U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 10
Puget Sound Action Agenda- Implementation Strategies; Science, Monitoring and Adaptive Management Analysis and Activities
2017 Request for Proposals

Federal Agency: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) – Region 10

Funding Opportunity Title: Puget Sound Action Agenda – Implementation Strategies; Science, Monitoring and Adaptive Management Analysis and Activities

Announcement Type: Request for Proposals (RFP)

Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-R10-PS-2017-001, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number: 66.123

Statutory Authority: The statutory authority for the assistance agreement(s) to be funded under this announcement is Section 320(g) of the Clean Water Act (Public Law 33.U.S.C.1251-1387).

Dates: The closing date and time for receipt of proposal submissions is **January 30, 2017, 11:59 P.M., Eastern Time (EST)** in order to be considered for funding. Proposal packages must be submitted electronically to EPA through Grants.gov (http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/home.html) no later than the closing date and time.

Summary: This Request for Proposals (RFP) announces the availability of funds to support the National Estuary Program (NEP) Management Conference to conduct work consistent with the 2016 Puget Sound Action Agenda and subsequent updates for the protection and restoration of Puget Sound. The 2016 Action Agenda can be found at: http://psp.wa.gov/action-agenda-document.php

Funding/Awards: EPA anticipates awarding one cooperative agreement for an organization or a coalition of more than one organization to conduct and direct the scientific research, monitoring and adaptive management analysis and activities for Implementation Strategies to achieve environmental results and progress related to the Puget Sound Action Agenda Vital Signs. Additional information about the Puget Sound Vital Signs can be found at: Puget Sound Action Agenda Vital Signs

The award from this RFP is subject to the availability of funds, the quality of proposals received, and other applicable considerations. Funding for the award is expected to be provided incrementally over a four (4) year period with an initial award range of approximately $1,250,000 the first year, subject to FY2017 appropriations. Future incremental funding could be up to $2,000,000 per year. Incremental funding after the initial period of the award is subject to future appropriations, satisfactory performance of work, and other applicable considerations. The total estimated funding for this competitive opportunity is approximately $7,250,000 for the four (4) year project period.

Funding will be awarded under Fiscal Year 2017 appropriations and, if applicable, subsequent appropriations, and the Clean Water Act, Title III, Section 320(g), (as amended). Successful

applicants will be required to provide a nonfederal match equal to the amount of federal financial assistance that would be provided in the assistance award, as described in Section III of this RFP.

Important Dates:

December 15, 2016: RFP expected to be released and posted at: Grants.gov and at: EPA Puget Sound NEP-Grants and Funding

December 30, 2016: Applicants should have a current registration or have applied for registration in the System for Award Management (SAM) as well as having or applied for a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) registration. The process for obtaining both could take a month or more and both are required for applying to this funding opportunity. Applicants must also be registered in Grants.gov.

January 30, 2017: Proposals must be submitted through Grants.gov by January 30, 2017 by 11:59 PM Eastern time. See section IV of this RFP for more details.

Please note that Grants.gov is strongly encouraging users to sign up for and use their "Workspace" feature when applying for opportunities. Grants.gov will be phasing out the "legacy" application process, so EPA recommends that all applicants begin using Workspace as soon as possible so they are prepared when the "legacy" application process is no longer available

February 15, 2017: Selected successful applicants are notified and requested to develop and submit a complete application for assistance and negotiate a final work plan and budget for the proposal.

March 30, 2017: Grant application and final work plan completed and submitted to EPA.

April 30, 2017: Award(s) made, subject to review by EPA Region 10 Grants Specialist, approval by EPA Region 10 Award Official and other applicable considerations

The above dates are subject to change. EPA reserves the right to amend this solicitation. Amendments could be administrative (change of dates or location), technical (change in requirements), or affected by the anticipated funding. EPA will post amendments on the web page for this solicitation which may be found at: Grants.gov and EPA Puget Sound NEP-Grants and Funding. Please check the web site periodically for changes.

Table of Contents

I.   Funding Opportunity Description

A. Background Information and Program Summary

EPA is soliciting proposals from eligible applicants under the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance – CFDA number 66.123 (Puget Sound Action Agenda: Technical Investigations and Implementation Assistance Program) to initiate and guide, use, review and update the scientific activities needed for ongoing development and use of Implementation Strategies to achieve progress towards the 2020 Vital Signs recovery targets in the Puget Sound Action Agenda. Implementation Strategies provide the detailed and science-based plans for achieving the 2020 Puget Sound Vital Signs recovery targets. The Puget Sound National Estuary Program (NEP) Leadership Council adopted 21 Vital Sign indicators to more precisely track the goals and set 18 recovery targets that articulate desired conditions for 2020.

For a description of the Vital Signs 2020 targets see: [Puget Sound Action Agenda Vital Signs](#).

The Puget Sound Action Agenda is the region's shared vision and roadmap for Puget Sound recovery and protection. It identifies key ongoing programs and the specific actions that must be taken to achieve recovery of the ecosystem, including both regional and local priority actions for the various areas of the Sound. The Action Agenda serves as the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, (CCMP) required by EPA for the NEP program for estuaries of national significance.

The Puget Sound Action Agenda can be found at: http://psp.wa.gov/action-agenda-document.php

Throughout this RFP, where the term Action Agenda is used, it refers to 2016 Action Agenda as approved by EPA[1] and subsequent updates as approved by EPA for the duration of the assistance agreement expected to be awarded under this RFP.

Vital Sign Implementation Strategies:

The Puget Sound Management Conference adopted the approach of using Implementation Strategies for achieving environmental outcomes and measurable progress for selected Puget Sound Vital Sign recovery targets. Implementation Strategies are also plans for accelerating progress to meet the 2020 Vital Sign ecosystem recovery targets. They provide the direction needed by local and regional stakeholders for identifying the priority actions, including scientific and monitoring priority actions, for inclusion in updates to the workplans of the Action Agenda. Implementation Strategies have eight essential components: 1) current conditions, 2) logic models, 3) ongoing programs, 4) policy changes or social approaches and related actions, 5) research needs, 6) monitoring, 7) adaptive management, and 8) costs. This RFP focuses primarily on components 5, 6,

---

[1] At the time of this RFP being released, the 2016 Action Agenda has been conditionally approved by EPA pending final edits and response to EPA review comments. Edits and response to EPA comments are not expected to result in any changes that would impact the intent of this RFP. Final approval is expected in 2017.

and 7. However, the applicant selected under this RFP will be expected to work collaboratively with the Puget Sound Management Conference to integrate all of the essential components to advance the success of Implementation Strategies. The applicant selected under this RFP will necessarily work closely and collaboratively with the Puget Sound Action Agenda Strategic Initiative Leads,[2] the Washington State agencies who manage Implementation Strategies under funding from EPA's Puget Sound program. The selected applicant will also work closely and collaboratively with the Puget Sound Partnership in their role as the lead Washington State agency for managing the Action Agenda and the Puget Sound NEP, and also with the Puget Sound Tribes primarily through the NEP Tribal Management Conference. The applicant selected under this RFP will be responsible for ensuring that the teams assembled to develop and refine Implementation Strategies are sufficiently represented by experienced social scientists.   By using social science tools, Implementation Strategies can better consider the values and expectations of the many diverse Puget Sound communities while developing pragmatic and robust policy recommendations.   A plan will be needed to establish a strategic and sustained communications program to ensure that local and regional policy and decision makers have "buy-in", building understanding and support for the use of Implementation Strategies.

Additionally, the applicant selected under this RFP will need to advance the refinement of Implementation Strategies through adaptive management analysis, identifying obstacles that may impede the success of Implementation Strategies and crafting viable solutions. Through the use of appropriate modeling, sequencing and grouping of Implementation Strategies, the selected applicant will guide the evolution of Implementation Strategies to better achieve Puget Sound ecosystem recovery and protection goals. Groups of two or more eligible applicants may form a coalition and submit a single application under this RFP. EPA Region 10 encourages eligible applicants to consider coalitions where the combined expertise and capacity of eligible applicants could result in a stronger application and more successful project outcomes.   However, only one entity can be responsible for the ensuing EPA Cooperative Agreement. Coalitions must identify which eligible organization will be the recipient of the Cooperative Agreement, and which eligible organization(s) will be subawardees of the recipient.

B. Objective

This RFP is soliciting proposals from eligible entities to initiate, guide, review, use, and update the science activities, research, monitoring and adaptive management components of Puget Sound Action Agenda Vital Sign Implementation Strategies. Implementation Strategies have eight essential components: 1) current conditions, 2) logic models, 3) ongoing programs, 4) policy changes or social

---

[2] The *Puget Sound Action Agenda Strategic Initiative Leads* refer to the three entities selected to have responsibility for developing Implementation Strategies and managing related subaward programs to address the Vital Sign objectives associated with Stormwater pollution, Shellfish growing areas, and Marine and Estuarine Habitat in the Puget Sound. The three entities selected by EPA in 2016 are: Washington Department of Ecology for the Stormwater Strategic Initiative, Washington Department of Health for the Shellfish Strategic initiative, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for the Habitat Strategic Initiative.

approaches and related actions, 5) research needs, 6) monitoring, 7) adaptive management, and 8) costs. Proposals should pick up from the current state of affairs with existing Implementation Strategies and address the processes to further develop existing Implementation Strategies to address components 5, 6 and 7 of the eight essential components. Proposals should also demonstrate the capacity to provide "starter packages" that inform components 1 and 3 for new Implementation Strategies not yet developed. To meet the objective of this this RFP, proposals should include how the science research and monitoring requirements of Implementation Strategies will be identified and communicated. Proposals should describe in some detail, the specific types and extent of activities that will be conducted to facilitate cross-jurisdictional, multi-agency (local, state, tribal and federal) coordination to accomplish the necessary science, research, monitoring and adaptive management needs for current and future Implementation Strategies.

A key objective of this RFP is to support synergistic and complimentary work that effectively engages with the Puget Sound NEP Management Conference. Proposals should discuss any experience the applicant has in working with the Puget Sound Partnership and knowledge of the Puget Sound Management Conference processes. Proposals should explain how the applicant's organization will conduct or oversee scientific analyses to inform adaptive management and how the organization will participate with the Puget Sound Partnership's (PSP) established adaptive management framework which utilizes the Open Standards methodology and Miradi software.

This RFP is also calling for proposals that can actively identify, address and build strategies to resolve the roadblocks or obstacles hindering completion of current and yet-to-be-developed Implementation Strategies.

A further objective of this RFP is to continuously conduct strategic communications to inform the Puget Sound Management Conference boards and other Puget Sound stakeholders about the science and technical rationale for implementation strategy research and monitoring, the lessons learned and the justification for adaptive management decision-making. Proposals should describe the approach and activities that will be employed to deliver comprehensible public content to communicate the rationale for using and the effectiveness of Implementation Strategies over the course of this multi-year assistance agreement.

 Background:
The Action Agenda sets targets for recovery (termed Vital Signs in the Action Agenda) that are based on scientific understandings of the ecosystem. These recovery targets are used to focus and guide development of strategies and actions needed to achieve the respective environmental outcomes as well as to inform needed revisions to the Action Agenda through adaptive management. Beginning in 2015, the Puget Sound Management Conference began developing Implementation Strategies as the primary approach for prioritizing and sequencing the activities needed to make progress in achieving positive results against the objectives represented by the Puget Sound Vital Signs. To date, three Implementation Strategies have been developed with components 1 through

4 largely completed. Five additional Implementation Strategies have been identified and are in earlier stages of development. These Implementation Strategies and others yet to be developed will require different skill sets and expertise to continue building on the foundational work of components 1 ~ 4 and conduct the scientific activities for components 5, 6, and 7.   There is recognized gap in the current capacity of Puget Sound implementation strategy practitioners to focus on and deliver the products required to advance Implementation Strategies beyond the early stages of development. This RFP is meant to generate proposals that will bring in the different technical and scientific skill sets, and innovative approaches to address the challenges of moving Implementation Strategies beyond the current level of utility. Examples of the types of science research, monitoring, adaptive management analyses that may be needed are further detailed in the Section I-C, "Eligible Activities".

C. Eligible Activities

Eligible activities encompass the scope of work covered by this RFP. Although grouped in categories related to different components and stages of work in the following descriptions, the activities are not mutually exclusive. All of the described activities relate to the successful development, application and refinement of Implementation Strategies to achieve progress towards Puget Sound Vital Sign targets.   Components of Implementation Strategies frequently overlap, and other organizations will continue to be active participants in using Implementation Strategies for achieving Puget Sound Vital Sign targets.   Applicants should describe how they would communicate and collaborate with other organizations who remain involved in the development and use of Implementation Strategies, especially in overlapping areas.

Described below are the activities that are expected to be performed under the agreement and that applicants should address in their proposals.

I. Implementation Strategy Technical Needs

1.	State of Knowledge (SOK), and Base Programs (BP) reports: Assemble, summarize and synthesize the State of Knowledge (SOK), and Base Programs (BP) relating to each topic selected for Implementation Strategy development. This includes briefing materials intended to inform Implementation Strategy development ('starter packages'), as well as the rationale relating to approaches to recovery identified as priorities in the Implementation Strategy document. State of Knowledge (SOK) and Base Program (BP) reports have been previously developed for existing Implementation Strategies, and for current newly started Implementation Strategies. These reports are being produced by the University of Washington's (UW) Puget Sound Institute (PSI). Applicants should describe how they would collaborate with

the UW PSI and build upon the content and format of these reports and maintain consistency in the efficacy of this work going forward.

2.   Science research and monitoring to inform adaptive management: Proposals should describe how the applicant's organization will design and implement research and monitoring strategies and analysis for adaptive management. The description of a proposal's designs for adaptive management must lay out how the organization will address critical uncertainties in need of research, conduct monitoring of both the effectiveness of actions and the status and trends of indicators, and how the organization will inform or guide the recovery strategy so that it is adapted in the light of research and monitoring results. Successful design of these elements (research, monitoring and adaptive management) require a) familiarity with the strengths and weaknesses of ongoing recovery programs for the focal topic (e.g. Vital Sign indicator), b) experience with the design of experiments and ability to recognize natural experiments, preferably at large scales, c) experience with the design of monitoring programs both for effectiveness, and long-term changes in the status of indicators. Since individual organizations may not be skilled in all three of the elements, applications should describe how the organization will identify and establish working groups of individuals, with complementary skills or otherwise collaborate with qualified partners to design and manage these elements. Proposals should build upon and integrate with the adaptive management structure and processes developed and employed by the Puget Sound Partnership and the Puget Sound National Estuary Program Management Conference. Proposals should demonstrate the understanding that adaptive management is ongoing and that all the components of an adaptive management process are not necessarily fixed before the first actions are taken.

3.   Science Panel engagement and liaison: Proposals should provide a detailed plan to engage the PSP Science Panel to review, or convene panels to review, Implementation Strategies at appropriate stages of development and adaptive management. The proposed plan should identify the logistical and organizational support activities that will be involved to sustain this Science Panel role for all applicable Implementation Strategies throughout the life of the four-year work period called for in this RFP. As applicable, proposals should also describe processes for engaging with other scientific communities to enhance the breadth and depth of science review and input for developing and refining Implementation Strategies.

4.   Application of Social Science: Proposals should describe how the organization will improve and enhance the use of social science tools within each Implementation Strategy. Applicants need to discuss how they will facilitate appropriate consideration of the values and expectations of the many diverse Puget Sound communities so that Implementation Strategies draw upon social science to develop pragmatic and robust policy recommendations.   Proposals should include specific activities that will be managed by the applicant organization or partners to bolster

the representation of experienced social scientists to educate, guide and collaborate with Strategic Initiative teams.

II. Technical Needs Across Implementation Strategies:

5. **Development sequence and grouping of Implementation Strategies**: Proposals should include the timing and scope of analysis that the applicant's organization will conduct, or the analysis that the organization will commission, to inform the development sequence and the grouping of related Implementation Strategies. It is unlikely that an Implementation Strategy will be developed for each Vital Sign (or VS indicator). Instead, ISs will serve groups of related Vital Signs (or indicators), including those that have been developed. Applicants should offer specific recommendations that answer questions about sequencing and grouping related Implementation Strategies. On what basis should those groups be defined? In what sequence should ISs for those groups be developed? What objective criteria will the applicant's organization apply or develop to address these questions. What processes is the application proposing to validate the criteria and basis for grouping and sequencing? How will the proposed approach yield a manageable number of Implementation Strategies that nonetheless span the required scope of recovery?

6. **Modeling:** Proposals should identify the applicant's ability to utilize and assess the utility of modeling. Applicants should offer specific recommendations to answer questions about modeling and how related Implementation Strategies can be enhanced through the use of modeling tools. Modeling is an essential but underdeveloped component of the recovery process. However, the number and scope of models are limited by available resources. What processes should the models address? How should they be prioritized? How might they inform each other? Applicants should answer these questions as a way to demonstrate the organization's ability to apply objective rationale for evaluating the utility of modeling as applicable to Implementation Strategies and ecosystem recovery.

7. **Innovation:** Proposals should discuss how the applicant's organization will foster innovation and creative problem solving over the 4-year work period covered by this RFP. Proposals should express the organization's procedures for applying new approaches, and its ability to respond to emerging issues. The applicant organization should provide examples of how it will engage with other science and policy program leaders of other ecosystem restoration program leaders nationally.   The proposal should list activities that the organization intends to participate in that represent the Puget Sound program at major science and policy conferences, if applicable.

8. **Strategic Communication:** Proposals should outline a sustaining plan to communicate recovery effort progress, successes, challenges and weaknesses to

specific members of the recovery community (Management Conference, Tribal Conference, practitioners, managers, and partners and to the general public). This includes developing compelling stories that highlight the challenges and successes of the recovery program. The recovery effort will be sustained only if there is sufficient awareness about the scientific foundation of Implementation Strategies and the dynamics of adaptive management informed by research and monitoring work.

9. **Ecosystem-Level Synthesis:** Proposals should include the processes by which the applicant's organization will work to synthesize the various data sources and reports that inform the utility of Implementation Strategies and cross-region strategies. Proposals should articulate how the organization will work with Implementation Strategy owners (e.g. Strategic initiative leads or other IS owners), the PSP Management Conference, the Tribal Management Conference, and with other recovery practitioners to synthesize the various data sources and reports that inform the utility of Implementation Strategies. Cross-cutting integration of completed and planned technical investments are required to insure optimal benefits across the ecosystem while avoiding unintended consequences and conflicts. Implementation Strategy-specific Base Program Analyses, LIO 5-Year Plans, the Federal Task Force Work Plan, and State of Knowledge reports, while providing the necessary information for individual strategies, will be underutilized unless their findings are synthesized across Implementation Strategies and across the region.

D. Strategic Plan Linkages, Anticipated Outcomes, Outputs and Performance Measures

Pursuant to paragraph 6.a. of EPA Order 5700.7A1 "Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements," EPA must link proposed assistance agreements to EPA's strategic goals (see EPA Order 5700.7A1). EPA also requires that applicants and recipients adequately describe environmental outputs, environmental outcomes and performance measurements to be achieved under assistance agreements. These linkages, outputs, outcomes and performance measures are described below.

1. Linkages

Linkage to EPA Region 10's Strategic Plan for FY15-FY18: The plan identifies "Engaging with Partners on Puget Sound National Estuary Program Decisions" as Regional Objective (RO) 3.2. Specific commitments under RO 3.2 include:

a) Involve all partners early on in decision-making processes through strategic and priority-driven communication efforts (meetings, discussions, listening sessions, briefings).
b) Accelerate achievement of desired environmental outcomes such as the restoration of marine nearshore habitats, upstream riparian and floodplain habitats, reducing the impact

of stormwater runoff on receiving waters and protecting and improving water quality for more shellfish growing areas.

This RFP for Puget Sound Action Agenda- Implementation Strategies; Science, Monitoring and Adaptive Management Activities is a key component in Region 10's Puget Sound program for achieving these commitments and fulfilling RO 3.2.

Linkage to EPA Strategic Plan: The assistance agreement to be awarded under this RFP will be linked to EPA's Strategic Plan Goal 2: Protecting America's Waters: Objective 2 – 'Protect and Restore Watersheds and Aquatic Ecosystems'; and specifically the sub-objective for Puget Sound, in that the assistance agreement will support work to use Implementation Strategies to: restore and protect aquatic habitat; to improve water quality by implementing solutions to stormwater pollution impacts on rivers, stream, and wetlands in the Puget Sound basin; and help protect and restore Puget Sound resources, specifically shellfish harvest areas. A copy of EPA's 2014- 2018 Strategic Plan can be found at: EPA Strategic Plan

2. Outputs

The term "output" means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work product related to an environmental goal and objective that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period. Examples of expected outputs from the activities and project(s) to be funded under this announcement may include, but are not limited to, the following examples:
*   Research and monitoring projects and reports to inform adaptive management of Implementation Strategies currently in use.
*   Review Panel processes and reports that engage the Puget Sound Science Panel
*   Magazine style articles or other communication products to build public confidence in the science basis for using Implementation Strategies to achieve Puget Sound ecosystem restoration.
*   A methodology and attendant report for synthesizing and integrating completed technical products across Implementation Strategies.

Progress reports and a final report will also be a required output, as specified in Section VI (C) of this announcement, "Reporting Requirements."

3. Outcomes

The term "outcome" means the result, effect or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be qualitative and environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic in nature, but must also be quantitative. They may not necessarily be entirely achievable within an assistance agreement funding period. Activities and projects to be funded under the award(s) to be made under this announcement are expected to produce programmatic and /or environmental outcomes including but not limited to:

- Measurable increases in the amount of estuarine habitat that is preserved, restored and / or protected.
- Quantifiable reductions in toxic contaminant loadings to Puget Sound streams, rivers and watersheds.
- Increases in shellfish growing areas approved for harvest because of improved water quality conditions resulting from pollution identification and correction efforts.

4. Performance Measures

The applicant should also develop performance measures they expect to achieve through the proposed activities and describe them in their proposal. These performance measures will help gather insights and will be the mechanism to track progress concerning successful process and output and outcome strategies and will provide the basis for developing lessons to inform future recipients. It is expected that the description of performance measures will include defined benchmark or change in status, either in programmatic function or environmental condition, and that the performance measures be time constrained and / or quantifiable such as the following:

- Performance Measure Example: Number of Management Conference venues where current or proposed-for-development Implementation Strategies are presented to stakeholders for information and / or input.
- Performance Measure Example: Number of Vital Sign Implementation Strategies that are documented and supported by NTAs in 2016 Action Agenda update and subsequent updates to Action Agenda workplan.

The following are questions to consider when developing output and outcome measures of quantitative and qualitative results:

- What are the measurable short term and longer term results the project will achieve?
- How does the plan measure progress in achieving the expected results (including outputs and outcomes) and how will the approach use resources effectively and efficiently?

E. Logic Models

To ensure your application supports both the Puget Sound Action Agenda and EPA's national strategic plan objectives, we recommend that you include a logic model with your application. A logic model summarizes the major elements of your project, and connects strategic objectives to your proposed resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes.

Logic models and results chains are tools to be used to build better projects and programs. Accordingly, logic models come in many forms and shapes, from simple storylines that link various actions into strategies and work programs to more complex system diagrams. For a straight forward implementation project, the logic model can be as simple as a clearly documented history and basis

for a particular project in a particular place to achieve a particular result. For a project with many tasks, work processes, timelines and partners, a more detailed approach may be more helpful.

With whatever logic model format you choose, please explain how the proposed work addresses the most significant challenges of the area of emphasis. We encourage you to identify ecosystem endpoints or indicators (the outcomes) that would be affected or supported by the products and information (the outputs) from the proposed scope of work. See Appendix A for information on logic models, results chains, and additional information sources.

II. Award Information

A. Number and Amount of Awards

EPA anticipates awarding one cooperative agreement from this RFP, subject to the availability of funds, the quality of proposals received, and other applicable considerations. Funding for the award is expected to be provided incrementally over a four (4) year period with an initial award range of approximately $1,250,000 the first year, subject to FY2017 appropriations. Future incremental funding could be up to $2,000,000 per year. Incremental funding after the initial period of the award is subject to future appropriations, satisfactory performance of work, and other applicable considerations. The total estimated funding for this competitive opportunity is approximately $7,250,000 for the four (4) year project period.

B. Start Date and Length of Project Period

Successful applicants should plan for projects to begin on or after April 30, 2017. EPA will accept proposals for a four -year project period based on initial first year funding and subsequent incremental funding for an additional three (3) years. The proposal must clearly demonstrate how the project will be sustained for the time frame proposed.

C. Funding Type

The successful applicant will be issued a cooperative agreement. A cooperative agreement is an assistance agreement that is used when there is substantial federal involvement with the recipient during the performance of an activity or project. EPA awards cooperative agreements for those it expects to have substantial interaction with the recipient throughout the performance of the project.

EPA will negotiate the precise terms and conditions of substantial involvement as part of the award process. Federal involvement may include close monitoring of the recipient's performance; collaboration during the performance of the scope of work; in accordance with 2 CFR 200.317 and 2 CFR 200.318, as appropriate, review of proposed procurements; reviewing qualifications of key personnel; and/or review and comment on the content of printed or electronic publications prepared.

EPA does not have the authority to select employees or contractors employed by the recipient. The final decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient. In addition, under the award to be made under this RFP, EPA involvement may include: (1) negotiating the initial Scope of Work for the cooperative agreement and also annual amendments when incremental funding is applied for. EPA may re-negotiate annual work plans and budgets so long as it is done consistent with the scope of work of the agreement and the solicitation and EPA's annual federal budget; (2) monitor the project management and execution throughout the assistance agreement's project and budget period; (3) provide technical assistance and coordination as requested or needed by the recipient; and (4) review and approve technical deliverables.

D. Other Award Provisions

EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards under this announcement or to make an award for less than expected.

In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund proposals by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund a proposal, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the proposal was evaluated and selected for award, and therefore maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.

EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement, consistent with Agency policy and guidance, if additional funding becomes available after the original selections are made. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than 6 months after the original selection decisions.

III. Eligibility Information

A. Eligible Entities-See CFDA 66.123

- Federal government and Washington State government agencies.
- Public and private institutions of higher education located in the United States.
- Units of local government organized under Washington State law and located within the Greater Puget Sound basin.
- Special purpose districts, as defined by Washington State law at R.C.W. 36.93.020, including but not limited to, irrigation districts, and water and sewer districts that are located in or govern land and water resources within the greater Puget Sound basin; and conservation districts located in or governing land and water resources within the greater Puget Sound Basin.
- Watershed planning units formed under RCW 90.82.040 and RCW 90.82.060, local management boards organized under RCW 90.88.030, salmon recovery lead entities organized pursuant to RCW 77.85.050, regional fisheries enhancement groups organized pursuant to RCW 77.95.060 and Marine Resource Committees authorized under PL 105-384 if they are located within or their jurisdictions include waters and/or lands within the greater Puget Sound basin.

• Intrastate organizations such as associations of cities, counties or conservation districts in the greater Puget Sound basin.

• Nonprofit non-governmental entities.
Non-profit organization, as defined by 2 CFR Part 200, means any corporation, trust, association, cooperative or other organization that: (1) is operated primarily for scientific, educational, service, charitable or similar purposes in the public interest; (2) is not organized primarily for profit; and (3) uses its net proceeds to maintain, improve and/or expand its operations. Note that 2 CFR Part 200 specifically excludes the following types of organizations from the definition of "non-profit organization" because they are separately defined in the regulation: (i) institutions of higher education; and (ii) state, local and federally-recognized Indian tribal governments. For-profit colleges, universities, trade schools, and hospitals are ineligible.

• Federally recognized Indian Tribes located within the greater Puget Sound basin and any consortium of these eligible Tribes.
An Intertribal consortium must have adequate documentation of the existence of the partnership and the authorization of the member Tribes to apply for and receive assistance. Documentation that demonstrates the existence of the partnership of Indian Tribal governments may consist of Tribal council resolutions, Intertribal consortia resolutions in conjunction with a Tribal council resolution from each member Tribe, or other written certification from a duly authorized representative of each Tribal government that clearly demonstrates that a partnership of Indian Tribal governments exists. An Intertribal consortium resolution is not adequate documentation of the member Tribes authorization of the consortium unless it includes a written certification from a duly authorized representative of each Tribal government.

The greater Puget Sound basin is defined as all watersheds draining to the U.S. waters of Puget Sound, southern Georgia Basin, and the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

Coalitions

Groups of two or more eligible applicants may choose to form a coalition and submit a single application under this RFP. However, one entity must be responsible for the Cooperative Agreement. Coalitions must identify which eligible organization will be the recipient of the Cooperative Agreement, and which eligible organization(s) will be subawardees of the recipient.

Subawards and subgrants must be consistent with the definition of that term in 2 CFR Part 200. The recipient must administer the cooperative agreement, will be accountable to the EPA for proper expenditure of the funds and reporting, and will be the point of contact for the coalition. As provided in 2 CFR Part 200, subrecipients or subgrantees are accountable to the recipient or grantee for proper use of EPA funding.

Coalitions may not include for-profit organizations that will provide services or products to the successful applicant. For-profit organizations are not eligible for subawards. For-profit organizations are eligible to receive contracts. Any contracts for services or products funded with EPA financial assistance must be awarded under the competitive procurement procedures of 2 CFR Part 200. The

regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Please see EPA's definition of consultants in Section 2 CFR Part 200, as applicable. For additional information, please review the EPA Grants Policy document titled: [Consultant Fees Under EPA Assistance Agreements (GPI-04-04)](#).

For-profit business entities, private individuals, and families are not eligible to apply.

B. Non-federal Match Requirement

The Clean Water Act, at §320(g)(3)(A)(ii), provides that the Federal share of a grant under this program for a fiscal year shall not exceed 50% of the annual aggregate costs of implementing the project. For this RFP, this means that applicants must be able to show in their proposals that they and/or other members of the Management Conference will spend an equal amount of nonfederal funds on implementing these projects during the budget period. Applicants should identify the source (s) of the anticipated non-federal match, and describe the nature of the projects funded with the non-federal match. Proposals must show that the projects providing the nonfederal match are "committed" and that they have not been used to provide nonfederal match for any other federal financial assistance. While the match can come from expenditures to implement the Action Agenda/CCMP in the aggregate, this RFP encourages the match to come specifically from allowable costs related to the applicable area of emphasis.

Forms of Match: The match requirement may be met in the form of cash or in-kind contributions. In-kind contributions include volunteer or donated time, equipment, expertise, salaries, other verifiable costs, etc. and are subject to the regulations governing matching fund requirements at 2 CFR Part 200. The match must be for allowable project costs. Matching funds are considered assistance agreement funds and are included in the total award amount and should be used for the reasonable and necessary expenses of carrying out the work plan. All assistance agreement funds are subject to federal audit. Any restrictions on the use of assistance agreement funds (examples of restrictions are outlined in Section III.D of this announcement) also apply to the use of matching funds.

Other Federal assistance agreements may not be used as match without specific statutory authority. If matching requirements for incremental funding awarded under this RFP change as a result of future legislation on restoration of Puget Sound or otherwise, EPA will make appropriate adjustments to match requirements in the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreements. An example of the match requirements for awards made under this RFP would be for a federal assistance agreement that provides a first year funding of $2,000,000, the recipient organization would have to demonstrate that qualified nonfederal match expenditures in an amount equal or greater than $2,000,000 have been obligated to the project for the first year of the assistance agreement. For subsequent years' incremental funding, an equal or greater amount of nonfederal funding for qualified expenditures for that subsequent year must be obligated and documented. At the end of the assistance agreement project period, an aggregate amount equal to or greater than the total aggregate amount of federal funds must have be documented as having been obligated and expended during the project period.

C. Threshold Eligibility Criteria

Proposals must meet the threshold eligibility criteria listed below by the time of a proposal's submission or they will be eliminated from consideration for funding. Only proposals meeting all of the criteria will be evaluated against the ranking factors in Section V.A. Applicants whose proposals are deemed ineligible as a result of the threshold review will be notified within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

I.   Proposals must substantially comply with the proposal submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this announcement or else they will be rejected. However, where a page limit is expressed in Section IV with respect to the narrative proposal, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.

II.   Proposals must be submitted through Grants.gov as stated in Section IV of this announcement (except in the limited circumstances where another mode of submission is specifically allowed for as explained in Section IV) on or before the proposal submission deadline published in Section IV of this announcement. Applicants are responsible for following the submission instructions in Section IV, and as detailed in Appendix B, of this announcement to ensure that their proposal is timely submitted.

III.   Proposals submitted after the submission deadline will be considered late and deemed ineligible without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling or because of technical problems associated with Grants.gov or relevant SAM.gov issues. An applicant's failure to timely submit their proposal through Grants.gov because they did not timely or properly register in SAM.gov or Grants.gov will not be considered an acceptable reason to consider a late submission. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposal with the EPA Puget Sound Program contact, Melissa Whitaker, at Whitaker.Melissa@epa.gov as soon as possible after the submission deadline. Failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.

IV.   Applicants must meet the eligibility requirements as described in Section III. A above.

V.   Applicants must demonstrate how they will meet the match requirements as described in Section III.B above.

VI.   Proposals with international work plan elements must demonstrate that they directly and primarily benefit U.S. waters, resources, or policy interests to restore and protect the greater Puget Sound ecosystem.

D. Funding Restrictions

Award funds may not be used for matching funds for other federal assistance agreements, lobbying or intervention in federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Award funding must be authorized by the statutory authority (e.g. Section 320(g) of the Clean Water Act) and may

not be used to sue the federal government or any other government entity. In accordance with applicable law, regulation, and policy, any recipient of funding must agree to comply with restrictions on using assistance funds for unauthorized lobbying, fund-raising, or political activities (i.e., lobbying members of Congress or lobbying for other federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts). EPA reserves the right to make final decisions regarding actions or costs incurred that are contrary or damaging to the intent and purposes of the Puget Sound National Estuary Program (NEP), the Puget Sound Action Agenda and Management Conference, for which award funds may not be used.

All costs incurred under this program must be allowable under 2 CFR 200, Subpart E.

If an application is submitted that includes any ineligible activities, that portion of the application will be ineligible for funding and may, depending on the extent to which it affects the application, render the entire application ineligible.

IV. Proposal and Submission Information

a. Requirement to Submit Through Grants.gov and Limited Exception Procedures

Applicants, except as noted below, must apply electronically through [Grants.gov](#) under this funding opportunity based on the grants.gov instructions in this announcement. If an applicant does not have the technical capability to apply electronically through grants.gov because of limited or no internet access which prevents them from being able to upload the required application materials to [Grants.gov,](#) the applicant must contact [OGDWaivers@epa.gov](#) or the address listed below in writing (e.g., by hard copy, email) *at least 15 calendar days prior to the submission deadline under this announcement* to request approval to submit their application materials through an alternate method.

Mailing Address:
OGD Waivers
c/o Barbara Perkins
USEPA Headquarters
William Jefferson Clinton Building
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N. W.
Mail Code: 3903R
Washington, DC 20460

Courier Address:
OGD Waivers
c/o Barbara Perkins
Ronald Reagan Building
1300 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Rm # 51267
Washington, DC 20004

In the request, the applicant must include the following information:
Funding Opportunity Number (FON)
Organization Name and DUNS
Organization's Contact Information (email address and phone number)
Explanation of how they lack the technical capability to apply electronically through Grants.gov because of 1) limited internet access or 2) no internet access which prevents them from being able to upload the required application materials through Grants.gov.

EPA will only consider alternate submission exception requests based on the two reasons stated above and will timely respond to the request -- all other requests will be denied. If an alternate submission method is approved, the applicant will receive documentation of this approval and further instructions on how to apply under this announcement. Applicants will be required to submit the documentation of approval with any initial application submitted under the alternative method. In addition, any submittal through an alternative method must comply with all applicable requirements and deadlines in the announcement including the submission deadline and requirements regarding proposal content and page limits (although the documentation of approval of an alternate submission method will not count against any page limits).

If an exception is granted, it is valid for submissions to EPA for the remainder of the entire calendar year in which the exception was approved and can be used to justify alternative submission methods for application submissions made through December 31 of the calendar year in which the exception was approved (e.g., if the exception was approved on March 1, 2016, it is valid for any competitive or non-competitive application submission to EPA through December 31, 2016). Applicants need only request an exception once in a calendar year and all exceptions will expire on December 31 of that calendar year. Applicants must request a new exception from required electronic submission through Grants.gov for submissions for any succeeding calendar year. For example, if there is a competitive opportunity issued on December 1, 2016 with a submission deadline of January 15, 2017, the applicant would need a new exception to submit through alternative methods beginning January 1, 2017. Please note that the process described in this section is only for requesting alternate submission methods. All other inquiries about this announcement must be directed to the Agency Contact listed in Section VII of the announcement. Queries or requests submitted to the email address identified above for any reason other than to request an alternate submission method will not be acknowledged or answered.

b. Submission Instructions (See Appendix B)

The electronic submission of your application must be made by an official representative of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information on the registration requirements that must be completed in order to submit an application through grants.gov, go to Grants.gov and click on "Applicants" on the top of the page and then go to the "Get Registered" link on the page. If your organization is not currently registered with Grants.gov, please encourage your office to designate an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible. Please note that the registration process also requires that your organization have a DUNS number and a current registration with the System for Award Management (SAM) and the process of obtaining both could take a month or more. Applicants must ensure that all registration requirements are met in order to apply for this opportunity through grants.gov and should ensure that all such requirements have been met well in advance of the submission deadline. Registration on grants.gov, SAM.gov, and DUNS number assignment is FREE.

Applicants need to ensure that the AOR who submits the application through Grants.gov and whose DUNS number is listed on the application is an AOR for the applicant listed on the application. Additionally, the DUNS number listed on the application must be registered to the applicant organization's SAM account. If not, the application may be deemed ineligible.

To begin the application process under this grant announcement, go to Grants.gov and click on "Applicants" on the top of the page and then "Apply for Grants" from the dropdown menu and then follow the instructions accordingly. Please note: To apply through grants.gov, you must use Adobe Reader software and download the compatible Adobe Reader version. For more information about Adobe Reader, to verify compatibility, or to download the free software, please visit Adobe Reader Compatibility Information on Grants.gov

You may also be able to access the application package for this announcement by searching for the opportunity on Grants.gov. Go to Grants.gov and then click on "Search Grants" at the top of the

page and enter the Funding Opportunity Number, EPA-R10-PS-2017-001 or the CFDA number that applies to the announcement (CFDA 66.123), in the appropriate field and click the Search button. Alternatively, you may be able to access the application package by clicking on the Package button at the top right of the synopsis page for the announcement on [Grants.gov.](#) To find the synopsis page, go to [Grants.gov](#) and click "Browse Agencies" in the middle of the page and then go to "Environmental Protection Agency" to find the EPA funding opportunities.

Please note that Grants.gov is strongly encouraging users to sign up for and use their "[Workspace](#)" feature when applying for opportunities. Grants.gov will be phasing out the "legacy" application process, so EPA recommends that all applicants begin using Workspace as soon as possible so they are prepared when the "legacy" application process is no longer available.

Application Submission Deadline: Your organization's AOR must submit your complete application package electronically to EPA through [Grants.gov](#) January 30, 2017. Please allow for enough time to successfully submit your application process and allow for unexpected errors that may require you to resubmit.
Please submit all of the application materials described below using the grants.gov application package that you downloaded using the instructions above. For additional instructions on completing and submitting the electronic application package, click on the "Show Instructions" tab that is accessible within the application package itself.

Please note that successful submission through Grants.gov or via email does not necessarily mean your application is eligible for award.

C. Content of Proposal Submission

The proposal package must include all of the following materials:

1. **Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance** - There are no attachments. Please be sure to include organization fax number and email address in Block 5 of the Standard Form SF 424. Please note that the organizational Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number must be included on the SF-424. Organizations may obtain a DUNS number at no cost by calling the toll-free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711.

2. **Standard Form (SF) 424A, Budget Information -** There are no attachments. The total amount of federal funding requested for the project period should be shown on line 5(e) and on line 6(k) of SF-424A, the amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (e.g. a percentage), the base rate (e.g. personnel costs and fringe benefits), and their amounts should also be indicated on line 22.

3. **Narrative Proposal (including the summary information page and workplan as described below)** cannot exceed a maximum of 30 single-spaced, typed pages and should use no less than 12-point font. Excess pages will not be reviewed. Supporting materials such as resumes and letters of support can be submitted as attachments and are not included in the above noted 30-page limit. Ensure that your narrative proposal addresses all of the evaluation criteria in Section V.

Summary Information Page (recommended not to exceed one page)

a. **Application Title:** Relate to and identify the funding opportunity i.e. "Management Conference for Implementation Strategies and Additional Activities"

b. **Applicant Information:** Include applicant (organization) name, address, contact person, phone number, fax and e-mail address.

c. **Project Period:** Provide proposed beginning date and ending date; awards may be for up to a four-year work period.

d. **Funding Requested:** Specify the amount you are requesting from EPA for the proposed work period. See Summary paragraph on Page 1 for information on total estimated funding.

e. **Total Project Cost:** Specify total cost of the project. Identify amount of funding from other sources for required non- federal match

f. **Abstract:** Provide a proposal abstract of no longer than a recommended 150 words. Include a statement of the proposed objective, the proposed approach affirming capacity to work in support of the Puget Sound NEP Management Conference, and the anticipated outputs and outcomes**.**

g. **DUNS number**

Workplan

The workplan should explicitly describe how each of the eligible activities described in Section I.C. will be accomplished, and how through these activities the applicant proposes to meet the objectives and requirements in Section I of this RFP. In the work plan the applicant should address each of the evaluation criteria listed in Section V and demonstrate that the applicant meets all elements of the threshold criteria in Section III.C including the non-federal match.

EPA is soliciting proposals for strategies and work plans to be implemented over a four-year time period. It is important for proposals to describe levels of effort and workplans that are sustainable over the full four-year project period. Because future funding levels are not guaranteed, applicants should present a proposed scope of work with well thought out sequencing and objectives described in the near term as well as objectives over the longer four-year term expected for this assistance agreement.   By noting tasks or components that are severable (fairly independent of other actions) or that could be funded at variable levels, applicants can submit proposals that provide flexibility to incrementally award funds in later years of the project period.

The workplan must include the following:

a. **Project Summary -Narrative: Include the following components, (i – x).**

i) **Supporting Technical needs for Implementation Strategies through science activities research, and monitoring-** Describe your organization's experience and approach to conducting scientific activities directly and / or directing science activities in partnership with other entities to address ecosystem recovery and protection efforts. Explain how you would meet the need for timely delivery of State of Knowledge and

Base Program reports so that new Implementation Strategies can be built upon these reports. Explain how you would identify research and monitoring needs and triage the priority research and monitoring actions to guide and direct Implementation Strategy science efforts for years one, two, three, and four. Describe your organizations approach to enlisting the necessary scientific expertise from qualified entities outside of your immediate organization and how this science capacity will be supported through contracting or partnering and any other funding sources by which science and monitoring efforts can be leveraged.

ii) **Adaptive Management-** Describe how your organization would guide, direct and design research and monitoring so that the outputs of this work can effectively integrate with the adaptive management structure and processes developed and employed by the Puget Sound Partnership and the Puget Sound National Estuary Program Management Conference. Describe the additional areas of scientific contribution related to ecosystem recovery adaptive management that you could make available to the Puget Sound through your organization's collaboration with and outreach to other scientists and scientific institutions. Discuss your organization's experience and approach to partnering with a wide variety of different entities (federal, state and local government agencies, tribes and tribal consortiums, local watershed groups, salmon recovery groups or marine resource committees, scientific organizations or universities, non-governmental organizations, etc.) within the context of large scale ecosystem recovery and protection.

iii) **Science Panel Engagement-** Describe how your organization would plan and schedule the Science Panel to engage in review, or to convene panels to review Implementation Strategies at appropriate development stages. Discuss engagement of other scientific communities as applicable for reviewing Implementation Strategies and the review activities and approach for science review that your organization would plan for across the four year workplan period.

iv) **Applications of Social Science-** Describe how your organization would enhance the use of social science tools, and how you would bolster social science representation to collaborate with the Strategic Initiative Leads as they develop and use Implementation Strategies.

v) **Sequencing / Grouping of Implementation Strategies-** Describe how your organization would provide specific recommendations for sequencing and / or grouping Implementation Strategies. Will your organization conduct the analysis internally or will it commission outside expertise to do this, or both? How would you develop the criteria and validate the criteria used as basis for the recommendations?

vi) **Modeling-** Describe how your organization would evaluate the utility of modeling as applicable to Implementation Strategies. Describe the approach you would take to using modeling as a tool to enhance Implementation Strategies. How would your

organization address the questions about prioritizing modeling, and how different models can inform each other?

vii) <u>Innovation</u>: What experience does your organization have in identifying and overcoming obstacles to sustain progress towards the objectives and desired outcomes of ecosystem restoration and protection programs? What resources and expertise, internal and external, would your organization be able to draw upon to ensure that continued learning and advancement will occur over the four-year work period given the known, and still unknown, obstacles that challenge Implementation Strategy effectiveness?

viii) <u>Strategic Communications-</u> Discuss how your organization would work with the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) and the Puget Sound NEP Management Conference Boards and the Tribal Management Conference to create sufficient awareness about the scientific foundation of Implementation Strategies and effectively build up the public and decision-maker understanding and social support for Implementation Strategies.

ix) <u>Ecosystem-Level Synthesis-</u> Describe how the organization will work with Implementation Strategy owners (e.g. Strategic initiative leads or other IS owners), the PSP Management Conference, the Tribal Management Conference, and with other recovery practitioners to synthesize the various data sources and reports that inform the utility of Implementation Strategies. Discuss your plan to facilitate cross-cutting integration of completed and planned technical investments that are being driven by Implementation Strategies.

x) <u>Experience and administrative systems for managing federal assistance agreements and providing required non- federal match:</u> Describe your organization's experience in managing federal assistance agreements and specific EPA cooperative agreements as applicable. Provide identifying information on any EPA assistance agreements managed by the applicant's organization. Describe the administrative systems, internal controls, policies and procedures that exist to ensure that all federal requirements are met. Describe how progress is monitored and reported on, and how federal assistance agreements are managed to ensure successful project outcomes.

Discuss how the applicant's organization will provide and account for the required match as described in Section III.B. If applicable, describe any additional sources of non-federal funds that the applicant's organization may be able to leverage towards the achievement of Puget Sound Vital Sign Implementation Strategies and Action Agenda objectives.

Timeline: As part of the project summary narrative include a chart of milestones and timelines for accomplishing tasks and deliverables including estimates of timelines for proposed future tasks that may not yet be fully determined.

b. **Environmental Results—Outcomes, Outputs and Performance Measures**

Identify the expected quantitative and qualitative outcomes and outputs of the project (see Section I.D.) including what performance measurements, milestone timelines, or other means will be used to track and measure your progress towards achieving the expected outcomes and outputs including those identified in Section I.D and how the results of the project will be evaluated.

c. **Programmatic Capability and Past Performance**

Submit a list of federally funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include Federal grants and cooperative agreements but not Federal contracts) similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than 5 agreements, and preferably EPA agreements) and describe (i) whether, and how, you were able to successfully complete and manage those agreements and (ii) your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements including whether you adequately and timely reported on your progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes of those agreements (and if not, explain why not) and whether you submitted acceptable final technical reports under the agreements. In evaluating applicants under these factors in Section V, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current/prior grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant).

If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

In addition, provide information on your organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project, and your staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

d. **Detailed Budget Narrative (See Appendix C, Budget Sample)** must include:

    i.   A description of the budget and estimated funding amounts for each work component/task.

    ii.   A description of the applicant's approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner.

iii. Itemized costs related to personnel, fringe benefits, contractual costs, travel, equipment, supplies, other direct costs, indirect costs, and total costs. For those selected for awards, applicants will need to submit a copy of their current indirect cost rate that has been negotiated with a federal cognizant agency prior to award. This is not a necessary document for application but is necessary for the selected applicant to provide prior to award. If the applicant is a non-profit organization and EPA is the applicant's cognizant agency for negotiating indirect cost rate (IDC), EPA can allow the non-profit to charge a flat IDC rate of 10% of salaries and wages (see 2 CFR Part 200). If selected for award a recipient that exercises this option for a flat IDC rate of 10%, is obligated to use the flat rate for the life of the grant award.

Note: All matching funds are subject to the regulations governing matching fund requirements at 2 CFR Part 200.

D. Submission Dates and Times

The closing date and time for submission of proposals is **January 30, 2017, 11:59 PM Eastern Time (EST)**. Proposals submitted after the closing date and time will not be considered for funding.

E. Additional Provisions for Applicants Incorporated into the Solicitation

Additional provisions that apply to this solicitation and/or awards made under this solicitation, including but not limited to those related to confidential business information, contracts and subawards under grants, and proposal assistance and communications, can be found at: https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-solicitation-clauses

These, and the other provisions that can be found at the website link, are important, and applicants must review them when preparing proposals for this solicitation.   If you are unable to access these provisions electronically at the website above, please communicate with the EPA contact listed in this solicitation to obtain the provisions.

V. Proposal Review Information
Only proposals from eligible entities that meet the threshold criteria in Section III of this announcement will be reviewed according to the evaluation criterion below. Applicants should explicitly address these criteria as part of their proposal. Each proposal will be rated under a points system. A total of 100 points is possible. Eligible proposals will be reviewed and ranked based on these criteria and EPA intends to select the highest ranking proposal for award.

A. Evaluation Criteria

1. **(35 points total for this section) Implementation Strategy Starter Packages; Science Research, Monitoring and Adaptive Management.**

    a. **IS Starter Packages, State of Knowledge and Base Program reports – 5 points:** The applicant organization's ability to assemble, summarize and synthesize the State of Knowledge (SOK), and Base Programs (BP) associated Implementation Strategies yet to be developed will be evaluated as will its approach and plan for producing related briefing materials and delivering these on a timely basis.

    b. **Scientific Research Activities-10 points total:** The following items will be evaluated: The applicant's approach and activities proposed to engage scientific communities or organizations to ensure that the best and most current science is available to inform the development, review and utilization of Implementation Strategies **(4 points)**. The applicant's experience with the design of experiments and ability to recognize natural experiments **(3 points)**. How the organization will identify and establish working groups of individuals, with complementary skills **(3 points)**.

    c. **Monitoring – 10 points total:** The following items will be evaluated: The proposed approach and activities to conduct partnering and collaborations to activate adequate capacity for the scientific monitoring necessary for successful Implementation Strategies **(4 points)**. The applicant's experience with the design of monitoring programs both for effectiveness, and long-term changes in the status of indicators **(3 points)**. How the organization will identify and establish working groups of individuals, with complementary skills **(3 points)**.

    d. **Adaptive Management – 10 points total: The following items will be evaluated:** The applicant's approach, practices and experience to supporting others in applying adaptive management of programs and projects as might be used for Implementation Strategies **(4 points)**. The ability to bring additional scientific input and perspective to the application of adaptive management related to Implementation Strategies **(3 points)**. How the applicant's proposed adaptive management work can effectively integrate with the adaptive management structure and processes developed and employed by the Puget Sound Partnership and the Puget Sound National Estuary Program Management Conference **(3 points)**.

2. **(15 points total for this section) Science Community Engagement and Social Science**

a. **Science Panel engagement / Science community engagement to expand capacities– 10 points:** The applicant's ability to develop and follow a detailed plan over the four-year work period to engage the PSP Science Panel to review, or convene panels to review, Implementation Strategies at appropriate stages of development and adaptive management will be evaluated as will their ability to engage with other scientific communities to enhance the breadth and depth of science review.
b. **Social Science input, tools and applications- 5 points:** The applicant's proposal to manage specific activities to bolster the representation of experienced social scientists to educate, guide and collaborate with Strategic Initiative teams will be evaluated.

3. **(25 points total for this section) Advancing Implementation Strategies beyond current state of knowledge;**
   a. **Grouping/ Sequencing- 8 points:** The applicant's ability to conduct or commission analysis to inform the development sequence and the grouping of related Implementation Strategies and how they propose to validate the criteria and basis for grouping and sequencing will be evaluated.
   b. **Modeling-7 points** The applicant's ability to apply objective rationale for evaluating the utility of modeling as applicable to Implementation Strategies and ecosystem recovery will be evaluated.
   c. **Identifying Obstacles / crafting solutions – 5 points:**
   The applicant's ability to identify and overcome obstacles to sustain progress towards the objectives and desired outcomes of ecosystem restoration and protection programs and their ability to engage in creative problem solving will be evaluated.
   d. **Innovation- 5 points:** The applicant's organization ability to foster innovation, apply new approaches and respond to emerging issues and how they will engage with other science and policy program leaders of other ecosystem restoration program leaders nationally will be evaluated.

4. **(10 points total for this section) Communications /Ecosystem Strategy Synthesis**

   a. **Strategic Communications- 5 points:** The applicant's ability to plan, deliver and sustain the communications of recovery effort progress, successes, challenges and weaknesses to specific members of the recovery community (NEP Management Conference, Tribal Management Conference, partners, practitioners, local entities, and to the general public) will be evaluated as wills theapproach and activities that the applicant will take to ensure "buy-in" from the various recovery community members.
   b. **Cross-jurisdictional, multi-agency coordination for ecosystem strategy synthesis– 5 points:** The ability of the organization to work with Implementation Strategy owners (e.g. Strategic initiative leads or other IS owners), the PSP Management Conference, the Tribal Management Conference, and with other recovery practitioners to

synthesize the various data sources and reports that inform the utility of Implementation Strategies will be evaluated.

5. **(15 points total for this section) Quality of Proposal &Technical Merit, Financial Integrity & Internal Financial Management System, Budget Information including Non-federal Match, Past Performance, Outputs and Outcomes**

   a. **Quality of Proposal, Technical Merit, 3 points:** Proposals will be evaluated based on the quality of the proposal especially the written narrative sections, in terms of effectiveness of the applicant's written communication and explanations of the technical aspects of the proposed approaches.   Reviewers will evaluate whether the proposed activities are logically presented and if the descriptions provide enough specificity to demonstrate that the applicant fully understands the work to be performed.   For example, reviewers will consider if the proposal effectively describes how the applicant will identify the steps and processes and the approach for initiating and managing science and monitoring activities needed for Implementation Strategies.

   b. **Financial Integrity and Internal Financial Management System -3 points**: Whether the narrative proposal describes the systems, policies and procedures by which the applicant will track expenditures funded by the EPA assistance agreement. In addition, EPA will evaluate the applicant's approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner to minimize the extent of unliquidated obligations.

   c. **Past Performance- 3 points**: Applicants will be evaluated based on their past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement; (e.g. Workplan ,Project Summary Narrative, page 24).This includes their history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not will also be evaluated.

   In evaluating applicants under these factors, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current/prior grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant).If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

d. **Budget Information / Non-federal match-2 points**: Whether the proposal provides complete budget information such that amounts indicated for task areas described in the narrative proposal are clearly identifiable and sufficient and reasonable to complete the proposed work and it provides justification and/ or explanations sufficient to support of costs included in different budget categories will be evaluated as will whether the proposal describes in the budget narrative how required non-federal match will secured and accounted for.

e. **Outputs and Outcomes - 2 points**: - How the applicant proposes to achieve the expected outputs and outcomes including those described in Section I.D, and the applicant's approach for tracking and measuring its progress towards achieving expected outcomes and outputs will be evaluated. The clarity and logic demonstrated in the linkage between proposed support activities or programs, and the expected success of Vital Sign Implementation Strategies to achieve environmental outcomes will also be evaluated . See Appendix A: Measuring Environmental Results for additional guidance on presenting outputs, outcomes and logic models.

f. **Organizational Experience – 2 points: -** Provide information on your organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project, and your staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project

B. Review and Selection Process

Proposals will first be evaluated against the threshold factors listed in Section III-C. Only those proposals which meet all of the threshold factors will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria listed above by an EPA evaluation team.   Each eligible proposal will be given a numerical score and will be rank-ordered according to the numerical score. The final funding decision for award will be made by the Approving Official (Director of the U.S. EPA Region 10 Office of Water and Watersheds) based on the rankings and preliminary recommendations of the review panel. While EPA intends to select the highest scoring proposal for award, in making the final funding decision, the Approving Official may also consider EPA's national and regional goals and priorities relevant to Puget Sound and funding limitations and availability.

C. Additional Provisions Incorporated By Reference

Additional Provisions For Applicants Incorporated Into The Solicitation:
Additional provisions that apply to this solicitation and/or awards made under this solicitation including the clause on Reporting and Use of Information Concerning Recipient Integrity and Performance can be

found on the [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#) page. These, and the other provisions that can be found at the website link, are important, and applicants must review them when preparing proposals for this solicitation. If you are unable to access these provisions electronically at the website above, please communicate with the EPA contact listed in this solicitation to obtain the provisionsVI. Award Administration Information

VI. Award Administration Information

A. Award Notices

Following the evaluation-of proposals all applicants will be notified regarding their status.

Proposal Notifications

1. EPA notification to the successful applicant will be made via e-mail. The notification will be sent to the original signer of the proposal or the project contact listed in the proposal. This notification, which informs the applicant that its proposal has been selected and is being recommended for award, is not an authorization to begin work. The official notification of an award will be made by the Regional Grants Management Official.

    Applicants are cautioned that only a grants officer is authorized to bind the Government to the expenditure of funds; selection does not guarantee an award will be made. For example, statutory authorization, funding or other issues discovered during the award process may affect the ability of EPA to make an award to an applicant. The award notice, signed by an EPA grants officer, is the authorizing document and will be provided through electronic mail. The successful applicant may need to prepare and submit additional documents and forms (e.g., work plan), which must be approved by EPA, before the grant can officially be awarded. The time between notification of selection and award of a grant can take up to 90 days or longer.

1. EPA notification to unsuccessful applicant(s) will be made via email. The notification will be made to the original signer of the Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirement

A listing and description of general regulations applicable to the award of assistance agreements may be viewed at EPA's [Policy, Regulations and Guidance](#) website.

C. Reporting Requirement

Semiannual reports and a detailed final technical report will be required. Semiannual reports summarizing technical progress, planned activities or changes to approved workplan for the reporting period and a summary of expenditures are required. The final technical report shall be

completed within 90 calendar days of the completion of the period of performance. The final technical report should include: summary of the project or activity, advances achieved, and costs of the project or activity. In addition, the final technical report should discuss the problems, successes, and lessons learned from the project or activity that could help overcome structural, organizational or technical obstacles to implementing a similar project elsewhere. The schedule for submission of semiannual reports will be established by EPA, as a term and condition of the award including the use of the Financial Ecosystem and Accounting Tracking System (FEATS) established for Puget Sound assistance agreements.

D. Disputes

Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005) at EPA's [Dispute Resolution Procedures](). Copies of these procedures may also be requested from Angela Adams, EPA Region 10 Puget Sound program at: [Adams.Angela@epa.gov]()

E. Additional Provisions for Applicants Incorporated into the Solicitation

Additional provisions that apply to this solicitation and/or awards made under this solicitation, including but not limited to those related to DUNS, SAM, copyrights, disputes, and administrative capability, can be found at [https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-solicitation-clauses]()These, and the other provisions that can be found at the website link, are important, and applicants must review them when preparing proposals for this solicitation. If you are unable to access these provisions electronically at the website above, please communicate with the EPA contact listed in this solicitation to obtain the provisions.

VII. Agency Contacts

For further information, contact:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ATTN: Melissa Whitaker
Region 10, Puget Sound Program
1200 6th Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, Washington 98101
E-mail address [Whitaker.Melissa@epa.gov]()

All questions or comments must be communicated in writing via postal mail or email to the contact person listed above. Questions and answers will be posted until the closing date of this announcement at the [EPA Puget Sound NEP-Grants and Funding]() webpage.

VIII. Other Information

Terms and Conditions

See EPA's Grant Terms and Conditions at http://www.epa.gov/ogd/tc.htm. Additionally, some of the programmatic and administrative terms and conditions that apply to awards made under this RFP are explained below:

A. Quality Assurance

The selected recipients for this cooperative agreement, along with all subaward projects collecting environmental data, will require a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), as appropriate. The subawardees' QAPPs will need to meet the standards of the lead organization's QAPP. Approval of the recipient's Quality Management Plan (QMP) by the EPA Project Officer and the EPA Quality Assurance Manager, may allow delegation of the authority to review and approve QAPPs to the recipient based on procedures documented in the QMP All projects collecting environmental data will require a QAPP.

Certain quality assurance and/or quality control (QA/QC) and peer review requirements are applicable to the collection of environmental data. Environmental data are any measurements or information that describes environmental processes, location, or condition, ecological or health effects and consequences, or the performance of environmental technology. Environmental data also include information collected directly from measurements, produced from models, and obtained from other sources such as databases or published literature. Regulations pertaining to QA/QC requirements can be found in 40 C.F.R. 31.45. Additional guidance can be found at http://www.epa.gov/quality/qa_docs.html#noepargt.

Applicants should allow sufficient time and resources for development and approval of a QAPP for their proposed projects. If your organization does not have a Quality Management System in place, one must be developed. A project specific QAPP must be submitted and approved by EPA, before sampling is scheduled to begin. Allow about one month for EPA approval in your timeline.

The EPA R10 Quality Assurance Team Contact is Donald Brown at (206) 553-0717 or email: brown.donaldm@epa.gov

B. Data Access and Information Release

The OMB Circular A-110 has been revised to provide public access to research data through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) under some circumstances. Data that are (1) first produced in a project that is supported in whole or in part with Federal funds and (2) cited publicly and officially by a Federal agency in support of an action that has the force and effect of law (i.e., a regulation) may be accessed through FOIA. If such data are requested by the public, the EPA must ask for it, and the grantee must submit it, in accordance with A-110 and EPA regulations 40 C.F.R. Part 30.36(d)(1).

C. Grantee Conference Attendance

The recipient may attend one or more appropriate conferences each year, which may be within the Puget Sound region. The specific conferences will be determined in consultation with the EPA Project Officer. The purpose of this requirement is to provide recipients with opportunities to learn about and benefit from other relevant initiatives and programs that relate to the funded work, such as to:

- Exchange information about their funded work with organizations that may benefit from their experience; and,
- Raise awareness within the Puget Sound, Salish Sea, and large aquatic ecosystem protection and restoration communities of the funded work.

Examples of potentially relevant conferences include, but are not limited to:

- The Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference which is a biennial conference.
- Local or regional meetings of Tribal, professional, scientific, or other relevant associations.

Participating in specific conferences and meetings will depend on the nature of the work proposed. Recipients will be allowed to use award funds to pay for travel and lodging needs. Recipients should include anticipated costs for attending conferences in their proposed budgets.

D. STORET Requirement

Recipients are required to institute standardized reporting requirements into their work plans and include such costs in their budgets. All water quality data generated in accordance with an EPA approved Quality Assurance Project Plan as a result of this assistance agreement, either directly or by subaward, will be required to be transmitted into the Agency's Storage and Retrieval (STORET) data warehouse using either WQX or WQX web.

Water quality data appropriate for STORET include physical, chemical, and biological sample results for water, sediment and fish tissue. The data include toxicity data, microbiological data, and the metrics and indices generated from biological and habitat data. The Water Quality Exchange (WQX) is the water data schema associated with the EPA, State and Tribal Exchange Network. Using the WQX schema, partners map their database structure to the WQX/STORET structure. WQX is a web based tool to convert data into the STORET format for smaller data generators that are not direct partners on the Exchange Network.

More information about WQX, WQX web, and the STORET warehouse, including tutorials, can be found at [STORET/WQX: What is WQX?](#) If activities submitted as match for this federal assistance agreement involve the generation of water quality data, the resulting information must be publicly accessible (in STORET or some other database). Recipients are encouraged to develop a cross walk between any non-STORET database utilized for the storage of water quality data associated with match activities and EPA's WQX.

E. National Term & Condition for Subawards

In March 2016, EPA issued revised and updated guidance and requirements for the management and monitoring of subawards. The new subaward term and condition can be found at: https://wcms.epa.gov/grants/grants-policy-issuance-gpi-16-01-epa-subaward-policy-epa-assistance-agreement-recipients . All recipients of EPA assistance agreements who make subawards during the time period of the award must meet the subaward management, oversight, monitoring and reporting requirements as explained in the EPA National Term and Condition for Subawards.

Appendix A: Measuring Environmental Results

Logic Models, Outputs, and Outcomes

Beginning in 2005, EPA required that all assistance agreement recipients document outputs and "to the extent practicable" outcomes. Outputs and outcomes differ both in their nature, and in how they are measured.

OUTPUTS: Outputs are the activities or deliverables that are to be accomplished as a result of an assistance agreement grant. Outputs are generally described as deliverables or milestones in a work plan or timeline. EPA Project Officers track the completion of outputs to monitor the progress of an assistance agreement. Outputs include items like the number of workshops held, number of volunteers trained, field work completed, studies completed, watershed management plan completed, etc.

OUTCOMES: Outcomes are the measurable impacts or results of the work of the assistance agreement. While outputs are accomplished during the life of the assistance agreement, outcomes generally occur after the completion of the assistance agreement. It is useful to categorize outcomes as short, medium, and long-term. Measuring environmental outcomes can be challenging, especially for small assistance agreements.

Tracking medium and long-term outcomes can be costly, especially if monitoring, sampling and analysis are involved. In addition, it can take many years for the long-term impact of an assistance agreement to have a measurable effect on the environment. For small assistance agreements, we tend to focus on short and medium-term outcomes, however, the recipient should still attempt to state long term goals and objectives from the assistance agreement.

- *Short-term outcomes* may include changes such as increased knowledge or an active stewardship program.

- *Medium-term outcomes* may include documented widespread adoption of best management practices, documented reduction of pesticide use (E.g. 3 pounds of pesticides per acre no longer being used on 2000 acres).

- *Long-term outcomes* may include documented reduction of nutrients in a lake, documented reduction in number of children with asthma, documented improvement of indoor air quality, or meeting river water quality standards.

The following hypothetical examples include brief discussions of outputs and outcomes:

Example 1: For a project aimed at protecting a salmon run, expected outputs may include an ecosystem services valuation; a formal public review process for the valuation; and a systematic, multifaceted outreach effort to educate decision-makers on the results of the valuation and its recommendations. Other outputs of the proposed work could include implementation and completion of specific habitat restoration projects previously identified in an established salmon recovery plan or other local implementation plan, leading to a specific number of acres of habitat restored, fish passage barriers removed, or the like. All of these products, or outputs, would be clearly identified as assistance agreement products and would be expected to be completed as part of the proposed work. The expected outcomes would include anticipated acres of key habitat protected or restored as a result of the valuation. Other outcomes would include supporting a healthy salmon run, maintaining water quality standards, delisting a water-body segment listed as impaired under CWA §303(d), or attaining a milestone under a Total Maximum Daily Load.

Example 2: A proposed project may be focused on protecting marine water quality and shellfish harvest areas. The anticipated outputs may be a local assessment program that systematically lists areas of known water quality and shellfish habitat problems, and systematically identifies appropriate/innovative technologies, development patterns, best management practices (BMPs), and other tools relevant to addressing these issues. The outputs would also include a report presenting the specific findings of the assessment. For example, such an assessment program could identify innovative household-scale septic systems as a tool for addressing nitrogen inputs to impaired estuarine waters; or innovative procedures to connect decisions regarding the location and use of septic systems to land use decisions and water quality requirements in sensitive areas. The proposed work may also include a plan for obtaining and documenting a formal technical review of the assessment by regionally recognized experts; for presenting and publicizing the assessment and its results; for taking public comment and revising the assessment; and for formally presenting it to key decision-making bodies. All of the previous outputs would be delivered during the project's period. Outcomes of this work would include reduced pollutants in surface waters and an upgrade in shellfish harvest areas.

LOGIC MODELS: Logic models are intended to help identify the range and sequence of actions necessary to attain a particular project result or outcome. They help line up and organize sequences of actions to achieve results. This is particularly relevant today as projects and implementation programs become more complex and multi-faceted and yet need to be communicated to and understood by many people. Logic models also help both project implementers and evaluators to view the whole system of actions and eventually to assess if the system is working as expected, or if not, why. In these ways logic tracks and result chains can help design, communicate, evaluate, track and adapt work programs.

Logic models and results chains are tools to be used to build better projects and programs. Accordingly, logic models come in many forms and shapes, from simple storylines that link various

actions into strategies and work programs to more complex system diagrams. For a straight forward implementation project, perhaps the logic model is as simple as clearly documenting the history and basis for a particular project in a particular place to achieve a particular result. For a project with many tasks, work processes, timelines and partners, a more detailed approach may be more helpful.

With whatever logic model format you choose, please explain how the proposed work addresses the largest uncertainties or tests key hypotheses identified or embedded in the logic models. We also encourage the identification of ecosystem endpoints or indicators that would be affected or supported by the products and information from the proposed investigation.

Two brief examples of logic models are provided on the following pages.

Model Example 1: Generic Template

Proposal:	BLANK

Link to EPA Strategic Plan	Resources/Input	Activities (and targets, if any)	Stated Outputs (with targets)	Anticipated Outcomes (with targets)	Baseline
Goal 2=Clean and Safe Water Objective 2.1: Protect Human Health Subobjective 2.1.1= Water Safe to Drink Objective 2.2= Protect Water Quality Subobjective 2.2.1= Improve Water Quality on a Watershed Basis 2.2.2= Improve Coastal and Ocean Waters Goal 4=Healthy Communities and Ecosystems Objective 4.3= Ecosystems. Protect, Sustain, and Restore the Health of Natural Habitats and Ecosystems Sub-objective 4.3.1=Protect and Restore Ecosystems Sub-objective 4.3.2=Increase Wetlands	Describe the resources needed, funding amounts from EPA and match, in-house and/or contractor expertise, property, etc. ← *identify and describe sub-objectives that are relevant*	Describe actions, not results; e.g. conducting technical assessments and reviews, developing plans for getting public input, purchasing information or equipment, developing ecosystem assessments or watershed characterizations	Describe actual products, reports, meetings, plans, for each activity. Include numbers and dates expected if known. These should be accomplishments during the grant period.	**Examples:** Broader results that continue or occur after the end of the assistance agreement project period. Include numbers and dates expected if known **Short Term**: (1) Volume of cleaner water discharged or supplied for X number of people (2) Increased infiltration, (3) Increased public support or scientific understanding of watershed or ecosystem capacities or recovery limitations. **Interim:** (1) Potential reduction of pollutant loadings. (2) Increased environmental awareness within community. (3) Protection of acres or functions of wetlands or local ecosystem. (4) Reduction of risk to watershed or ecosystem through proactive assessment or calibration. **Long term**: (1) Restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of targeted ecosystems, (2) Improved health of associated population These measures are supportive of the strategic sub-objectives in column 1	Source of and data on, for example, current conditions, discharge volumes, quality, high quality waters in need of protection, impervious cover; against which to measure change due to funded activity.

Logic Model Example 2

INPUTS	OUTPUTS		OUTCOMES		
	ACTIVITIES	PARTICIPANTS	SHORT TERM	MEDIUM TERM	LONG TERM
EPA funds $148,768 *Logan County Planning Division Manager time in project management $1748* *(other stated inputs)*	*Conduct an ecosystem valuation of a small watershed in Logan County to determine functional values and/or cost-benefit of protecting natural systems over engineered stormwater structures.* *Develop land use designations, development standards, or incentive programs to help guide development of implementation approaches.*	*Logan County staff and University staff conduct valuation.* *Logan County staff, with assistance from outside contract and local citizen committee, develop land use designations and development standards and incentive programs.*	*Ecosystem Valuation* *Develop land use designations and development standards and incentive programs*	• *Increase in acreage or ecosystems protected from development.* • *No net increase in effective impervious cover* • *Reduced risk of increased flooding in downstream floodplain.* • *Reduction of chemical loadings or risk of chemical exposure.*	*Preservation of the naturally functioning ecosystem/watershed processes so that all species dependent on all the functions of that ecosystem are maintained in plentiful supply in the watershed.*
			OUTCOME MEASURES		
			Final report with recommendations for implementation. Specific land use designations in subarea plans. Incentive program.	# of wetland acres protected. # of functioning riparian miles protected. Peak flow hydrology maintained or reduced with increased development.	Watershed hydrology maintained. Less need for new restoration projects. Species maintenance or recovery. Chemical and/or nutrient pollutant loadings reduced.

Appendix B: Grants.Gov Submission Instructions

The electronic submission of your application must be made by an official representative of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information on the registration requirements that must be completed in order to submit an application through grants.gov, go to Grants.gov and click on "Applicants" on the top of the page and then go to the "Get Registered" link on the page. If your organization is not currently registered with Grants.gov, please encourage your office to designate an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible. Please note that the registration process also requires that your organization have a DUNS number and a current registration with the System for Award Management (SAM) and the process of obtaining both could take a month or more. Applicants must ensure that all registration requirements are met in order to apply for this opportunity through grants.gov and should ensure that all such requirements have been met well in advance of the submission deadline. Registration on grants.gov, SAM.gov, and DUNS number assignment is FREE.

Applicants need to ensure that the AOR who submits the application through Grants.gov and whose DUNS number is listed on the application is an AOR for the applicant listed on the application. Additionally, the DUNS number listed on the application must be registered to the applicant organization's SAM account. If not, the application may be deemed ineligible.

To begin the application process under this grant announcement, go to Grants.gov and click on "Applicants" on the top of the page and then "Apply for Grants" from the dropdown menu and then follow the instructions accordingly. Please note: To apply through grants.gov, you must use Adobe Reader software and download the compatible Adobe Reader version. For more information about Adobe Reader, to verify compatibility, or to download the free software, please visit Adobe Reader Compatibility Information on Grants.gov

You may also be able to access the application package for this announcement by searching for the opportunity on Grants.gov. Go to Grants.gov and then click on "Search Grants" at the top of the page and enter the Funding Opportunity Number, EPA-R10-PS-2017-001 or the CFDA number that applies to the announcement (CFDA 66.123), in the appropriate field and click the Search button. Alternatively, you may be able to access the application package by clicking on the Package button at the top right of the synopsis page for the announcement on Grants.gov. To find the synopsis page, go to Grants.gov and click "Browse Agencies" in the middle of the page and then go to "Environmental Protection Agency" to find the EPA funding opportunities.

Please note that Grants.gov is strongly encouraging users to sign up for and use their "Workspace" feature when applying for opportunities. Grants.gov will be phasing out the "legacy" application process, so EPA recommends that all applicants begin using Workspace as soon as possible so they are prepared when the "legacy" application process is no longer available.

Application Submission Deadline: Your organization's AOR must submit your complete application

package electronically to EPA through Grants.gov no later than January 30, 2017. Please allow for enough time to successfully submit your application process and allow for unexpected errors that may require you to resubmit.

Please submit all of the application materials described below using the grants.gov application package that you downloaded using the instructions above. For additional instructions on completing and submitting the electronic application package, click on the "Show Instructions" tab that is accessible within the application package itself.

Application Materials

The following forms and documents are required under this announcement:

Mandatory Documents:

   1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

   2. Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)

3. Narrative Proposal (Project Narrative Attachment Form)-prepared as described in section IV of the announcement.

Optional Documents:

   Other Attachments, if applicable - see section IV-C.

   Applications submitted through grants.gov will be time and date stamped electronically.
   If you have not received a confirmation of receipt from EPA (not from grants.gov) within 30 days of the application deadline, please contact Melissa Whitaker @ (206) 553-2119.   Failure to do so may result in your application not being reviewed.

   c. Technical Issues with Submission

1.   Once the application package has been completed, the "Submit" button should be enabled. If the "Submit" button is not active, please call Grants.gov for assistance at 1-800-518-4726. Applicants who are outside the U.S. at the time of submittal and are not able to access the toll-free number may reach a Grants.gov representative by calling 606-545-5035. Applicants should save the completed application package with two different file names before providing it to the AOR to avoid having to re-create the package should submission problems be experienced or a revised application needs to be submitted.

2.   Submitting the application. The application package must be transferred to Grants.gov by an AOR. The AOR should close all other software before attempting to submit the application package. Click the "submit" button of the application package. Your Internet browser will launch and a sign-in page will appear. **Note: Minor problems are not uncommon with transfers to Grants.gov. It is essential to allow sufficient time to ensure that your application is submitted to Grants.gov BEFORE the due date identified in Section IV of the solicitation.** The Grants.gov support desk operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week, except Federal Holidays.

A successful transfer will end with an on-screen acknowledgement. For documentation purposes, print or screen capture this acknowledgement. If a submission problem occurs, reboot the computer – turning the power off may be necessary – and re-attempt the submission.

Note: Grants.gov issues a "case number" upon a request for assistance.

3. Transmission Difficulties. If transmission difficulties that result in a late transmission, no transmission, or rejection of the transmitted application are experienced, and following the above instructions do not resolve the problem so that the application is submitted to Grants.gov by the deadline date and time, follow the guidance below. The Agency will make a decision concerning acceptance of each late submission on a case-by-case basis. All emails, as described below, are to be sent to Whitaker.Melissa@epa.gov with the FON in the subject line. If you are unable to email, contact Melissa Whitaker (206) 553-2119. Be aware that EPA will only consider accepting applications that were unable to transmit due to Grants.gov or relevant www.Sam.gov system issues or for unforeseen exigent circumstances, such as extreme weather interfering with internet access. Failure of an applicant to submit timely because they did not properly or timely register in SAM.gov or Grants.gov is not an acceptable reason to justify acceptance of a late submittal.

a. If you are experiencing problems resulting in an inability to upload the application to Grants.gov, it is essential to call Grants.gov for assistance at 1-800-518-4726 before the application deadline. Applicants who are outside the U.S. at the time of submittal and are not able to access the toll-free number may reach a Grants.gov representative by calling 606-545-5035. Be sure to obtain a case number from Grants.gov. If the problems stem from unforeseen exigent circumstances unrelated to Grants.gov, such as extreme weather interfering with internet access, contact Whitaker.Melissa@epa.gov at (206) 553-2119.

b. Unsuccessful transfer of the application package: If a successful transfer of the application cannot be accomplished even with assistance from Grants.gov due to electronic submission system issues or unforeseen exigent circumstances, and you have already attempted to resolve the issue by contacting Grants.gov, send an email message to Whitaker.Melissa@epa.gov prior to the application deadline. The email message must document the problem and include the Grants.gov case number as well as the entire application in PDF format as an attachment.

c. Grants.gov rejection of the application package: If a notification is received from Grants.gov stating that the application has been rejected for reasons other than late submittal and it is too late to reapply, promptly send an email to Whitaker.Melissa@epa.gov with the FON in the subject line within one business day of the closing date of this solicitation. The email should include any materials provided by Grants.gov and attach the entire application in PDF format.

Please note that successful submission through Grants.gov or via email does not necessarily mean your application is eligible for award.

Appendix C: Budget Sample

Budget Detail

This section of the work plan is a detailed description of the budget found in the SF-424A, and must include a detailed discussion of how EPA funds will be used. Applicants must **itemize** costs related to personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual costs, other direct costs, indirect costs, and total costs.

Applicants should use the following instructions, budget object class descriptions, and example table to complete the Budget Detail section of the work plan.

- **Personnel - List all staff positions by title. Give annual salary, percentage of time assigned to the project, and total cost for the budget period.** This category includes only direct costs for the salaries of those individuals who will perform work directly for the project (generally, paid employees of the applicant organization). If the applicant organization is including staff time (in-kind services) as a cost share, this should be included as Personnel costs. Personnel costs do not include: (1) costs for services of consultants, contractors, consortia members, or other partner organizations, which are included in the "Contractual" category; (2) costs for employees of subrecipients under subawards, which are included in the "Other" category; or (3) effort that is nor directly in support of the proposed project, which may be covered by the organization's negotiated indirect cost rate. The budget detail must identify the personnel category type by Full Time Equivalent (FTE), including percentage of FTE for part-time employees, number of personnel proposed for each category, and the estimated funding amounts.

- **Fringe Benefits - Identify the percentage used, the basis for its computation, and the types of benefits included**. Fringe benefits are allowances and services provided by employers to their employees as compensation in addition to regular salaries and wages. Fringe benefits include, but are not limited to the cost of leave, employee insurance, pensions and unemployment benefit plans.

- **Travel - Specify the mileage, per diem, estimated number of trips in-State and out-of-State, number of travelers, and other costs for each type of travel.** Travel may be integral to the purpose of the proposed project (e.g. inspections) or related to proposed project activities (e.g. attendance at meetings). Travel costs do not include: (1) costs for travel of consultants, contractors, consortia members, or other partner organizations, which are included in the "Contractual" category; (2) travel costs for employees of subrecipients under subawards, which are included in the "Other" category.

- **Equipment - Identify each item to be purchased which has an estimated acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit and a useful life of more than one year.** Equipment also includes accessories necessary to make the equipment operational. Equipment does not include: (1) equipment planned to be leased/rented, including lease/purchase agreement; or (2) equipment service or maintenance contracts. These types of proposed costs should be included in the "Other" category. Items with a unit cost of less than $5,000 should be categorized as supplies,

pursuant to 2 CFR Part 200. The budget detail must include an itemized listing of all equipment proposed under the project.

- **Supplies - "Supplies" means all tangible personal property other than "equipment".** The budget detail should identify categories of supplies to be procured (e.g., laboratory supplies or office supplies). Non-tangible goods and services associated with supplies, such as printing service, photocopy services, and rental costs should be included in the "Other" category.

- **Contractual – Identify each proposed contract and specify its purpose and estimated cost.** Contractual/consultant services are those services to be carried out by an individual or organization, other than the applicant, in the form of a procurement relationship. Leased or rented goods (equipment or supplies) should be included in the "Other" category. The applicant should list the proposed contract activities along with a brief description of the scope of work or services to be provided, proposed duration, and proposed procurement method (competitive or non-competitive), if known.

- **Other - List each item in sufficient detail for EPA to determine the reasonableness and allowability of its cost.** This category should include only those types of direct costs that do not fit in any of the other budget categories. Examples of costs that may be in this category are: insurance, rental/lease of equipment or supplies, equipment service or maintenance contracts, printing or photocopying, rebates, and subaward costs. Subawards (e.g., subgrants) are a distinct type of cost under this category. The term "subaward" means an award of financial assistance (money or property) by any legal agreement made by the recipient to an eligible subrecipient. This term does not include procurement purchases, technical assistance in the form of services instead of money, or other assistance in the form of revenue sharing, loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, insurance, or direct appropriations. Subcontracts are not subawards and belong in the contractual category. Applicants must provide the aggregate amount they propose to issue as subaward work and a description of the types of activities to be supported

- **Indirect Charges - If indirect charges are budgeted, indicate the approved rate and base.** Indirect costs are those incurred by the grantee for a common or joint purpose that benefit more than one cost objective or project, and are not readily assignable to specific cost objectives or projects as a direct cost. In order for indirect costs to be allowable, the applicant must have a federal or state negotiated indirect cost rate (e.g., fixed, predetermined, final or provisional), or must have submitted a proposal to the cognizant Federal or State agency. Examples of Indirect Cost Rate calculations are shown below:

  - ✓ Personnel (Indirect Rate x Personnel = Indirect Costs)
  - ✓ Personnel and Fringe (Indirect Rate x Personnel & Fringe = Indirect Costs)
  - ✓ Total Direct Costs (Indirect Rate x Total direct costs = Indirect Costs)
  - ✓ Direct Costs minus distorting or other factors such as contracts and equipment (Indirect Rate x (total direct cost – distorting factors) = Indirect Costs)

  Note on Management Fees: When formulating budgets for proposals, applicants must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicant's cognizant Federal audit agency, or at the rate provided for by

the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges cannot be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the work plan.

Example Budget Table

	EPA Funding	**Match
Personnel		
(1) Project Manager @ $40/hr x 10 hrs/week x 52 wks		$ 20,800
(3) Project Staff @ $25/hr x 40 hrs/week x 40 wks	$120,000	
TOTAL PERSONNEL	$120,000	$ 20,800
Fringe Benefits		
20% of Salary and Wages	20% (120,000)	20% (20,800)
- Retirement, Health Benefits, FICA, SUI	$ 24,000	$ 4,160
TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	$ 24,000	$ 4,160
Travel		
Travel for Project Manager and staff: 500 mi/month @$0.55 /mi x 12 months	$ 3,300	
TOTAL TRAVEL	$ 3,300	
Equipment		
TOTAL EQUIPMENT		
Supplies		
Office and related supplies to support training	$ 10,000	
TOTAL SUPPLIES	$ 10,000	
Contractual		
Support Services Contract	$ 20,000	
TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	$ 20,000	
Other		
TOTAL OTHER		
Indirect Charges		
Negotiated Rate – Sample 10%	$ 12,000	
TOTAL INDIRECT	$ 12,000	
TOTAL FUNDING	$189,300	$ 24,960