



**March 6, 2026**

**To: Interested Parties**

**From: Andrew Dorr, Town Manager, Town of Damariscotta**

**RE: RFP - Housing Development Consulting Services Questions**

1. Is there a boundary and/or topographic survey that has been performed on the parcel(s)? If not, is the expectation that this will be a component of the Site Suitability Task?
  - a. **Yes, there is a boundary survey, topographical only exists for the previously completed wetland analysis on the adjacent property.**
2. We do not have any architectural staff, so we would need to retain a subconsultant to perform the architectural scope. Is the architectural scope just the concept planning that is outlined in Task 2? Is the Town expecting that we are providing full architectural plans as part of Task 4?
  - a. **Task 4, specifically 4b, would include architectural plans for the benefit of achieving the 90% design.**
3. Who will be responsible for permitting? (subdivision with Town PB, MEDEP, USACE). Should this be included in our scope of work?
  - a. **Task 4b identifies and anticipates permits will be prepared and that responses to permitting agencies' comments (one round) will be provided.**
4. It appears from the RFP that a Geotech desktop evaluation is the only review requested for existing subsurface information. Will additional phases of Geotechnical Investigations (preliminary with recommendations for final investigations and reporting) be contracted separately from this RFP?
  - a. **Working with our chosen partner, based on their recommendations, additional geotechnical investigations will be contracted separately.**

#### **Existing Conditions and Survey Information**

5. To date, has the wetland delineation on the adjoining property been extended and field-verified on the subject parcels? Is the wetland mapping available for review?
  - a. **Unknown, the adjacent property has been surveyed and may include information.**
6. Has either property been surveyed for vernal pools?
  - a. **Unknown, the adjacent property has been surveyed and may include information.**

7. Should the two lots be considered a single combined lot or should they be treated as two separate lots to be developed independently?
  - a. **Either may be possible. This will be determined once there is a better understanding of the benefits and challenges that are presented with either consideration.**

#### Utilities and Infrastructure

8. Are municipal water and sewer services available at the frontage?
  - a. **Yes**
9. Has capacity for additional residential units been confirmed?
  - a. **Yes**
10. Should potential off-site infrastructure upgrades be assumed within the consultant's scope or treated as future construction considerations?
  - a. **Off-site infrastructure upgrades, directly related to the designs, should be identified, but the future upgrades will be managed in future construction considerations.**

#### Development Program

11. Who represents the owner(s) for this project?
  - a. **Steven Hufnagel, Executive Director, CRCT, represents the property owner**
  - b. **Andrew Dorr, Town Manager, will serve as the contract contact/manager**
12. Are the lots being developed by the town (public) or is the town assisting CRC (private) in developing these parcels?
  - a. **The town is partnering with CRCT to envision what the potential for development is and final determinations as to who will be developing the lots will be reserved for future consideration.**
13. In the 'General Conditions' section it states, "*The Towns of Damariscotta and Newcastle reserve the right to pause, modify, or terminate services between phases without penalty.*" What role does the town of Newcastle play in developing these parcels?
  - a. **The Town of Newcastle will not be involved in this project.**
14. Is there a target residential unit count or density goal established for this project?
  - a. **There is no defined target, but working within the allowable density and what is most suitable for the site. This will be clarified by the project stakeholders and the selected consultant.**
15. Is affordable housing funding (e.g., MaineHousing) anticipated?
  - a. **Unknown at this time, but the stakeholders would explore the possibility.**
16. Is mixed-use development a defined objective or only exploratory at this stage?
  - a. **Mixed-use development is a defined objective for this site, at least in/on part of the site area.**

#### Task 4 Scope Clarification

17. The Bid Form references "Task 4: Landscape Plan," while the RFP describes phased engineering and near-permit-ready construction documents. Should Task 4 pricing include full civil,

architectural, and permit-ready engineering advancement or should we assume that task 4 *excludes* architectural drawings?

- a. **Task 4b, Final Engineering and 90% Construction Documents should include full civil, architectural, and permit-ready engineering advancement**
18. Should consultants submit separate fee estimates for tasks 4a and 4b, or combine them? If separate, will the fee for 4b be adjustable based on 4a's findings?
- a. **The bid sheet has been updated to allow space to bid on 4a and 4b separately.**
19. Is Task 4a (30%) guaranteed to proceed under current grant funding?
- a. **This is subject to the bid results for tasks 1-3.**
20. Under Task 4b, should consultants assume *preparation* of local, state, or federal permit applications, or only *identification* of required permits?
- a. **Yes, preparation and responses to the permitting agency's comments is expected in Task 4b.**
21. If permitting preparation is expected, how many rounds of agency permitting reviews are anticipated?
- a. **See answer above.**

#### **Public Engagement**

22. Will the Town facilitate public meetings, or is the consultant expected to lead facilitation?
- a. **The consultant is expected to lead facilitation. Staff from both entities will be available to assist.**
23. Should proposers assume a single revision cycle following public input?
- a. **Yes.**
24. Are 3D renderings or visualizations expected? If so, what quantity and level of detail is envisioned?
- a. **3D concepts are expected in alignment with Task 2 to inform Task 3. 3D renderings of the preferred concept would be expected as part of Task 4a. Visualizations should include up to four perspectives.**
25. What is the Town's overall goal for the RFP?
- a. **To envision, design, and draft construction-ready documents that would lead to a successful housing development.**
26. What is the goal for the housing? (affordability? Workforce housing? Apartments? Maximum value/best use?)
- a. **Affordability and mixed-income housing solutions are sought. We seek to maximize the housing potential while being mindful of design standards that are in alignment with sustainability and fitting harmoniously with the abutting properties.**
27. What team is considered the lead for the project?
- a. **The team will consist of staff from the Town and CRCT with CRCT having the final decision in design/property impacts.**
28. What available soil data is there?

- a. **No**
29. Any intent to reuse existing structure?
- a. **There are two options sought.**
    - i. **Scenario 1: With the existing structure staying in place.**
    - ii. **Scenario 2: Without the existing structure**
30. Can referenced available data for the site/lot be shared?
- a. **Yes, this will be available to the successful bidder**
31. When will responses be received by?
- a. **The selected consultant is expected to be notified no later than the first week in April.**
32. Please confirm that the parcels of interest for this RFP are tax map 003, Lots 002 and 008, not tax map 001, Lots 002 and 008 as noted in the RFP.
- a. **The correct map/lots are Map 3, Lots 001-002 and 001-008**
  - b. **Additionally, there is a third lot that we expect this scope of work to include/utilize that is adjacent to these, Map 3 Lot 001-009**

