifying plans to secure funding for the third project
  - Task 1: Final Design of Nature-Based Strategy Projects



## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Ogunquit

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Three concept designs: 1) vegetated shorefront improvements to a portion of the embankment between the parking lot and the Ogunquit River; 2) installation of gabion basket system at existing stormwater outfall located near intersection of Beach Street and parking lot area adjacent to the River; and 3) vegetative buffer above existing riprap shorefront between Norseman Lane and the River
    - Designs will be suitable for filing regulatory permit applications, and include tech specs and cost estimates for the Town to use for bidding and construction
    - Post-implementation maintenance and monitoring plan
  - Task 2: Permitting of NBS Projects
  - Task 3: Construction of two of the NBS Projects
    - Vegetation improvements to embankment between the parking lot and Ogunquit River
    - Gabion basket installation for stormwater discharge filtration
  - Task 4: Monitoring, Maintenance, and Educational Signage
  - Task 5: Project Management and Grant Administration
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
    - Detailed and reasonable
    - Appreciate inclusion of 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
  - Priority vulnerable areas were selected based on factors including exposure to coastal flood hazards, co-occurrence of vulnerabilities, and regional and/or local significance.
  - Identified as a priority project by community and as a vulnerable area by Climate Ready Coast, a regional vulnerability assessment.
    - Main beach area is one of southern Maine's few undeveloped barrier beaches
  - Would benefit from further describing the climate and resilience need of this project, especially when confronted by increasing sea-level rise and storm events

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate the note that this project could serve as a case study for other towns and an example of resilient nature-based infrastructure for community members
- 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
  - Mandy Cummings, Assistant Town Manager and Treasurer, will serve as project manager with support from:

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Ogunquit

**DATE:** 2/7/25

- Director of Codes and Town Manager
- GEI Consultants to finalize design and complete permitting process
- TBD contractor to complete construction of NBS
- SMPDC to assist with grant administration and reporting
- Sustainability Committee and Conservation Commission will lead community education efforts, monitoring and maintenance

**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
  - Community engagement throughout this process, including the selection of these projects, was strong. Project will also ensure, through signage, an education campaign to highlight the benefits of these NBS projects.
  - Would benefit from a more detailed volunteer management and outreach plan
- 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 identification of how most vulnerable community members will benefit from the project and be engaged.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 including costs for subtasks, hours and hourly rates
- 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

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Old Town

**DATE:** 2/11/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>25</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>10</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>50</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Old Town

**DATE:** 2/11/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Old Town City Council
  - UMaine Cooperative Extension

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Old Town

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- 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:   10**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

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

- Project title: Helping Old Town "Grow" Locally and Sustainably
- 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 D1 and E1

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60                      Score:   25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 concrete and actionable tasks and subtasks, and deliverables, such as how many gardens will be created and where, how many events will be held, etc.
    - Would benefit from more clarity on the difference between the professional development program and the volunteer program
    - Would benefit from more clarity on the partnership with the Collaborative Extension and what this part of the project will entail
    - Would benefit from an Operations and Maintenance plan to ensure the longevity and success of the program(s)

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Old Town

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Would benefit from more detail on which beds will be used as community gardens versus which will be used to donate to the food pantry, or how these different uses will be determined and how distribution pathways will be created.
- Task 1: Expand garden beds at public park on Perkins Ave.
- Task 2: Professional Development: Offer hands-on internship experience for local youth and adults interested in pursuing careers in horticulture and agriculture
  - Utilize sustainable farming practices to address industry's need for skilled labor
- Task 3: Volunteer Engagement
  - Recruit and train new volunteers to support food security efforts and work with UMaine's Harvest for Hunger program to grow and glean produce.
  - Hands-on service learning for local school and community groups
- Task 4: Public Engagement
  - Engage a range of stakeholders, including those being served by CBOs like Caring Community Cupboard and RSU#34 to gather input on food security needs
  - Host community events at community gardens
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Minimally described
  - Would benefit from timelines for each task, subtask and deliverable, including 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
  - Significant portion of Old Town's population lives below the federal poverty level, with many relying on food pantries and other community resources to meet nutritional needs
    - A need for food security
  - Maine's agricultural sector is facing challenges related to climate change, pest pressures, and a shrinking workforce
  - This program aims to expand workforce, volunteer, and education opportunities to both address food insecurity and create a sustainable model for local food production and workforce development
  - Program will use climate-resilient farming practices that will help local farmers adapt to these challenges.
  - Provides important detail on the UMaine Cooperative Extension and how this community's program will build upon existing resources to create additional opportunities

### 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 detailed metrics around expected number of volunteers engaged, number of apprentices or young adults trained in sustainable agricultural practices, etc.
  - Outcomes include creating sustainable agricultural practices, offer career development opportunities, strengthen volunteer engagement, enhance community resilience, and address food security needs, and add additional food into the community through residents who use the beds on Perkins Ave and food that is cultivated and donated to the food pantry

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Old Town

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Unable to determine
  - Not enough detail provided on what actions will be taken to stand up these programs. Would benefit from more clarity on what actionable and concrete tasks will be completed in order to produce specific deliverables.
  - Without more detail on how many garden beds will be created and how much food will be donated/eaten by the community, or how many young adults will be provided workforce development and for how long, it is hard to determine the full impact of this program.

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from identifying a single City Staff member who will serve as project manager, and a more clearly defined chain of command between City Staff and the Cooperative Extension.
  - Would benefit from identifying specific staff from both the UMaine Cooperative Extension and the City who will be supporting specific tasks within this project
  - City and UMaine will implement and monitor project
  - Stakeholder group to serve in an advisory capacity throughout the project

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Will provide workforce development, volunteer opportunities, and educational events
  - Would benefit from a communications strategy to engage community members in workforce development opportunities
  - Would benefit from more detail on what kind of events will be held and how often, who the audience will be, where they will be held, etc.
  - Would benefit from more detail on how the events, volunteer and workforce development opportunities, and survey will be advertised
  - Would benefit from more detail on what will be taught through the educational opportunities
- 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 donate some of the harvested food to a local food bank
  - Will invite local community organizations like Caring Community Cupboard and RSU#34 to take part in the stakeholder advisory group
  - Would benefit from a plan to encourage and/or prioritizes use of the community garden beds and workforce development opportunities for vulnerable or disadvantaged community members
  - Would benefit from an outreach plan to advertise to and encourage participation from vulnerable or disadvantaged community members

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Old Town

**DATE:** 2/11/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$65,215.55
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Tasks in budget narrative and worksheet do not match
    - Budget worksheet Task 1 and 2 not included in budget narrative
    - Budget worksheet Task 3 and 4 do not match budget narrative
  - Would benefit from tasks in budget matching the scope of work
  - Would benefit from more clarity on the intern program budget, including the Mentor/Supervisor position, and would benefit from a plan for how this position will continue to be funded beyond the grant performance period, if interns will continue to be used.
  - Would benefit from more clarity on what the costs are for the Rogers Farm program versus the Perkins Ave program, and how will these two programs interact. Grant funds cannot be used to develop community gardens on non-publicly owned property.
  - Would benefit from more detail on what budget items will be supporting the workforce development program.
  - Would benefit from a plan for how the Rogers Farm fee, and other O&M such as consumables and agricultural materials, will continue to be funded past the grant performance period to ensure the success, longevity, and impact of this program
- 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
  - Land fee at a private property is ineligible for grant funding
  - Project need and proposed actions are well-aligned with *Maine Won't Wait* goals to increase local food production and support workforce development, but this proposal lacked concrete details around how these actions would be implemented and managed to achieve the desired outcomes and included ineligible costs for funding. We invite the applicant to apply again with increased detail in the project scope and management structure to demonstrate how this project will successfully be implemented.



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Orono

**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>30</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>73</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT: Orono**

**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:
  - Town Manager
  - Facilities 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 is complete.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available:** 5

**Score:** 3

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Orono

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Penobscot
- 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: Executing Projects Identified in the Municipal Building Energy Audit
- 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?)
  - Project 1 well-aligned with B3, B4
  - Project 2 somewhat aligned with F
  - Project 3 somewhat aligned with E, providing 20% match

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Project 1:
    - Conducted a baseline energy audit of five municipal buildings using spring 2022 CAG funding
    - Incorporating high expenditure upgrades into CIP

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Orono

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Would benefit from more specific details for each of the upgrades including: any pre-installation tasks (contracting, etc.), specific types or models for each proposed upgrade (energystar rated, etc.)
  - Gas-powered boiler is ineligible for grant funds based on program goals to transition to clean energy generation.
- Project 2:
  - Based on study from UMaine students
  - Would benefit from further describing which streetlights need a backup and how the generators will be used across the five streetlights
  - Would benefit from describing why generators were selected, rather than a renewable battery storage
  - Fossil-fuel powered generator is ineligible for grant funds based on program goals to transition to clean energy generation.
- Project 3:
  - Would benefit from more details on a cohesive invasives management plan to ensure this is a long term solution
- Task 1: Implement low-cost energy efficiency projects recommended in municipal energy audit:
  - Keith Anderson Community House
    - Replace end of life water heater with heat pump water heater
    - Replace end of life oil boiler with 200,000 BTU natural gas boiler + new efficient thermostats (building is already hooked up with natural gas)
    - Replace old drafty front glass french doors with more weatherized and efficient door
  - Birch Street Senior Center
    - Replace old water heater with heat pump water heater
    - Upgrade thermostats to programmable efficient kind
    - Install spray foam insulation to the bare box sills and walls in basement
    - Replace front door with more efficient weatherized one
    - Install a heat pump in the community room
  - Town Hall
    - Replace old water heater with heat pump water heater
  - Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF)
    - Install heat pump in the lab
    - Relocate and upgrade thermostat
- Task 2: Install backup power source for traffic lights during power outages to increase safety and resilience.
  - Purchase two generators
- Task 3: Invasive plant restoration on the shores of the Stillwater River
  - Cut back invasive plants and treat cut stems with herbicide
  - Replant the shoreline with native species
- 
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from including a timeline which clearly breaks down each task and subtask and includes start and end dates
  - Would benefit from including project 2 in the timeline
- 12 or 24 months
  - 24 months

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Orono

**DATE:** 3/3/25

**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
  - Task 1: Lead by example, and reduce costs (\$270,000 in municipal energy costs/year)
    - Completed a 2022 energy audit which identified these upgrades
  - Task 2: Increased storms have increased susceptibility to outage.
    - “Preparing the traffic signals for outages helps the town with climate resiliency and increases safety of residents and visitors during a time where emergency vehicles are already at maximum capacity”
  - Task 3: Important recreation spot for the Town; recently invasive species are choking out native flora diversity and limiting river access
    - The Town of Orono has a record of completing invasive species restoration projects and monitoring them for years after treatment including at the Union St Boat Launch and Jeremiah Colburn Natural Area using the Maine Forest Service (MFS) Invasive Species Management Program funding. However, this MFS program does not fund projects that are less than 10 contiguous acres, which the River Trail and Webster Park is.

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Partially described
  - Task 1: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions, increased comfort of the buildings to visitors and employees, increased resiliency, and reduce taxpayer dollars spent on energy
    - Would benefit from specific savings/reduction estimates
  - Task 2: Increase resiliency to power outages and increase community safety
  - Task 3:
    - Will increase diversity of plants and animals, increase shoreland stabilization during flood events, increase recreational opportunities, and increase the park's aesthetics
    - Would benefit from detailing how this will be a long term resilience solution
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Somewhat
  - Gas boiler and fossil fuel powered generators in Tasks 1 and 2 do not meet GHG reduction recommendations and goals outlined in Maine Won't Wait and are ineligible for grant funds.

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from identifying who will lead community engagement
  - The Environmental Services Manager and the Facilities Manager will manage all three tasks
  - Public Works Director to oversee all tasks
  - Contracted electrician
  - Contracted licensed commercial herbicide applicator

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Orono

**DATE:** 3/3/25

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Projects reflect community needs and priorities
    - Environmental services manager met with the town council environment committee in a public meeting to discuss priorities from the audit
    - Increasing resiliency during extreme weather events identified as community need
    - Residents how asked the Town to clean up the shoreline access
  - Plan to submit an article in the Orono Observer (resident newspaper) when projects are completed to inform residents of how the Town took advantage of GOPIF grant funding and examples of how residents can reduce GHG emissions within their homes
  - Would benefit from a more detailed and specific community outreach plan to publicize these projects and their benefits.
- 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
  - "all resident ideas are considered and have been incorporated into the plans"
  - Would benefit from specifically identifying vulnerable populations and how they 1) influenced these scopes and 2) they will be prioritized in the communication of the outcomes of the projects.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Vendor estimates provided to support estimated costs
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - Yes – EMT hot water heater rebate
- 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:** Orono

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Gas-powered boiler and fossil fuel-powered generators (and necessary corresponding equipment) are not eligible for grant funds.
- Control tactics such as herbicide treatments could be eligible for funding as one component of a larger invasive management plan to support Strategy E, but do not qualify for grant funding as a singular component for invasive control.
- Updated requested fund total with ineligible tasks removed: \$50,943
- Proposal was scored with tasks 2 and 3 removed.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Otisfield

**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>40</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>23</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: Otisfield**

**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:
  - Sen. Richard Bennett

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 and Selectboard will be tracking both projects. Little overlap is anticipated.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Otisfield

**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):
  - 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: Making Otisfield's Fire Stations Energy Efficient
- 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 and B4

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Would benefit from more detail on Tasks 2 and 3, including type and amount of insulation and type of dehumidifier
  - Increase energy efficiency through making the following upgrades to all three town fire stations:
    - Task 1 - Upgrade Electrical & Install Heat Pumps - Samsung DVM S Eco (VRF) heat pump systems

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Otisfield

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- 1.1 the Spurrs Corner fire station requires a new 400 AMP overhead service, upgraded panels, and new breakers;
  - 1.2 the Gore Road fire station requires a new 200 AMP overhead service, upgraded panels, and new breakers; and
  - 1.3 the Pugglyville fire station requires a new 200 AMP overhead service, upgraded panels, and new breakers.
  - 1.4 the Spurrs Corner fire station will have 9 indoor heat pump units installed along with 3 outdoor units;
  - 1.5 the Gore Road fire station will have 2 indoor heat pump units installed along with 1 outdoor unit; and
  - 1.6 the Pugglyville fire station will have 2 indoor heat pump units installed along with 1 outdoor unit.
  - Task 2 - Installation of new insulation
  - Task 3 - Installation of two dehumidifiers at Spurrs Corner fire station
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
    - Reasonable
  - 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 for Tasks 1 and 2
  - Somewhat aligned for Task 3
    - Would benefit from further documentation that the efficiency of the drier insulation outperforms the additional electricity usage from the dehumidifiers, to result in an overall increase in efficiency.
  - These projects are based on a CAG-funded energy audit
  - In FY23, Spurr's Corner Fire Station consumed 1,907 gallons of oil, Fore Road Fire Station used 700 gallons, and Pugglyville Fire Station used 384 gallons, a combined total of \$2,991 gallons and cost of \$10,885
  - All buildings need new insulation to help prevent the transmission of heat through ceilings
  - Spurr's Corner Fire Station has large bay for fire trucks and often has higher than normal humidity levels. Dehumidifiers would help combat this humidity and keep newly installed insulation more effective.

**Project Outcomes**

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Discussed current oil used and cost to heat the three buildings.
    - Would benefit from anticipated outcomes from electrification, such as gallons of oil avoided, cost savings, etc. Not clear if heat pumps will fully replace oil or if the oil heating will be kept as backup.
  - Heat pump outcomes include reduced usage of fossil fuels and town's emissions and step forward toward clean energy and electrification of these buildings.
  - Outcomes for insulation and dehumidifiers include potential 11% reduction in total energy costs.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Otisfield

**DATE:** 3/3/25

- Potential outcome for these buildings to serve as backup overflow heating/cooling centers
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - Would benefit from further documentation that the efficiency of the drier insulation outperforms the additional electricity usage from the dehumidifiers, to result in an overall increase in efficiency.

**Project Management**

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Might benefit from more detail on how the Selectboard and Resilience Committee will work together to complete this project
  - Selectboard – lead
  - Community Resilience Committee – co-lead
  - Contractors
    - Bedell Electric – electric upgrades
    - EcoHeat Maine – heat pumps
    - Acadia Insulation - insulation
    - Field Electric - humidifiers

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Minimal
  - Would benefit from a more robust engagement and outreach plan that updates the community and encourages public participation
  - Discusses impact on taxpayers due to reduction in municipal costs
- 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*)
  - Minimal/Moderate
  - Would benefit from a more robust engagement and outreach plan that specifically advertises to and encourages participation from vulnerable or disadvantaged community members
  - Identifies poverty rates among community and lessening tax burden
  - Mentions fire stations serving as backup overflow heating/cooling centers which could benefit community members who live closer to these stations than the primary center

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Otisfield

**DATE:** 3/3/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF**  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 23**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$74,754.81
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Math for Task 1 may be off by \$10
    - Adds to \$29,805 not \$29,397
    - Gore Rd is \$5,442 not \$5,850, based on vendor estimate, which would still make total \$29,407
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Vendor estimates provided
- Are other sources of funding included where required? (e.g., Efficiency Maine incentives)
  - No – EMT rebates were not included in the budget worksheet but are incorporated into the overall cost
- 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
  - Would benefit from further documentation that the efficiency of the drier insulation outperforms the additional electricity usage from the dehumidifiers, to result in an overall increase in efficiency.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Owls Head

**DATE:** 2/11/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>23</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: Owls Head**

**DATE: 2/11/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Owls Head Fire Volunteer Fire Company

\*\*\*\*\*

**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, but decided to not move forward with the project
  - 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:
  - Knox

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Owls Head

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- 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: Fire-Fighting Water Supply Ponds with Dry Hydrants
- 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 F13 and 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 a higher-level description of the tasks to provide the reviewers with a more clear understanding of the project
  - Would benefit from inclusion of some of the contracting tasks and engagement tasks mentioned in the Project Timeline
  - South Shore Site tasks and activities:
    - Excavate and clean up overgrowth around fire pond
    - Dredge and remove overgrowth from pond
    - Install piping and dry hydrant (Piping, fittings & dry hydrant to be supplied by Owls Head FD)
    - Loam and shape around edges of pond
    - Seed and Hay around edges of pond



## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Owls Head

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Lighthouse Road tasks and activities:
  - Excavate and clean up overgrowth around fire pond
  - Install piping and dry hydrant (Piping, fittings & dry hydrant to be supplied by Owls Head FD)
  - Loam and shape around edges of pond
  - Seed and Hay around edges of pond
  - Install gravel apron at roadside for access
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from providing timelines and start/end dates for each project subtask.
  - Would benefit from clarifying if the two projects will happen simultaneously.
- 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
  - Town identified fire risk and lack of water as an emerging risk
    - Town of Owls Head has no water treatment facilities nor stormwater infrastructure (culverts aside); 50% of the town's square mileage not serviced by fire hydrants
    - House or barn fires often require multiple trips from pumper trucks
    - Fire ponds capture and store excess water during rainfall or water abundance
  - Would benefit from describing how these improvements will result in more resilient infrastructure in the long term, and would benefit from describing the planning process which resulted in the decision to excavate these ponds rather than an alternative solution (construction of a cistern, etc.)

### 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 exploring longer-term resilience improvements and how this will result in a reduced susceptibility to extreme weather events
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely to achieve the applicant's scope of work outcomes
  - Unable to determine whether this provides a long-term solution for firefighting in the community that addresses projected climate impacts on the water source.
  - Would benefit from including as part of the project the development of a water conservation or wildfire fighting strategy, as well as an O&M plan to maintain the dry ponds and hydrant, as they are described as historically unmaintained.

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Russ Krauss, community volunteer, to oversee grant
  - Fire Chief will assist in project management and oversight

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Owls Head

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Contractor to complete fire pond maintenance
- Town Administrative Contact:
  - Christine Fee
  - Administrative Assistant
  - adminassistant@owlshead.maine.gov
- Would benefit from the inclusion of the role of the Owls Head Volunteer Fire Co.

**Engagement and equity**

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Well-designed
  - Proposed communications and engagement strategy that includes multiple outreach and education efforts from project start through completion.
  - Appreciate noting specific opportunities for public engagement
  - Activities include: project kickoff through select board meetings, flyers, website updates, Facebook, and email; ribbon cutting event; and fire safety education activities at the Owls Head Community Building and Owls Head Fire Department.
  - Would benefit from further describing how “priorities shifted” and how this project is the result of public input and feedback
  - Could benefit from exploring other partner organizations to raise awareness
- 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
  - Identified residents with limited access to water sources as vulnerable.
  - Would benefit from a more robust engagement plan that specifically engages with the most vulnerable community groups such as partnering with community based organizations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 23**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$44,857
  - Includes a 5% contingency
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Owls Head

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Yes
  - Would benefit from an hours estimate for community engagement
- 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 - \$3000 in Fire Department-supplied materials – these should be included in the budget worksheet
- Other notes
  - Vendor estimates provided
  - Confirm that proposed improvements are in compliance with shoreland zoning

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Parsonsfield

**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>24</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: Parsonsfield**

**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:
  - Selectboard
  - SMPDC
  - CEBE

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Parsonsfield

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- No
- County:
  - York
- 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 of Parsonsfield Municipal Energy Plan
- 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, C1

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 more details on the energy assessment: how many buildings? What, specifically, will be assessed?
  - Would benefit from describing how the results from the MEP will impact long-term planning efforts
  - Task 1: Baseline Energy Assessment
    - Energy assessment of all municipal facilities

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Parsonsfield

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- Collect and analyze data on the Town's energy use in buildings, streetlights, and other infrastructure.
    - Create an energy assessment that prioritizes energy efficiency improvements and implementation plan
    - Evaluate use and need for backup energy generation at Town Hall
    - Deliverable: Energy assessment report.
  - Task 2: Renewable Energy Assessment
    - Evaluation of municipal properties for solar or other renewable energy potential.
    - Energy assessment will inform "right size" solar generation
    - Site assessment of 160 Sokokis Ave. to be complete by CEBE. Site was considered for solar development in the past.
    - Identification of other municipal sites for renewable energy
    - Cost estimates and funding strategies
    - Deliverable: Renewable energy feasibility report
  - Task 3: Community Engagement
    - Conduct community engagement to gather input and feedback on the priorities and proposed actions of the Municipal Energy Report
      - Tabling
      - Community coffee event
      - Special town meeting and Selectboard workshop
      - Social media posts, handouts, newsletters, newspaper articles, and a page on the Town website sharing energy saving tips and renewable energy opportunities with community members.
      - Deliverables: community engagement materials and summary
  - Task 4: Municipal Energy Plan Development
    - Use energy assessment and renewable energy feasibility report and summary of community engagement to inform plan
    - Incorporate community and staff feedback on draft plan
    - Deliverable: Final Municipal Energy Plan
  - Task 5: Project and Grant Administration
    - Deliverables: Summary of project activities for input into CRP quarterly update reports; Summary of project activities for input into CRP final project report
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
    - Detailed and reasonable
    - Detailed and reasonable. Timeline has clear start and end dates and outlines the desire to use the outcomes from the renewable energy assessment to apply for August CAG funding.
  - 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
  - The project will address the community's desire for solar and renewable energy as well as increasing the energy efficiency and resilience of the Town Hall; all identified as clear priorities during enrollment

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Parsonsfield

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- The Town previously had a lease agreement with a solar developer for a solar farm on town-owned property; this lease was broken due to interconnection costs and challenges
- Parsonsfield has a small population, is rural with a high percentage of tree cover making it vulnerable to prolonged power outages, and has a limited budget.
- Aligns with Comp plan which reflects a desire for Town Hall to serve as an emergency shelter
- Would benefit from describing the need for an energy assessment at other municipal buildings besides the Town Hall

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - This project could realize cost savings, increased resilience and make the Town Hall serve as a more effective emergency heating and cooling shelter, and improve overall energy efficiency
  - Identified cost-savings through energy efficiency upgrades; a clear set of next steps for the Town to prioritize municipal energy actions; increased engagement with the community on energy efficiency and renewable energy opportunities.
- 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 more information on who will be on the advisory committee
  - Jen Lewis, CRP liaison and selectboard member, to serve as primary town point of contact
    - Administer grant, assist SMPDC on reports, provide input on MEP
  - Ad Hoc Advisory Committee will be formed to provide input on MEP
  - SMPDC staff will provide overall project coordination and administration, lead the energy audit consultant selection process, coordinate the evaluation of municipal properties for solar or other renewable energy potential, lead the drafting of the plan, and support community engagement opportunities.
  - Center for an Ecology Based Economy (CEBE) will partner with the Town to perform site assessments for solar development potential

### 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
  - Engagement includes:
    - Tabling at local community events to spread awareness about the plan and hear community members' priorities and concerns.
    - A community coffee event to discuss assessment findings and possible municipal actions with community members.
    - A special town meeting and Selectboard workshop to review and discuss the draft assessment.
    - Social media posts, handouts available at Town Hall, newsletters, newspaper articles, and a page on the Town website sharing energy saving tips and renewable energy opportunities with community members.



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Parsonsfield

**DATE:** 2/28/25

- SMPDC will make revisions to the MEP based on feedback from the town and the community. SMPDC will work with the Town to refine action ideas and finalize the plan.
- 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
  - Identify vulnerable populations: Community members who are low-income, older, or disabled are more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.
  - "Parsonsfield's MEP will provide community-wide benefits by exploring opportunities for increased renewable energy which could represent cost-savings for the community, as well as making recommendations for increasing energy efficiency and resilience of the Town Hall for use as an emergency shelter and for other Town uses."
  - Would benefit from noting how, specifically, these vulnerable populations will be engaged during Task 3, community engagement

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$61,304
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Appreciate the inclusion of estimated hours and hourly rate
  - Energy audit estimate based on similar projects
    - Would benefit from specific energy assessment deliverables to support estimated cost
- 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:** Penobscot Nation – Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians

**DATE:** 2/11/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>17</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>67</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Penobscot Nation – Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians

**DATE:** 2/11/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Tribal Government
- Applicant is currently enrolled in the Partnership (y/n):
  - Yes
- Community/Partner/other Letters of Support:
  - Kirk Francis, Tribal Chief, Penobscot Nation
  - Clarissa Sabattis, Tribal Chief, Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians
  - Would benefit from letters of support from other Wabanaki Nations: Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point and Indian Township and the Mi'kmaq Nation, and UMaine

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 – both have received grants
- Has an extension ever been requested?
  - No
- How will the community ensure both grants are completed on time?
  - Current Wabanaki Sustainable Energy Coordinator will lead hiring and mentoring of new Coordinator proposed in this application.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Penobscot Nation – Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians

**DATE:** 2/11/25

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - Tribal, multi-community
- County:
  - Penobscot and Aroostook
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small, small
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - 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: Wabanaki Sustainable Energy Coordinator to Support Wabanaki-led Sustainable Energy Initiatives
- 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
  - B1, C7, D4, H2, H5

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 discrete job positions that delineate the roles and responsibilities for the 2 Wabanaki Sustainable Energy Coordinator positions, with clear expectations and deliverables for the position funded through this grant

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Penobscot Nation – Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Would benefit from a more concrete plan to sustain the funding for this position, which includes potential funding opportunities
- Would benefit from including concrete and actionable tasks and subtasks to support the hiring and management of the WSEC position, building upon those listed in the Project Timeline section
- Hire a second Wabanaki Sustainable Energy Coordinator to work with the Wabanaki Sustainable Energy Team (WSET) and support five Wabanaki Governments (Penobscot Nation, the Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point and Indian Township, the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians, and the Mi'kmaq Nation) in meeting their sustainable energy goals to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Coordinator tasks to include:
  - Meet with WSET regularly to check-in on ongoing and future energy projects
  - Co-develop project grant proposals
    - Including funding to continue Wabanaki Sustainable Energy Coordinator positions beyond initial timelines
  - Assist with budget management, contractor coordination, and timely project completion
  - Collaborate with citizen resilience committees to identify priorities, conduct community engagement, provide training and support for the use and maintenance of renewable energy systems and energy efficient technologies
  - Collaborate with tribal government agencies and coordinate tribal leadership as appropriate in the development of sustainable energy programs
  - Co-lead educational workshops about sustainable energy programs
  - Work with tribal government staff and citizens in HBMI and Mi'kmaq Nation to develop citizen committees as desired/appropriate
  - Help to coordinate communications among and between citizen committees and the WSET to ensure effective collaborations that reduce costs and improve outcomes
  - Coordinator will be trained and expected to conduct and/or oversee energy audits and air sealing on tribally-owned homes and office buildings
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from including detailed tasks and subtasks with start and end dates for each
  - Would benefit from a workplan for the new WSEC position, which includes deadlines for the expected deliverables
- 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
  - Wabanaki tribes have an interest in increasing capacity to expand and support ongoing educational outreach efforts, grant applications, and project implementation
  - Current SWEC, Kelsey Flores, has coordinated inter-tribal sustainable energy initiative since August 2024 and has allowed for more clarity among each tribe for the multiple energy and sustainability projects
  - Wabanaki Governments have many ongoing initiatives, including heat pump installations, photovoltaic installations, weatherization, workforce training programs, and other energy efficiency measures, as well as:

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Penobscot Nation – Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Penobscot Nation Energy Efficiency Program, which will train 10 AmeriCorps members in heat pump installation and energy audits
- EPA Government-to-Government Program, which will provide \$1 for installation of 45 heat pumps at each tribal community and training to tribal members as certified renewable energy technicians
- Need additional support beyond existing Coordinator to manage these programs and more as tribes make progress in this area
- Additional coordinator will also help the current Coordinator to find additional funding for a Coordinator at each tribe long term

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Partially described
  - Discuss broadly the cost savings, reduced energy consumption, and/or increased renewable energy generation in each of the 5 Wabanaki governments
  - Intend to track and quantify these metrics using UMaine researchers led by Sharon Klein as part of their EPA Energy Star research grant project
  - Would benefit from more information on the current energy landscape for each of the communities served by the Wabanaki governments, as well as the types of clean energy and energy efficient equipment that will replace the old models
  - Would benefit from more concrete deliverables for what the new coordinator will accomplish as part of their workplan
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Unable to determine
  - Would benefit from a more concrete and actionable workplan for the new position, as well as concrete deliverables and measurable outcomes
  - Would benefit from further detail in why management structure is not already in place to support existing grant projects and programs.

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from including roles and responsibilities related to the hiring of the new Coordinator position, as well as grant reporting and administration and quality control and assurance
    - Kelsey will act as direct supervisor until the new Coordinator is ready to operate in a more collaborative system
  - The new Coordinator will be mentored through regular check ins with Michael Burgess (Penobscot Nation Economic Development Director), Sharon Klein, Jasmine Lamb (UMaine PhD student and Sipayik Resilience Committee Chair)
  - Sharri Venno, Environmental Planner for HBMI, will play active role in mentorship

### 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 concrete deliverables related to community engagement, such as a goal number of events, public meetings, workshops, people engaged, etc, or a commitment to specific engagement activities

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Penobscot Nation – Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Engagement may include community workshops, phone calls, door-to-door canvassing, interaction at elder centers, housing offices, and food banks, and tabling or other interaction at existing cultural events
  - Will collaborate with tribal governments, citizen committees, and more through activities laid out 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*)
  - Yes
  - Identify vulnerable groups, such as elders and people with lowest income, and a desire to ensure these groups realize the benefits of these activities first
  - Will work with citizen committees and tribal government staff to identify and actively engage vulnerable members of the population in the projects and programs tribes are implementing
  - Will work with researchers at UMaine studying renewable energy and energy efficiency in underserved communities and the Wabanaki Sustainable Energy Team, whose work includes survey and interviews of tribal citizens, which can help identify and reach vulnerable community members

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: 17**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$155,144
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - No
  - 19.43% of direct costs = \$23,970.01 indirect costs
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Would benefit from further detail around how Coordinator salary was estimated
  - Would benefit from aligning budget tasks with the budget narrative
- 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

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Penobscot Nation – Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians

**DATE:** 2/11/25

- Other notes
  - To receive funding, proposal will need to be revised to include concrete and actionable tasks and subtasks to support the hiring and management of the WSEC position, including a workplan with deliverables.
  - Would benefit from a more concrete funding plan for how this position will be continued



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Phippsburg

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>54</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>18</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:** Phippsburg

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Phippsburg Select Board
  - Phippsburg Committee Chairs
  - Rep. Allison Hepler
  - Phippsburg Fire Chief
  - Sagadahoc County EMA
  - Gayle Bowness, GMRI
  - Peyton Siler Jones, Siler Climate Consulting
  - Director, Bates-Morse Mountain Conservation Area & Shortridge Coastal Center
  - The Nature Conservancy
  - Phippsburg Land Trust

\*\*\*\*\*

**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**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Phippsburg

**DATE:** 2/12/25

**Total Points Available: 5**

**Score:   5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Sagadahoc
- 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: Town of Phippsburg Climate Vulnerability Assessment
- 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 F1 and G1
  - Somewhat aligned with H2, H4, F2, F3, F10, F13, F14, F15, H3

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60**

**Score:  54**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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*].

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Phippsburg

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Detailed and reasonable
- Would benefit from describing a more robust process for selecting a diverse set of volunteers for the Community Advisory Committee.
- Would benefit from a stronger summary of the information to be included in the final vulnerability assessment
- Appreciate the amount of planning and community engagement involved in this project; appreciate the robust community visioning process
  
- TASK 1 – PREPARATION
  - Task 1.1 – Form Community Advisory Committee
  - Task 1.2 – Identification of Additional Community Contributors
  - Task 1.3 – Develop Communications Strategy
  - Task 1.4 – Develop Community Engagement Strategy
- TASK 2 – Conduct Assessment of Climate Vulnerability on Community Infrastructure
  - Task 2.1 – Identification of Climate Concerns and Community Priorities
  - Task 2.2 – New Data Creation
  - Task 2.3 – Review of Climate Hazards
  - Task 2.4 – Impact Assessment of Climate Hazards
- TASK 3 – Community Science
  - The Town of Phippsburg will be enrolled in GMRI's Coastal Flooding Community Science project, to identify coastal flood monitoring sites and engage residents in documenting observed flood events or evidence of flooding.
- TASK 4 - PREPARE AND PRESENT FINALIZED CLIMATE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT
  - Task 4.1 – Present Project Findings
  - Task 4.2 – Final Assessment Compilation and Peer Review
  - Task 4.3 – Create Public Facing StoryMap
- TASK 5 – DEVELOP INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON PROJECT FINDINGS
  - Task 5.1 – Community Visioning Process
  - Task 5.2 – Identify Actions
  - Task 5.3 – Present Recommendations
  
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate the inclusion of the 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
  - Phippsburg is experiencing significant climate-related impacts, including sea-level rise, storm surge, coastal flooding, high winds, damage to the working waterfronts, and extended power outages
    - 2024 storms: "Several of the community's small villages were isolated by flood waters without an evacuation plan. Popham Beach State Park, Seawall Beach, Hermit Island Campground and Sebasco Resort were transformed, with centuries-old protective dunes swept away, tidal rivers altered, and waterfronts demolished"
    - Phippsburg has completed no comprehensive resilience planning, due to limited municipal capacity, low public awareness, and lack of funding

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Phippsburg

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- FB Environmental created a gap analysis prior to 2024 storms and so it is largely out of date
- Would benefit from describing how the lessons learned, data, and outcomes from this recent planning process will be included in this project

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Identify short and long-term outcomes from completion of vulnerability assessment, including:
    - A framework for transparent communication and equitable community-engaged processes for the Town of Phippsburg.
    - Climate impact analysis to inform residents about disruption in access to community services, emergency services, and major employers.
    - Long-term engagement in community science to capture local observations and impacts of coastal flooding and sea level rise to inform municipal decision-making.
    - Informed community members and leaders ready to apply the climate vulnerability assessment to future climate planning.
    - Community-informed implementation roadmaps for priority actions.
- 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 describing the breakdown of roles within teams/organizations
  - Would benefit from identifying one municipal project lead to coordinate grant management and reporting
  - Would benefit from stating who will take over the Resilience Coordinator's role once the position ends.
  - CRC and CAC will lead the project management and project reporting.
  - Phippsburg Resilience Coordinator will lead in-community engagement, surveys, community science and provide logistical support.
  - GMRI will lead the community-informed climate vulnerability assessment, providing scientific and technical expertise while supporting equitable community engagement throughout the project in partnership with SCC and the Resilience Coordinator.
  - SCC will lead the development of the near- and long-term climate resilience recommendations and support community engagement alongside GMRI and the Resilience Coordinator.

### 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
  - Community engagement is woven throughout each project task.
  - Scope of work includes the:
    - Development of a community engagement strategy
    - Formation of a community advisory committee
    - Identification of additional community contributors
    - Pathways for public feedback on draft deliverables

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Phippsburg

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- 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
  - Vulnerable or disadvantaged groups are acknowledged, partially identified, and the need to engage them is recognized; however, could benefit from more specific mechanisms to incorporate their feedback

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25                      Score: \_\_18\_\_**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 would benefit from inclusion of hours/hourly rate
  - Proposal would benefit from estimates/scopes of work from GMRI and SCC
  - Budget allocates \$20,000 to Resilience Coordinator, but the scope of work states that this position is funded by a different grant.
- 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
  - Would benefit from more detail on why funding is included for the Resilience Coordinator position that is already funded through another grant. Will this project expand their contract to include more hours?

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Portland-South Portland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>10</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:** Portland-South Portland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - City of South Portland
  - GMRI

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?
    - Applicant will outline specific project time frames and deadlines to ensure project is completed on time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Portland-South Portland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - Multi-community
- County:
  - Cumberland
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Large, large
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - 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: One Climate Future Risk Based Asset Management Tool Project (RBAMT)
- 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 and G2

\*\*\*\*\*

**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*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate considerations to make a scalable and replicable tool, within context of Maine DOT's hydrodynamic model and replicability for island communities
  - Would benefit from a more organized scope of work with subtasks and narrative included within each task.
    - Task 1: Issue an RFP for a consultant to assist with the project.

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Portland-South Portland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Deliverable: Executed contract with a qualified consultant.
- Task 2: Integrate Vulnerability Assessments into a manageable GIS Database
  - Deliverable: A comprehensive assessment of data used in the OCF Climate Vulnerability Assessment with updated data.
- Task 3: Develop Coastal Typography Assessment Inventory
  - Deliverable: Add GIS dataset and assessment inventory of coastal infrastructure.
- Task 4: Conduct the Data Gap Analysis
  - Deliverable: An updated and complete inventory of base dataset.
- Task 5: Complete the Geodatabase - Foundation for the risk-based asset management tool
  - Deliverable: Complete geospatial dataset.
- Task 6: Update the climate vulnerability assessment
  - Deliverable: Updated climate vulnerability assessment for public infrastructure.
- Task 7: Establish risk-rating criteria for critical infrastructure
  - Deliverable: Completed rating criteria for the RBAMT.
- Task 8: Complete development of the RBAMT
  - Deliverable: Functional Risk Based Asset Management Tool
- Task 9: Community education about community resilience
  - Deliverable: Waterfront summit and other public engagement and education activities.
- Task 10: Evaluate the applicability of the tool for use in other cities and towns
  - Deliverable: Recommendations for how other communities or regions might adapt the tool for their use.
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Would benefit from start and end dates for all steps to provide a more detailed timeline
  - Provides good buffer at the end of the project
- 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
  - Latest sea level rise forecast indicates dramatic rise in number of days when severe flooding will occur in Portland and South Portland, with flooding events on the scale of the January 2024 storms occurring at least monthly by 2100
    - Have experienced damaged infrastructure and property on both waterfronts, including loss of the Willard Beach fishing shacks
  - Preparing to manage 3.9 feet SLR
  - Have strong resilience goals and focus within both the Portland Comp Plan and current update of South Portland's Comp Plan (in progress), with growing recognition of a need for citywide planning for compounding climate risks
  - Portland and South Portland City Councils have identified need to develop strategies to address SLR and storm surge as top priority
  - Need to update 2019 Vulnerability Assessment with new hydrodynamic model and other data sets to prioritize critical assets based on level of risk and cost

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

### PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5

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

**APPLICANT:** Portland-South Portland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

#### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Reasonable
  - Might benefit from outcomes rooted in the joint benefits of this project
  - Outcomes include:
    - Ensure investments in infrastructure prioritize climate resilience and social equity
    - Facilitate decision making by making a wide range of complex data visible in one place
    - A complete map of critical City-owned infrastructure
    - Public understanding of risk to critical infrastructure
    - Creation of comprehensive database about climate risk and social vulnerabilities that can support grant requests for resilience 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 inclusion of next steps after model is completed and how it will be used to prioritize project within the capital improvement plan.

#### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from inclusion of GMRI staff who will assist with engagement.
  - Would benefit from a clearer chain of command among staff, as well as a clearer composition of the steering committee or a plan for how it will be formed
  - Troy Moon and Julie Rosenbach to provide overall project coordination
  - Kevin Deneault, City of Portland GIS Specialist, will coordinate the technical work performed by the hired consultant.
  - Steering Committee made up of staff members from each city

#### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Engagement includes two consultant-led meetings in each city, as well as additional staff-led public meetings, as opportunities for public input which will influence the final design of the tool, as well as a workshop hosted with GMRI
  - Would benefit from a more clear engagement plan, with concrete roles and responsibilities, tasks, and deliverables
  - Would benefit from an outreach strategy that will be used to advertise the public events
- 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
    - Includes incorporating equity considerations, such as whether an asset is within a neighborhood with a large number of socially vulnerable individuals, and developing additional equity considerations within the tool
    - In Portland, will coordinate with the Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for guidance on the engagement process

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Portland-South Portland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Would benefit from a plan for how to advertise to and specifically engage vulnerable or disadvantaged groups in the development of the tool, such as by partnering with community based organizations

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$175,000
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Unable to determine without more detailed cost estimates
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Unable to determine – budget worksheet not included
  - Costs based on similar projects, anticipate that costs will exceed \$175,000
  - Would benefit from providing a vendor estimate, anticipated cost share, and plan for how this cost share will be covered
  - Would benefit from aligning the budget with specific tasks/steps mentioned in 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)
  - Intend to include in-kind staff time
  - GMRI to provide \$28,000 to support community engagement – proposal would benefit from further information around what these funds will support.
- Other notes
  - Will require a vendor estimate to support costs and a detailed strategy to fill any funding gap before contract can be issued.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>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:** Rockland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Rockland Energy and Sustainability Committee Letter of Support
  - Rockland Rolls Letter of Support
  - Midcoast Council of Governments Letter of Support
  - Maine Department of Transportation Letter of Support
  - Regional School Unit 13 Letter of Support
  - South School Letter of Support
  - AIO Food and Energy Assistance Letter of Support
  - Waldo Community Action Partners Letter of Support

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?
      - Current grant project will be completed in Summer 2025.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:** Rockland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

**Total Points Available: 5**

**Score: 5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Knox
- 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: Safe Routes to South School: Advancing Active and Public Transportation Access
- 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 A5, H4, H5

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60**

**Score: 58**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Planning study and conceptual design
  - Would benefit from the inclusion of the contracting process within the scope of work
  - Could benefit from expanded details around how the recommendations will be developed, potential data sources to be used, how to effectively weigh or prioritize the developed recommendations, and discussion about what bike/ped/transit infrastructure will be considered
- Associated community engagement
  - Appreciate the variety of community organizations engaged during this project and the clear emphasis on robust public engagement
- Improve bike, pedestrian, and transit accessibility on three streets surrounding Rockland's South Elementary School (Pleasant, Broadway, and Thomaston)
  - Streets were identified through multiple community processes as priority areas for public and transit accessibility improvements
- Task 1: Planning Study and Conceptual Design
  - Task 1a: Project coordination
  - Task 1b: Public participation
  - Task 1c: Data review and analysis
  - Task 1d: Preparation of recommendations
- Task 1 will deliver a final report that recommends improvements to the project area's bike, pedestrian, and transit accessibility. The report will include cost estimates that will enable the City to pursue engineering and construction, as well as a study narrative, landscape architect renderings, and traffic analysis results.
- Task 2: Associated Community Engagement
  - Task 2a: Project Outreach
  - Task 2b: Qualitative Interviews
  - Task 2c: Youth participation
  - Task 2d: Bike to Work (+ School!) Day
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Includes timelines 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
  - These three streets provide connectivity throughout Rockland's disadvantaged— and Knox County's densest— census tract and access to Rockland's downtown and Harbor Park.
    - Their redesign will also support a strategy identified by the City's public transportation service provider, Waldo Community Action Partners, to support and increase ridership through the development of improved bus stop facilities
    - Demonstrated community priority
      - 2024 Bike Route Network Development Plan
      - 2024 Complete Streets Ordinance
      - 2022 Comp Plan
      - 2019 Climate Action Resolve
  - Rockland's socioeconomic profile and existing car dependency indicate a substantial need for better bike, pedestrian, and transit accessibility that distributes benefits equitably to those most



## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

impacted by the effects of climate change, particularly disadvantaged community members, youth, and seniors

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate the inclusion of baselines upon which to quantify the outcomes
  - VMT Reduction
    - The interventions that will be considered in the planning study and conceptual design enable the adoption of affordable, accessible, and low-emission transportation modes
    - Increased mobility and connectivity for residents of Rockland's disadvantaged census tract
    - Contribute progress to MWW strategy to "reduce light-duty VMT over time, achieving 10% reductions by 2025 and 20% by 2030."
  - Expanded community engagement
- Is the scope of work likely to achieve the applicant's desired outcomes? [*likely, somewhat, not likely/unable to determine*]
  - Likely
  - Would benefit from inclusion of proposed funding strategy to implement plan

### Project Management

- Are roles and responsibilities clearly described and assigned? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Appreciate inclusion of community-based organizations and schools in the project management plan.
  - Sustainability and Community Development Coordinator, Jenny Carter, will manage this project and coordinate with Director of Public Services and City Manager
  - Engineering consultant, Gorrill Palmer, to complete planning study and conceptual design
  - MaineDOT will be involved in the planning and community engagement processes
  - MCOG will collaborate with Rockland to align with regional efforts
  - RSU 13 and South Elementary School to be engaged to share information and receive student and staff input in active transportation priorities
  - AIO Food and Energy Assistance will serve as a community-based partner that represents priority populations
  - City to collaborate with Midcoast Public Transportation to ensure the proposed street redesigns integrate with and enhance Downtown Area Shuttle (DASH's) existing bus stop in the project area, and consider opportunities for further integration as DASH expands, and assist with community engagement by posting materials on bus.

### 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
  - Clearly a focus on this project; demonstrated through robust involvement with community organizations: RSU13, AIO Food and Energy Assistance, Midcoast Public Transit, Rockland Rolls, Energy and Sustainability Advisory Committee

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockland

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Scope of work includes multiple pathways for community engagement and determination, including qualitative interviews, general outreach, a bike to work (school) day, and youth participation
- 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 and well-designed
  - Vulnerable groups are well identified and the proper community organizations and pathways to reach and include these groups have been considered
    - A visioning activity to engage and receive input from South School students • A dot-voting visioning activity at Bike to Work (+ School!) Day, which in 2024 engaged over 40 South School students and their families • Notifications of public meetings and public comment opportunities directed at South School families and faculty • Tabling to share project information and conduct qualitative interviews with DASH users and AIO clients • Up to three meetings with project partner representatives
    - 100% of project benefits are in a disadvantaged census tract

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Estimated hours and vendor estimate includes
- 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, City 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:** Rockport-Camden

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>52</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>24</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	(Max: 105 Points)	<b>96</b>

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockport-Camden

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - York Ready for Climate Action
  - Rockport Planning and Development Director
  - Camden Planning and Development Director
  - CamdenCAN
  - All-Around Home Performance, Colin McCullough, Energy Auditor
  - MCOG
  - Beech Hill Research LLC
  - Sen. Pinny Beebe-Center
  - Rep. Vicki Doudera

\*\*\*\*\*

**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?
      - Camden will complete current grant project before the award of this grant. Rockport has completed prior grant project.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockport-Camden

**DATE:** 2/12/25

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

**Total Points Available: 5**

**Score:   5**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 3 – Community Characteristics**

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - Multi-community
- County:
  - Knox
- Population size (small <4,000; medium 4,000-10,000; large 10,000+):
  - Small, Medium
- SVI (low, med, high):
  - Medium; 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: Climate Action Through Collaboration: Building Resilience in Camden and Rockport
- 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 H2, H3, F3, F14, F15

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Total Points Available: 60**

**Score:   52**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 5 – Scope of Work**  
Project Description and Timeline

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockport-Camden

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- 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 of program development and management, as well as outreach and engagement, for both projects
  - Demonstrates clear understanding of the objectives of each program and the steps needed to achieve those objectives
  - Objective 1: Energy Coach Program for Camden and Rockport
    - Program Development and Management Tasks
      - Establish Management Team
      - Recruit Program Manager
      - Collaborate with community service organizations
      - Explore partnerships with other municipalities and or the state
      - Evaluate program effectiveness and identify challenges
      - Explore funding models for continued program sustainability
    - Energy Coach Training and Support Tasks
    - Public Engagement Tasks
      - Marketing materials, public events, website, social media, home energy tour, news articles, surveys
    - Coaches Assist Residents Tasks
  - Objective 2: Needs Assessment and Public Outreach for Emergency Preparedness for Climate Events in Camden and Rockport
    - Program Development
      - Assess Local Resources, Initiatives, and Needs
      - Update Emergency Risk Assessment
      - Develop Action Steps and Policies
    - Public Engagement and Outreach Campaign
      - Multi-Channel Outreach Campaign
      - Information Sessions and Public Engagement
      - Explore Emergency Notification Systems
      - Peer-to-Peer and Neighbor-to-Neighbor Systems
  - Objectives 1 and 2: Program Management and Reporting
    - Grant Reporting and Oversight
    - Integration with Energy Coaching Program
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Partially described
  - Would benefit from a more detailed timeline that provides more clarity on when specific subtasks and deliverables will occur
- 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
  - Vulnerable housing and rising energy burden

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockport-Camden

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Rockport's 2024 vulnerability and GHG emissions assessment revealed high energy costs disproportionately affecting low income residents, seniors, and health vulnerable populations
- Older homes lack efficient heating or cooling
- Camden and Rockport share significant energy burden, similar to those seen across Maine
- Social vulnerability and housing affordability
  - Camden's social vulnerability assessment highlighted key barriers for essential workers, families, and young adults
- Greenhouse gas emissions from residential buildings
  - 64% of Rockport's discrete fuel emissions
- Emergency preparedness for climate resilience
  - Heightened risk for elders and low income residents
  - Aging infrastructure susceptible to damage
  - Limited public transportation creates additional challenges
- Local planning and broader impact
  - Camden's pledge through the Global Covenant of Mayor's and Rockport's draft Comprehensive Plan emphasize these gaps and needs for these communities

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Provide broad long-term outcomes for both projects, as well as discrete short term target goals based on outcomes from York's energy coach program
  - Objective 1: Some keys targets include:
    - 40 attendees at Energy Coaching trainings
    - 300 inquiries
    - 236 coaching consultations, including 30% low income or priority populations
    - 75 weatherization or home energy improvements, with 30% low income or priority populations
  - Objective 2:
    - Increased public awareness of potential emergencies and protocols
- 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 inclusion of the consultants supporting Objective 2
  - Would benefit from a more concise and simplified project management structure that clearly demonstrates the chain of command between partners
  - Town of Rockport will be fiscal agent
  - CamdenCAN will work with hired Program Manager to complete tasks
  - Rockport Conservation Commission will provide backup support
  - Energy Coach Training Consultant
  - Energy Coaches – unpaid volunteers
  - Student Participants and Interns
    - UMaine MCSIE interns

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockport-Camden

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Island Institute Fellows
- USM Data Innovation Project Interns
- Maine Climate Corps
- Camden Hills Regional High School Biology Program/Wind-planners Group

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Project 1
    - Robust and well-designed
    - Public engagement will include a website, public presentations at the Camden and Rockport Public libraries and local community organizations such as the Rotary Club
    - Create an annual home energy tour
    - Collect client surveys to document experience with coaches, and surveys at events to measure awareness of the program over time, to improve the program and identify homeowner challenges
  - Project 2
    - Moderately expected
    - Would benefit from providing similar care to the engagement and outreach for this Project as is given to the Energy Coach component.
    - Would benefit from a more detailed, concrete, and actionable engagement and outreach plan for how to encourage public participation in the development of these plans and programs
- 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*)
  - Both projects focus on an equitable distribution of project benefits, helping lower energy burden and enhance emergency preparedness for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups
  - Project 1
    - Yes and well-designed
    - Develop collaborations with local social service agencies, churches, and local food pantries to deliver services to their client bases and identify unique challenges faced by these clients
    - Rockport's Social Vulnerability Assessment has identified many potential organizations to partner with, which are listed within the application
    - Will provide assistance where needed by accessing Maine Housing and Midcoast Community Action programs
  - Project 2
    - Yes
    - Would benefit from a specific outreach plan to ensure vulnerable or disadvantaged residents are encouraged to provide input on these emergency plans and systems that are meant to serve them
    - Student/Fellow will work with town emergency staff to understand how underserved populations are now being contacted
    - Will leverage existing outreach methods (such as the elderly care network used in the winter in Camden)
    - Identify reaching elderly or others not on cell phones or computer systems will be important



**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rockport-Camden

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

**Total Points Available: 25**

**Score: 24**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$174,099
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - Yes
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Provides detailed budget worksheet in the appendix
  - Would benefit from a more streamlined and organized budget worksheet to support the cost 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)
  - N/A
- Other notes

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rome

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**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>48</b>
Criteria 6: Budget Proposal	(Max: 25 Points)	<b>24</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: Rome**

**DATE: 2/12/25**

\*\*\*\*\*

**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:
  - Rome Select Board
  - Rome Comprehensive Planning Implementation Committee
  - Rome Fire Chief
  - Rome Planning Board

\*\*\*\*\*

**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**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rome

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Multi-community, UT, or tribal application?
  - No
- County:
  - Kennebec
- 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: Fire Fighting - Emergency Water Source 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 with F1, F2, G1 (specific to fire-related infrastructure)

\*\*\*\*\*

**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
  - Conduct a vulnerability analysis of the current state of dry hydrants and develop a mitigation plan for future sources that are residents to extreme weather events brought about by climate change
  - Appreciate the emphasis on long-term resilience and recognition of the need for planning
  - Appreciate that the report is designed to be replicable by other communities with vulnerable dry hydrant infrastructure

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rome

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- Appreciate that the Plan for the Future includes updates to long-term planning including the Emergency Management and Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Installation/repair
  - Would benefit from describing the required contracting/oversight tasks that would be required during this step
- Could benefit from identifying other potential solutions (cistern, fire pond, etc.) to address this problem.
- 1) Vulnerability Assessment
  - Site Survey
  - Analysis
    - Climate impact assessment
    - Design alternatives
    - Location analysis
    - Cross-correlate climate, design and location analyses
  - Report
    - Results of the site survey and analysis will be compiled into a report that can be used by other communities to assess the vulnerabilities of their dry hydrant infrastructure.
- 2) Plan for the Future
  - Design Trades - trade study will use weighted measures to perform design trade-offs that will maximize climate resilience.
  - Location Trades - trade study will use weighted measures to perform location trade-offs that will maximize climate resilience
  - Recommendations – design and location
  - Update Emergency Management and Hazard Mitigation Plan
    - Update plan to include analysis, trade studies, and recommendations
  - Report
    - Results of the trade studies and recommendations
- 3) Installation/Repair
  - Recommendations will be used as the basis for the installation of new dry hydrants or the repair of existing dry hydrants in the town of Rome
- Project Timeline is [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*].
  - Reasonable
  - Timeline would benefit from the inclusion of subtasks with start/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
  - Severe weather events have rendered 50% of the fire hydrants in the town of Rome to be inoperable, putting life safety and property in jeopardy. The town must act to assess the vulnerability of fire department water sources to extreme weather events and respond by establishing new designs and locations that are resilient to the effects of climate change.
    - Two of four dry hydrants are non-functional due to flooding events
    - Dry hydrants are critical pieces of infrastructure for rural firefighting

## STATE OF MAINE TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rome

**DATE:** 2/12/25

- According to NOAA and the National Integrated Drought Information System, Kennebec County has seen increasing periods of abnormally dry and moderate drought conditions over the past ten years
- Rome is rural and heavily forested, making it highly vulnerable to wildfires

### Project Outcomes

- Are the expected outcomes from the completion of this project clearly described? [*detailed and reasonable, partially described, minimally described*]
  - Detailed and reasonable
  - Vulnerability assessment will help to solve local firefighting water supply problems, and will also provide a model that can be used across the State for towns experiencing similar issues to increase their resilience.
    - Appreciate the focus on this project providing a replicable solution for other communities in Maine; could benefit from exploring potential avenues to share these reports
- 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:
    - Identifying a primary point of contact at the Town to lead this project.
    - Identifying what is a contracted role vs. a staff role
    - Clarifying how the Project Lead Team will be selected
    - Noting the difference between the committee and the Project Lead Team
  - State Representative will assist to share the final plans with communities across the State

### Engagement and equity

- Community participation in the project is [*robust and well-designed, moderately expected, minimally considered, not applicable to scope*].
  - Moderately expected
  - Community participation informed and determined this project
    - "Therefore, each stage of the project will include at least one community engagement meeting to outline the approach, review results, and consider feedback from the town's residents"
  - Would benefit from more details around the community engagement meeting: how will it be advertised, how will feedback be incorporated, etc.
- 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 identifying specific vulnerable populations and potential avenues to engage them, including targeted outreach mechanisms or potential relevant community organizations to involve

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**PROGRAM STATEMENT: CAG2024-5**

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

**APPLICANT:** Rome

**DATE:** 2/12/25

\*\*\*\*\*

**EVALUATION OF  
Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

**Criteria 6 – Budget Proposal**

- Total request:
  - \$67,082
- Is the budget math correct? (yes/no)
  - 2.1 and 2.2 costs should be \$2904 based on attached budget spreadsheet
- Does the budget worksheet match the budget narrative? (yes/no)
  - Yes
  - Appreciate detailed budget breakdown; Hours and hourly rate provided
  - No vendor estimate provided for installation/repair, amount was calculated based on 50% increase
- 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
  - Cannot fund Task 3 due to unknown scope of work, scoring removes Task 3 from consideration.