

**OVERVIEW**  
**U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, Region III**  
**Chesapeake Bay Program Office Fiscal Year 2009 Request for Proposals (RFP) for the**  
**Development and Implementation of the Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and**  
**Sediment Reduction Program**  
**EPA-R3CBP- 09-06**  
**Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number 66.466**

**Important Dates**

December 23, 2008	Issuance of RFP
February 6, 2009	Proposal Submission Deadline (see section IV for more information)
March 3, 2009	Approximate date for EPA to notify applicants of results
April 3, 2009	Approximate date for Applicant to submit federal cooperative agreement application. Processing of an assistance agreement typically takes 90 days.
July 3, 2009	Approximate date of award

**Executive Summary**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Chesapeake Bay Program Office, is announcing a request for proposals for a recipient to develop and implement the FY 2009 CHESAPEAKE BAY INNOVATIVE NUTRIENT and SEDIMENT REDUCTION PROGRAM. This announcement is new and has not previously been distributed.

The Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Program (the Program) is a competitive grant program to support efforts within the Chesapeake Bay basin to vastly accelerate nutrient and sediment reductions with innovative, sustainable and cost-effective approaches. This RFP sets forth the process that will be used for competitively selecting a grant recipient that will develop and implement the Program with the primary task of making competitive subawards to eligible organizations to meet the specified expected environmental results. An estimated \$6 million to \$6.5 million is expected to be available for award under this announcement depending upon funding availability, the amount of FY 2009 funds ultimately received, and the quality of proposals received. EPA plans to award one agreement under this announcement.

The EPA will consider all proposals that are postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service, hand-delivered, sent through an official delivery service with documentation indicating EPA acceptance from a delivery service, or submitted via Grants.gov on or before 5:00 EST on February 6, 2009. Any proposals postmarked, hand delivered, or submitted via <http://www.grants.gov/> after the due date and time will not be considered for funding. No proposals will be accepted by facsimile machine submission.

**U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, Region III**  
**Chesapeake Bay Program Office Fiscal Year 2009**  
**Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Development and Implementation of the**  
**Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Program**  
**EPA-R3CBP- 09-06**

**FULL TEXT ANNOUNCEMENT**

**Section I: Funding Opportunity Description**

**A. About the Chesapeake Bay Program:** The Chesapeake Bay is North America's largest and most biologically diverse estuary. The Chesapeake Bay is a resource of extraordinary productivity, worthy of the highest levels of protection and restoration. Accordingly, in 1983 the states of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and the EPA signed an agreement that established the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.

**B. Chesapeake 2000:** On June 28, 2000, the Chesapeake Bay Program's governing Chesapeake Executive Council signed an agreement, known as *Chesapeake 2000: A Watershed Partnership (Chesapeake 2000)*. *Chesapeake 2000* is one of the most aggressive and comprehensive watershed restoration plans ever developed for the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The agreement is the result of a comprehensive three-year stakeholder-driven process involving more than 300 scientists, resource managers, policymakers and citizens from all parts of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The agreement consolidated prior commitments and established new goals and deadlines for protecting and restoring the Chesapeake Bay's living resources, water quality, and vital habitats, promoting sound land use, and engaging communities beyond 2000. In addition to identifying key measures necessary to restore the Bay, *Chesapeake 2000* provided the opportunity for Delaware, New York and West Virginia to become more involved in the Bay Program partnership. These headwater states now work with the Bay Program to reduce nutrients and sediment flowing into rivers from their jurisdictions. Through this grants programs, projects will be funded to help meet the nutrient and sediment water quality goals outlined in the *Chesapeake 2000*.

**C. Proposals:** This RFP is seeking proposals from eligible applicants to develop and implement a Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Program. The objective of the Program is to support efforts within the Chesapeake Bay basin to accelerate nutrient and sediment reductions with innovative, sustainable and cost-effective approaches. The awardee will award sub-grants on a competitive basis to support the demonstration of innovative approaches to expand the collective knowledge about the most cost effective and sustainable approaches to dramatically reduce or eliminate nutrient and sediment pollution to the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. Recognizing a need to foster a balance of cost-effectiveness with innovation to achieve better and accelerated methods for pollution reduction, EPA is defining "innovative" to include both: (a) new technologies or techniques for reducing nonpoint nutrient/sediment loads to the Bay, and/or (b) sustainable improvements in removal efficiencies

and/or cost effectiveness of current approaches. Tasks to be performed by the grant recipient include, but are not limited to the following:

- Provide subawards to eligible entities through a competitive process that treats all entities fairly.
- Establish guidelines and parameters for the program that: promote competition for the subawards through publicizing the subaward opportunities; define a process for evaluating and selecting subawardees, including the criteria to be used to evaluate and select subawardees; and fund and track up to eight watershed-based projects.
- Present workshop(s) in central, geographic locations in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to advertise the program and assist potential applicants.
- Assess the programmatic capability of the subaward recipients.
- Disperse monies to subaward recipients in a timely manner.
- Provide hands-on technical assistance to support the implementation of the subaward projects.
- Qualitatively and quantitatively measure environmental results and successes of the subaward projects, compile the data and information, and communicate them to the CBP partnership.
- Select and fund projects that accelerate implementation of proven technologies, conservation practices and Best Management Practices (BMPs) by demonstrating strategies that overcome barriers to adoption. These strategies should seek to accelerate adoption of practices that are known to be effective and efficient at reducing or eliminating nutrient and sediment pollution, but that have not been fully implemented throughout the region or within a specific watershed. Barriers may include social and cultural barriers, economic and political barriers, lack of professional acceptance, general lack of awareness or technical assistance, etc.
- Select and fund projects that maximize nutrient and sediment reductions through the strategic combinations of BMPs and technologies based upon specific landscape characteristics and land use objectives. Such system-based, holistic approaches should strive to dramatically decrease or eliminate nutrient and sediment runoff and/or improve cost-effectiveness when compared to a practice-by-practice approach. For projects addressing urban run-off, the scale should be the neighborhood, subdivision, community or small watershed scale and may include new development, redevelopment or retrofit projects. For projects addressing agriculture, the scale should be the whole farm or small watershed scale.
- Select and fund projects that support promising new technologies and practices that have shown improved performance in reducing nutrient and sediment pollution over traditional approaches in controlled demonstrations. Projects should reach new target audiences, demonstrate the technology or practice in a new region, and/or develop programs to accelerate widespread adoption. Such demonstrations should be designed to provide projections of nutrient and sediment reductions associated with implementation of the technology or practice in a range of scenarios.
- Ensure that the subawards also include a "new knowledge" outcome, as well as a method for transferring the knowledge (i.e., projects should both contribute to cleaning up the Bay more efficiently and improve the collective knowledge about how the Bay is cleaned up).

The applicant's subaward program should be designed to cultivate projects with the environmental result of vastly accelerating nutrient and sediment reductions with innovative, sustainable and cost-effective approaches. In addition, these projects should lead to new knowledge from the development and transfer of leading-edge, inventive ways of approaching nonpoint source load reductions while also contributing knowledge of cost-effective, sustainable new ways of doing business. Examples include projects that focus on:

- **New Development:** “green” development approaches which respond to the “no runoff challenge” to eliminate post-development stormwater runoff, control nutrient and sediment loads, and prevent damage to waterways downstream.
- **Existing Development:** new cost-effective approaches that respond to the “no runoff challenge” to eliminate stormwater runoff and nutrient and sediment loads from existing development possessing minimal stormwater controls.
- **Agriculture:** development of sustainable farming approaches that significantly reduce nutrient and sediment loads to the Bay (for example, agricultural niche markets) or demonstration of sustainable biofuels technology or markets that are good for both farmers and Chesapeake Bay water quality.
- **Economics:** use cost-savings as a way to motivate more farmers, local governments and developers to reduce or prevent stormwater runoff and nutrient and sediment loads from their areas of operation (e.g., widespread adoption of animal agriculture feed management which saves the farmer money and reduces manure nutrient loads to the Bay; e.g., retrofitting existing development with low-impact development practices (green roofs, rain gardens, pervious pavement) to avoid costs of expensive storm sewer infrastructure).
- **Targeting:** illustrate how targeting specific types or geographic locations of stormwater and/or nutrient and sediment prevention or reduction controls could result in more effective ways to protect local waterways and clean up the Bay.

If your organization has an interest in this topic, has the skills to accomplish the tasks, and is eligible to receive a federal assistance agreement as described in Section III, we encourage you to submit a proposal. The proposal will be evaluated based on the relevant criteria referenced in Section V. The proposal should have a work plan and a detailed budget (including cost share/match) for the award of \$6 to \$6.5 million.

**D. Authorizing Statutes and Regulations: Authorizing Statutes and Regulations:** Water quality grants and cooperative agreement projects are authorized under the Clean Water Act, Section 117(d). These projects are subject to EPA's General Grant Regulations: 40 CFR Part 30 for Grants and Cooperative Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and other Nonprofit Organizations and 40 CFR 31 Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments. Under Section 117(d) of the Clean Water Act, EPA has the authority to issue grants and cooperative agreements or enter into federal interagency agreements for the purposes of protecting and restoring the Chesapeake Bay's ecosystem.

**E. Environmental Results:** EPA Order 5700.7 requires that all cooperative agreements be aligned with EPA's strategic goals and objectives and that assistance agreements result in real

measurable results. Under this order, effective January 1, 2005, EPA requires assistance programs to focus not only on outputs (i.e., the activities and/or associated work products performed or conducted by an assistance agreement recipient during the funding period) but also on outcomes (i.e., the results, effects, or consequences of a recipient's activities). As a result of this order, EPA will negotiate outcomes and outputs with the selected grantee(s). Examples of expected outcomes and outputs for the cooperative agreement to be awarded under this announcement are listed in Appendix A.

#### **F. The Agency's Strategic Plan/Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)**

**Linkage:** The overall goal of these cooperative agreements is to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem through continued technical support and outreach necessary to address water quality restoration goals and maintain public awareness of Chesapeake Bay restoration. This goal supports the Agency's Strategic Goal #4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems, Objective 4.3 Ecosystem, Sub-objective 4.3.4 Improve Aquatic Health of the Chesapeake Bay. The projects funded under this announcement must be able to be linked to this strategic goal.

### **Section II: Award Information**

#### **Funding Amount:**

The EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office plans to make one award under this announcement:

An estimated \$6 million to \$6.5 million is expected to be available for award under this announcement depending on funding availability, the amount of FY 2009 funds received, and the quality of proposals received.

The award made under this RFP will support the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership's restoration effort by providing administrative, technical, and scientific support. Cooperative Agreements awarded will be funded under Section 117(d) and under Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number 66.466. EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards under this announcement. 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.

**B. Award Type:** EPA has determined that a cooperative agreement is the appropriate funding vehicle for this project. The Chesapeake Bay Program Office expects to award one cooperative agreement under this RFP. Cooperative agreements are used under circumstances where substantial involvement is anticipated between EPA and the recipient during performance of the activity. Typically federal involvement would be in the form of participation with other Chesapeake Bay Program partners and stakeholders in an advisory capacity to the grantee. This participation is expected to include involvement through Chesapeake Bay Program's subcommittees (on which EPA also participates to ensure that all the recommendations for technical work support the Chesapeake Bay Program partners). All work conducted is to

support the efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. EPA will not make final subaward decisions; the grantee will make the final subaward selections.

**C. Expected Project Period:** The expected project period of this cooperative agreement is six years. The expected start date is July 3, 2009. No commitment of funding can be made for future fiscal years. This RFP will cover the project period for the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) for a period up to and including six years from an expected start date of July 3, 2009.

### **Section III: Eligibility Information**

**A. Eligible Applicants:** Nonprofit organizations, State and local governments, colleges, universities, and interstate agencies are eligible to submit proposals in response to this RFP. EPA will consider all proposals that are postmarked by the closing date identified in Section IV C. For-profit organizations are not eligible to submit proposals in response to this RFP. Funding for these projects comes from EPA. Therefore, EPA employees are not eligible to submit a proposal in response to this solicitation or aid in the preparation of a proposal by conceptualizing, developing, or structuring proposals.

**B. Cost Share or Matching Requirements:** Per CWA 117(d)(2)(A), the agency shall determine the cost share requirement for awards under this subsection. The CFDA Number 66.466 states that assistance agreement applicants must commit to a cost share ranging from 5 percent to 50 percent, as determined at the sole discretion of EPA. For this RFP, EPA has determined that an applicant must provide a minimum of 50 percent of the total cost of the project as the non-federal cost share.

Cost share may be in the form of cash or in-kind contributions. Involvement from foundations, watershed groups, private sector, eligible governmental, as well as non-conventional partners can help with match. This match must be met by eligible and allowable costs and is subject to the match provisions in grant regulations. Proposals that do not demonstrate how the 50 percent (dollar for dollar) match will be met will be rejected.

In addition, applicants will be evaluated on leveraged funding included in their proposal (see Section V of this announcement for more detail).

Leveraged funding or other resources need not be for eligible and allowable project costs under the EPA assistance agreement unless the Applicant proposes to provide a voluntary cost share or match. If EPA accepts an offer for a voluntary cost share/match/participation, applicants must meet their matching/sharing/participation commitment as a condition of receiving EPA funding. Applicants may use their own funds or other resources for voluntary match/cost share/participation if the standards at 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24, as applicable, are met. Only eligible and allowable costs may be used for voluntary matches/cost shares/participation. Other Federal grants may not be used as voluntary matches or cost shares without specific statutory authority (e.g. HUD's Community Development Block Grants). Any form of proposed leveraging that is evaluated under a section V ranking criteria must be included in the proposal and the proposal must describe how the applicant will obtain the leveraged resources and what role EPA funding will play in the overall project.

**C. Threshold Eligibility Criteria:** Applicants must meet the following threshold criteria to be considered for funding. Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration as a result of the threshold eligibility review will be notified in writing within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

1. 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 proposal, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.
2. In addition, proposals must be postmarked by or received through [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov), as specified in Section IV of this announcement, on or before the proposal submission deadline published in Section IV of this announcement. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their proposal reaches the designated person/office specified in Section IV of the announcement by the submission deadline. Proposals postmarked or received via grants.gov after the submission deadline will be considered late and returned to the sender without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling or because of technical problems solely attributable to the grants.gov website and not the applicant. For hard copy submissions, where Section IV requires proposal receipt by a specific person/office by the submission deadline, receipt by an agency mailroom is not sufficient. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposal with Veronica Kuczynski at 410-267-5743 or [kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov](mailto:kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov) as soon as possible after the submission deadline—failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.
3. Proposals must address all of the tasks listed in Section I.C. of this announcement.
4. Projects funded under this announcement must be linked to this strategic goal outlined in Section I.F.
6. For a proposal to be considered eligible for funding, all work included in the proposals must take place within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, which includes portions of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and all of the District of Columbia.
7. Eligibility and Cost Share requirements of Section III.A. and B. must be met.

## **Section IV: Application and Submission Information**

**A. Federal Application:** Do not submit a full federal grant application in response to this RFP. If your proposal is selected for funding, an EPA project officer will request an application from you, negotiate the work plan and budget and oversee the process of awarding the cooperative agreement.

## **B. Content and Form of Proposal Submission:**

**Proposal Elements:** Each proposal will be evaluated using the criteria referenced in Section V. B. of this announcement. You must submit a single spaced proposal of up to twelve pages in length (see Appendix A) by the date and time specified in Section IV.C below. The format for this proposal is contained in Appendix A of this announcement. Review the directions for the preparation of the proposal. Proposals that are not prepared in substantial compliance with the requirements in Appendix A will not be considered for funding and will be returned to the applicant.

The proposal package **must** include all of the following materials:

- 1. Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance** – Complete the form. 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 Dunn 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. Narrative Proposal** – The format for this proposal is contained in Appendix A of this announcement. Review the directions for the preparation of the proposal.

**Requirements for Narrative Proposal— See Appendix A:** All proposal review criteria in Section V must be addressed in the proposal. The proposal shall not exceed twelve pages in length. Pages refer to one-side of a single spaced typed page. Font size should be no smaller than 10 and the proposal must be submitted on 8 ½” x 11” paper. Note that the twelve pages must include all supporting materials, including resumes or curriculum vitae and letters of support. With the exception of documentation of non-profit status and the SF-424, if you submit more than twelve pages, the additional pages will be discarded and will not be reviewed.

**Confidential Business Information:** In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their application/proposal as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark applications/proposals or portions of applications/proposals they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204(c) (2) prior to disclosure.

**Pre-proposal/Application Assistance and Communications:** In accordance with EPA’s Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals, provide informal comments on draft proposals, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their applications/proposals. However, consistent with the provisions in the announcement, EPA will respond to questions from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the proposals, and requests for clarification about the announcement. All questions and answers will be posted on <http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm>.

**C. Submission Dates and Times:** EPA will consider all submissions that are postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service, hand-delivered, include official delivery service documentation indicating EPA receipt from a delivery service, or submitted via <http://www.grants.gov/> on or before 5:00 p.m. EST on February 6, 2009. All submissions postmarked, hand delivered, or submitted via <http://www.grants.gov/> after the deadlines specified above will not be considered for funding. No proposals will be accepted by facsimile machine submission.

**D. Intergovernmental Review:** Applicants must comply with the Intergovernmental Review Process and/or consultation provisions of Section 204, Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, if applicable, which are contained in 40 CFR Part 29. This program is eligible for coverage under Executive Order (EO) 12372, An Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. An applicant should consult the office or official designated as the single point of contact in his or her state for more information on that state's required process for applying for assistance if the state has selected the program for review. Single Points of Contact can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html>. Further information regarding this requirement will be provided if your proposal is selected for funding.

**E. Funding Restrictions:**

**Administrative Cost Cap Requirement Under Statutory Authority:** Grantees applying for Chesapeake Bay Program assistance agreements must adhere to the requirement for "Administrative Costs" under the Clean Water Act, Section 117 (d)(4), which states that administrative costs shall not exceed 10 percent of the annual grant award. For this RFP, EPA has determined that administrative costs shall not exceed 5 percent. Information on how to calculate the 5 percent administration cost cap is located in **Appendix B: Administrative Cost Cap Worksheet**.

**Allowable Costs:** EPA assistance agreement funds may only be used for the purposes set forth in the cooperative agreement and must be consistent with the statutory authority for the award. Federal funds may not be used for cost sharing for other Federal grants (except where authorized by statute), lobbying, or intervention in Federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. In addition, Federal funds may not be used to sue the Federal government or any other government entity. All costs identified in the budget must conform to applicable Federal Cost Principles contained in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87 "Cost Principles for State, Local and Tribal Governments;" A-122 "Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations;" or A-21 "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions." During the grant negotiation, any ineligible costs outlined in the proposal (i.e. lobbying activities) will be not be included in the final grant award.

**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 applicants cognizant 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 may not 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 scope of work.

### **Partnerships, Contractors and Subawards:**

#### **a. Can funding be used for the applicant to make subawards, acquire contract services, or fund partnerships?**

EPA awards funds to one eligible applicant as the recipient even if other eligible applicants are named as partners or co-applicants or members of a coalition or consortium. The recipient is accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds.

Funding may be used to provide subgrants or subawards of financial assistance, which includes using subawards or subgrants to fund partnerships, provided the recipient complies with applicable requirements for subawards or subgrants including those contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. Applicants must compete contracts for services and products, including consultant contracts, and conduct cost and price analyses to the extent required by the procurement provisions of these regulations. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. While applicants are not required to identify subawardees/subgrantees and/or contractors or consultants in their proposal, if they do so the fact that an applicant selected for award has named a specific subawardee/subgrantee, contractor or consultant in the proposal EPA selects does not relieve the applicant of its obligations to comply with subaward/subgrant and/or competitive procurement requirements as appropriate. Please note that applicants may not award sole source contracts to consulting, engineering or other firms assisting applicants with the proposal solely based on the firm's role in preparing the proposal.

Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or subawards to avoid requirements in EPA grant regulations for competitive procurement by using these instruments to acquire commercial services or products from for-profit organizations to carry out its assistance agreement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the subawardee or subgrantee must be consistent with the standards for distinguishing between vendor transactions and subrecipient assistance under Subpart B Section .210 of [OMB Circular A-133](#), and the definitions of “subaward” at 40 CFR 30.2(ff) or “subgrant” at 40 CFR 31.3, as applicable. EPA will not be a party to these transactions. Applicants acquiring commercial goods or services must comply with the competitive procurement standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR Part 31.36 and cannot use a subaward/subgrant as the funding mechanism.

#### **b. How will an applicant’s proposed subawardees/subgrantees and contractors be considered during the evaluation process described in Section V of the announcement?**

Section V of the announcement describes the evaluation criteria and evaluation process that will be used by EPA to make selections under this announcement. During this evaluation, except for those criteria that relate to the applicant’s own qualifications, past performance, and reporting history, the review panel will consider, as appropriate and relevant, the qualifications, expertise, and experience of:

- (i) an applicant's named subawardees/subgrantees identified in the proposal if the applicant demonstrates in the proposal that if it receives an award that the subaward/subgrant will be properly awarded consistent with the applicable regulations in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31. For example, applicants must not use subawards/subgrants to obtain commercial services or products from for profits or individual consultants;
- (ii) an applicant's named contractor(s), including consultants, identified in the proposal if the applicant demonstrates in its proposal that the contractor(s) was selected in compliance with the competitive Procurement Standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR 31.36 as appropriate.. For example, an applicant must demonstrate that it selected the contractor(s) competitively or that a proper non-competitive sole-source award consistent with the regulations will be made to the contractor(s), that efforts were made to provide small and disadvantaged businesses with opportunities to compete, and that some form of cost or price analysis was conducted. EPA may not accept sole source justifications for contracts for services or products that are otherwise readily available in the commercial marketplace.

EPA will not consider the qualifications, experience, and expertise of named subawardees/subgrantees and/or named contractor(s) during the proposal/application evaluation process unless the applicant complies with these requirements.

**F. Other Submission Requirements:** Please note that you may choose to apply under this RFP in one of two ways: If you wish to apply with a hard copy submission, please follow the instructions under "Hard Copy Submission" below. If you wish to apply electronically via <http://www.grants.gov/>, please follow the appropriate instructions under "Electronic Submission" below. EPA encourages applicants to submit their proposal materials electronically through <http://www.grants.gov>. Please only use one form of submission.

### **Electronic Submission**

The electronic submission of your proposal/application must be made by an official representative of your institution who is registered with [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) and is authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on "Get Registered" on the left side of the page. *Note that the registration process may take a week or longer to complete.* If your organization is not currently registered with [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov), please encourage your office to designate an AOR and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible.

To begin the proposal/application process under this grant announcement, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the "Apply for Grants" tab on the left side of the page. Then click on "Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package" to download the compatible Adobe viewer and obtain the application package. **To apply through grants.gov you must use Adobe Reader applications and download the compatible Adobe Reader version ( Adobe Reader applications are available to download for free on the Grants.gov website. For**

**more information on Adobe Reader please visit the Help section on grants.gov at <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or [http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program\\_status.jsp](http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program_status.jsp)).**

Once you have downloaded the viewer, you may retrieve the application package by entering the Funding Opportunity Number, EPA-R3CBP-09-06, or the CFDA number that applies to the announcement (CFDA 66.466), in the appropriate field. You may also be able to access the proposal/application package by clicking on the Application button at the top right of the synopsis page for this announcement on <http://www.grants.gov> (to find the synopsis page, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Find Grant Opportunities” button on the left side of the page and then go to Search Opportunities and use the Browse by Agency feature to find EPA opportunities).

**Application/Proposal Submission Deadline:** Your organization’s AOR must submit your complete proposal/application electronically to EPA through Grants.gov (<http://www.grants.gov>) no later than 5 p.m. EST on February 6, 2009.

Please submit *all* of the proposal/application materials described below. To view the full funding announcement, go to <http://www.epa.gov/region03/chesapeake/grants.htm> or go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on “Find Grant Opportunities” on the left side of the page and then click on Search Opportunities/Browse by Agency and select Environmental Protection Agency.

## **Proposal/Application Materials**

**The following forms and documents are required to be submitted under this announcement:**

### **1. Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance**

Complete the form. 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. Narrative Proposal** – The format for this proposal is contained in Appendix A of this announcement. Review the directions for the preparation of the proposal. See Section IV.B. of this announcement for additional guidance. The document should be readable in PDF, MS Word or Word Perfect WP6/7/8 for Windows and consolidated into a single file.

## **Application Preparation and Submission Instructions**

**Documents 1 and 2** listed under Proposal/Application Materials above should appear in the “Mandatory Documents” box on the Grants.gov Grant Application Package page.

For document 1, click on the appropriate form and then click “Open Form” below the box. The fields that must be completed will be highlighted in yellow. Optional fields and completed fields will be displayed in white. If you enter an invalid response or incomplete information in a field, you will receive an error message. When you have finished filling out each form, click “Save.” When you return to the electronic Grant Application Package page, click on the form you just completed, and then click on the box that says, “Move Form to Submission List.” This action will move the document over to the box that says, “Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission.”

For document 2, you will need to attach electronic files. Prepare your narrative proposal as described in Appendix A of this announcement and save the document to your computer as an MS Word, PDF or WordPerfect file. When you are ready to attach your proposal to the application package, click on “Project Narrative Attachment Form,” and open the form. Click “Add Mandatory Project Narrative File,” and then attach your proposal (previously saved to your computer) using the browse window that appears. You may then click “View Mandatory Project Narrative File” to view it. Enter a brief descriptive title of your project in the space beside “Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename;” the filename should be no more than 40 characters long. If there other attachments that you would like to submit to accompany your proposal, you may click “Add Optional Project Narrative File” and proceed as before. When you have finished attaching the necessary documents, click “Close Form.” When you return to the “Grant Application Package” page, select the “Project Narrative Attachment Form” and click “Move Form to Submission List.” The form should now appear in the box that says, “Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission.”

Once you have finished filling out all of the forms/attachments and they appear in one of the “Completed Documents for Submission” boxes, click the “Save” button that appears at the top of the Web page. It is suggested that you save the document a second time, using a different name, since this will make it easier to submit an amended package later if necessary. Please use the following format when saving your file: “Applicant Name – FY09 – Innovative Sediment and Nutrient – 1st Submission” or “Applicant Name – FY 09 Innovative Sediment and Nutrient – Back-up Submission.” If it becomes necessary to submit an amended package at a later date, then the name of the 2nd submission should be changed to “Applicant Name – FY09 Innovative Sediment and Nutrient – 2nd Submission.”

Once your proposal/application package has been completed and saved, send it to your AOR for submission to U.S. EPA through Grants.gov. Please advise your AOR to close all other software programs before attempting to submit the application package through Grants.gov.

In the “Application Filing Name” box, your AOR should enter your organization’s name (abbreviate where possible), the fiscal year (e.g., FY09), and the grant category (e.g., Assoc Prog Supp). The filing name should not exceed 40 characters. From the “Grant Application Package” page, your AOR may submit the application package by clicking the “Submit” button that appears at the top of the page. The AOR will then be asked to verify the agency and funding opportunity number for which the application package is being submitted. If problems are encountered during the submission process, the AOR should reboot his/her computer before trying to submit the application package again. [It may be necessary to turn off the computer (not

just restart it) before attempting to submit the package again.] If the AOR continues to experience submission problems, he/she may contact Grants.gov for assistance by phone at 1-800-518-4726 or email at <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or contact the person listed in Section VII of this announcement.

Application/proposal packages submitted thru grants.gov will be time/date stamped electronically.

If you have not received a confirmation of receipt from EPA (*not from grants.gov*) within 30 days of the proposal/application deadline, please contact the person listed in Section VII of this announcement. Failure to do so may result in your proposal/application not being reviewed.

### **Hard Copy Submission**

Please submit three complete, unbound copies of the proposal package that is described in Section IV.B (SF 424 and Narrative Proposal) and an electronic copy of the narrative proposal in either Word or WordPerfect via email or disk. The hard copies of the proposal should be double-sided, if possible. The proposal must be mailed or delivered to:

Veronica Kuczynski  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office 410 Severn Ave., Suite 109, Annapolis, MD  
21403

Please email electronic copies to: [kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov](mailto:kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov)

EPA-R3CBP- 09-06

## **Section V: Application Review Information**

**A. Evaluation Process:** After EPA reviews proposals for threshold eligibility purposes as described in Section III of this announcement, the Chesapeake Bay Program Office will conduct a merit evaluation of each eligible proposal. Reviews will normally involve teams of professionals from EPA and non-EPA organizations. All reviewers will sign a conflict of interest statement.

### **B. Evaluation Criteria: Maximum Score: 135**

#### **1. Organizational Capability and Program Description:** (Maximum score: 15 points)

Applicants will be evaluated based on the quality of their proposed program and how it demonstrates the ability to achieve the objectives of the Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Program described in Section I.C. In addition, EPA will evaluate the applicants' approach and plan for making subawards including how they will promote competition for subawards, and the applicant's process for evaluating and selecting subawardees, including the criteria to be used to evaluate and select subawardees. Applicants will also be

evaluated based on how well the proposal demonstrates that the applicant has the organizational capacity, experience, travel capabilities and technical and outreach expertise to accomplish the proposed plan of work and is likely to be successful.

## **2. Programmatic Capability and Environmental Results Past Performance Ranking**

**Factor:** (Maximum score: 15 points; each subcriteria is of equal weight)

Applicants will be evaluated based on their programmatic capability to successfully perform the proposed tasks including their: (i) past performance in successfully completing federally and/or non-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 within the last three years (no more than 5, and preferably EPA agreements); (ii) extent and quality to which they adequately documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) under those assistance agreements, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not; (iii) history of meeting reporting requirements on prior or current federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements and submitting acceptable final technical reports under these agreements; and (iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project. In evaluating applicants past performance and reporting history under this criteria, (i, ii, and iii above) the agency will consider the information supplied by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). Applicants with no available or relevant past performance information and/or reporting history will receive a neutral score for those elements of programmatic capability.

## **3. Watershed and Ecosystem Knowledge:** (Maximum score: 10 points)

The degree to which the applicant has knowledge of and direct experience with the technical and policy issues related to the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay watershed and the specific challenges and issues facing the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the following subcriteria, each of which is of equal weight:

- i) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's knowledge of the specific challenges and issues faced in the Chesapeake Bay restoration? (Maximum score: 5 points)
- ii) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate that the applicant has expertise in assembling sustainable, innovative, cost-effective project approaches to accelerating nonpoint source nutrient and sediment load reductions? Examples of expertise could include forming public-private partnerships to approach restoration in a new or entirely different way. (Maximum score: 5 points).

**4. Specific Task Requirements:** (Maximum score: 40 points) Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the following subcriteria, each of which are of equal weight:

- i) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate that the applicant can perform the task requirements of this RFP including the ability to solicit for and manage subagreements that can assemble multiple partners to achieve innovation and provide new knowledge, and disperse the monies to subawardees in a timely fashion? (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- ii) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's ability to establish guidelines for the program, coordinating the review and selection of the grantees with various federal and state partners, and manage, track, and disseminate results from six to eight extensive watershed projects? (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- iii) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's ability to promote the program and assist potential applicants, e.g., present applicant workshops via webcast, etc.? (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- iv) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate both the applicant's ability to ensure the necessary technical assistance to the subgrantees to support on-the-ground activities AND the ability to communicate project results widely to the CBP and its partners? (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- v) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's ability to select and fund projects that accelerate implementation of proven technologies, conservation practices and Best Management Practices (BMPs) by demonstrating strategies that overcome barriers to adoption. These strategies should seek to accelerate adoption of practices that are known to be effective and efficient at reducing or eliminating nutrient and sediment pollution, but that have not been fully implemented throughout the region or within a specific watershed. Barriers may include social and cultural barriers, economic and political barriers, lack of professional acceptance, general lack of awareness or technical assistance, etc? (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- vi) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's ability to select and fund projects that maximize nutrient and sediment reductions through the strategic combinations of BMPs and technologies based upon specific landscape characteristics and land use objectives? (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- vii) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's ability to select and fund projects that support promising new technologies and practices that have shown improved performance in reducing nutrient and sediment pollution over traditional approaches in controlled demonstrations? (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- viii) To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's ability to ensure that the subawards also include a "new knowledge" outcome, as well as a method for transferring the knowledge (i.e., projects should both contribute to cleaning up

the Bay more efficiently and improve the collective knowledge about how the Bay is cleaned up)? (Maximum Score: 5 points)

**5. Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results:** (Maximum score: 15 points)

To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's plan and ability to measure the overall progress for the combined efforts of this grant in achieving the expected environmental results (outcomes and outputs) including those identified in Appendix A and successes and lessons learned of the various watershed management approaches and compile these data and information about success toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes described in Appendix A? In addition, to what degree does the proposal clearly demonstrate the applicant's ability to ensure that effective methodologies are established for tracking and measuring sub-awardee project success, including: successes, lessons learned, and measure of on-the-ground real environmental change?

**6. Subaward Project Selection, Partnering with Stakeholders and Leveraging Resources:** (Maximum score: 20 points) Under this criteria, applicants will be evaluated based on:

- i) the extent to which the proposed program has a methodology for selecting subaward projects that are sustainable, cost effective, innovative, and transferable. (Maximum Score 10 points)
- ii) an ability to partner with the necessary state agencies, watershed organizations, local governments, and other stakeholders to create sustainable, innovative, and transferable actions. (Maximum Score: 5 points)
- iii) the leveraging of other resources that complement activities relevant to the proposed project(s) to achieve the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Program. (Maximum Score: 5 points) (Note: Leveraged funding or other resources need not be for eligible and allowable project costs under the EPA assistance agreement unless the applicant proposes using it to provide a voluntary cost share or match.)

**7. Appropriate and Cost Effective Budget:** (Maximum score: 20 points) To what degree is the proposal cost effective based on the following factors:

- i) administrative cost (see Section E. Funding Restrictions, Administrative Cap Worksheet Under Statutory Authority). Recipients providing a lower administrative cost will score higher. (Maximum Score: 10 points)
- ii) organizational overhead (indirect costs). (Maximum Score: 5 points) and,
- iii) ability to perform the duties within the operational range of budgets provided by the Chesapeake Bay Program. (Maximum Score: 5 points)

**C. Review and Selection Process**

**Review:** The eligible proposals will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in Section V.B above and ranked by a panel of reviewers from EPA and other Federal agencies. The review team will then forward the highest ranked proposal to the Director or Deputy Director, Chesapeake Bay Program Office for final selection.

Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates:

December 23, 2008	Issuance of RFP
February 6, 2009	Proposal Submission Deadline (see section IV for more information)
March 3, 2009	Approximate date for EPA to notify applicants of results
April 3, 2009	Approximate date for Applicant to submit federal cooperative agreement application. Processing of an assistance agreement typically takes 90 days.
July 3, 2009	Approximate date of award

## **Section VI: Award Administration Information**

### **A. Award Notices**

It is expected that applicants will be notified in writing of funding decisions on or around March 3, 2009 either via email or U.S. Postal Service. Notification of selection does not indicate that the applicant can start work on the project. The selected applicants will then be asked to submit a full federal assistance agreement application package. A Federal project officer provides assistance in the application process and negotiates a work plan, budget, and starting date. Processing of the cooperative agreement award generally takes 90 days.

### **B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements**

If your proposal is selected, the following information will be helpful in preparing your cooperative agreement application.

**Disputes Resolution Process:** 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) that can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/resolution.htm>. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting Veronica Kuczynski by email at [kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov](mailto:kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov) or fax at 410-267-5777.

**DUNS Requirement:** Applicants are required to provide a Dunn and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number when applying for Federal assistance agreements. A DUNS number must be included in every application. The DUNS number must be included in Block 5 of the Standard Form 424 entitled, Application for Federal Assistance (Rev. 9-03). Organizations can receive a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711. Additional information on obtaining a DUNS number can also be found at: <http://www.dnb.com>

**Indirect Costs:** If indirect costs are budgeted in the assistance application and the non-profit organization or educational institute does not have a previously established indirect cost rate, it will need to prepare and submit an indirect cost rate proposal and/or cost allocation plan in accordance with the appropriate Federal cost principle, OMB Circular A-122, "Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations" or OMB Circular A-21, "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions" within ninety (90) days from the effective date of the award.

If a local government does not have a previously established indirect cost rate, it will need to prepare its indirect cost rate proposal and/or cost allocation plan in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, "Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments." The local government recipient whose cognizant Federal agency has been designated by OMB must develop and submit its indirect cost rate proposal to its cognizant agency within six (6) months after the close of the governmental unit's fiscal year. If the cognizant Federal agency has not been identified by the OMB, the local government recipient must still develop (and when required, submit) its proposal within that period.

**EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans and Quality Assurance Plans:** In accordance with 40 CFR 30.54 and 31.45, projects that include the generation or use of environmental data are required to submit a Quality Management Plan (QMP) and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).

The QMP must document quality assurance policies and practices that are sufficient to produce data of adequate quality to meet program objectives. The QMP should be prepared in accordance with EPA QA/R-2: EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans (refer to <http://www.epa.gov/region03/chesapeake/grants.htm>, Attachment 7). The recipient's QMP should be reviewed and updated annually as needed. The QMP must be submitted to the EPA Project Officer at least 45 days prior to the initiation of data collection or data compilation.

The recipient must develop and implement quality assurance and quality control procedures, specifications and documentation that are sufficient to produce data of adequate quality to meet project objectives. The Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) is the document that provides comprehensive details about the quality assurance/quality control requirements and technical activities that must be implemented to ensure that project objectives are met. The QAPP should be prepared in accordance with EPA QA/R-5: EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans. The QAPP must be submitted to the EPA Project Officer at least 30 days prior to the initiation of data collection or data compilation. Requirements for QAPPs can be found at [http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qa\\_docs.html](http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qa_docs.html).

**Federal Requirements:** An applicant whose proposal is selected for federal funding must complete additional forms prior to award (see 40 CFR 30.12 and 31.10). EPA reserves the right to negotiate and/or adjust the final cooperative agreement amount and work plan content prior to award consistent with Agency policies.

**Deliverables:** Awarded applicant will be required to provide a chart or list of deliverables, providing items and dates due.

**Pre-Award Administrative Capability Review for Non-Profit Organizations:** Non-profit applicants that are recommended for funding under this announcement are subject to pre-award administrative capability reviews consistent with Section 8b, 8c and 9d of EPA Order 5700.8 - Policy on Assessing Capabilities of Non-Profit Applicants for Managing Assistance Awards ([http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700\\_8.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700_8.pdf)). In addition, non-profit applicants that qualify for funding may, depending on the size of the award, will be required to fill out and submit to the Grants Management Office the Administrative Capabilities Form with supporting documents contained in Appendix A of EPA Order 5700.8.

The Order, in Section 7(c), defines non-profit organizations as any corporation, trust, association, cooperative, or other organization which: (1) is operated primary for scientific, education, service, charitable or similar purposes in the public interest; (2) is not organized primarily for profit; (3) uses its net proceeds to maintain, improve, and/or expand its operations; and (4) is subject to 40 CFR Part 30. The term does not include: colleges and universities as defined under Office of Management Budget (OMB) Circular A-21; State, local and federally-recognized Indian Tribal governments; hospitals; and organizations considered as similar to concerns under Attachment C to OMB Circular A-122.

**Incurred Costs:** Costs eligible for federal grant funding cannot be incurred prior to the effective date of the cooperative agreement between the applicant and EPA. Funding eligibility ends on the date specified in the award. The time expended and costs incurred in either the development of the proposal or the final assistance application, or in any subsequent discussions or negotiations prior to the award, are neither reimbursable nor recognizable as part of the recipient's cost share.

### **C. Reporting**

Quarterly or semiannual progress reports, as determined by the Federal project officer, will be required as a condition of this award.

## **Section VII: Agency Contact**

For administrative and technical issues regarding this RFP, please contact Veronica Kuczynski via email at: [kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov](mailto:kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov). All questions must be received in writing via email or fax at 215-267-5777 with the reference line referring to this RFP (RE: EPA-R3CBP- 09-06). All questions and answers will be posted on <http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm>.

## **Section VIII: Other Information**

In developing your proposal, you may find the following documents helpful. Websites for guidance documents are listed here. If you prefer a paper copy, please call 1-800-YOUR BAY.

An electronic copy of the *Chesapeake 2000* agreement is located at:  
<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/c2k.htm>

Electronic copy of the *Chesapeake Bay Program Guidance for Data Management* is located at <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/pubs/grantguidance/CIMSPOL2001.PDF>

EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans and Quality Assurance Plans: Requirements for quality assurance plans are defined in EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QA/R-5). These documents are located at [http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qa\\_docs.htm](http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qa_docs.htm).

Please visit the EPA Grants website at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd> if you have questions about grant issues such as costs or eligibility.

An electronic copy of the *Chesapeake Bay Program Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance* is located at <http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm>.

Additional questions about grant issues such as cost or eligibility can be obtained on the following websites: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd> or <http://www.epagov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm> for EPA Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance. For questions pertaining to the task and/or general questions, please refer to Section VII: Agency Contact.

Further information on Chesapeake Bay Program committees can be located at <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/committee.htm>.

**Appendix A**  
**Proposal Format**  
**Chesapeake Bay Program Office Fiscal Year 2009 Request for Proposals (RFP) for the**  
**Development and Implementation of a**  
**Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Program**  
**EPA-R3CBP- 09-06**

The following information must be provided or the proposal may not be considered complete and may not be evaluated.

**Format:** Proposals shall not exceed twelve single spaced pages. The proposal must be submitted on 8 ½" x 11" paper and font size should be no smaller than 10. Note that the twelve pages must include all supporting materials, including resumes or curriculum vitae and letters of support. With the exception of documentation of non-profit status and the SF-424, if the proposal includes more than twelve pages, the additional pages will be discarded and not considered in the review. Applicant's responses should be numbered and submitted according to the format listed below.

**1. Name, address (street and email), and contact information of the applicant**

**2. Background** - Include the following in this section:

- i) Brief description of your organization.
- ii) Documentation of non-profit status, if applicable.
- iii) Brief biographies of applicant lead(s) including resumes and/or curriculum vitae.

**3. Clear, concise narrative** of (1) the applicant's qualifications and proposal of activities and approaches to address needs stated in this RFP, and (2) explanation of how your organization is qualified to perform this work. You can include a curriculum vitae or resume of the principal investigators in Section 2, Background. These must be included in the twelve pages maximum for the proposal.

**4. Work plan** - Include the following in this section:

- i) Provide a clear, concise narrative of how your organization will meet the objectives of the Program described in Section I. C., develop and implement the Program, perform the tasks listed below and explain how the Program will support the mission of your organization. Tasks to be performed by the grant recipient include, but are not limited to the following:
  - Provide subawards to eligible entities through a competitive process that treats all entities fairly.
  - Establish guidelines and parameters for the program that: promote competition for the subawards through publicizing the subaward opportunities; define a process for evaluating and selecting subawardees,

including the criteria to be used to evaluate and select subawardees; and fund and track up to eight watershed-based projects.

- Present workshop(s) in central, geographic locations in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to advertise the program and assist potential applicants.
- Assess the programmatic capability of the subaward recipients.
- Provide hands-on technical assistance to support the implementation of the subaward projects.
- Disperse monies to subaward recipients in a timely manner.
- Qualitatively and quantitatively measure environmental results and successes of the subaward projects, compile the data and information, and communicate them to the CBP partnership.
- Select and fund projects that accelerate implementation of proven technologies, conservation practices and Best Management Practices (BMPs) by demonstrating strategies that overcome barriers to adoption. These strategies should seek to accelerate adoption of practices that are known to be effective and efficient at reducing or eliminating nutrient and sediment pollution, but that have not been fully implemented throughout the region or within a specific watershed. Barriers may include social and cultural barriers, economic and political barriers, lack of professional acceptance, general lack of awareness or technical assistance, etc.
- Select and fund projects that maximize nutrient and sediment reductions through the strategic combinations of BMPs and technologies based upon specific landscape characteristics and land use objectives. Such system-based, holistic approaches should strive to dramatically decrease or eliminate nutrient and sediment runoff and/or improve cost-effectiveness when compared to a practice-by-practice approach. For projects addressing urban run-off, the scale should be the neighborhood, subdivision, community or small watershed scale and may include new development, redevelopment or retrofit projects. For projects addressing agriculture, the scale should be the whole farm or small watershed scale.
- Select and fund projects that support promising new technologies and practices that have shown improved performance in reducing nutrient and sediment pollution over traditional approaches in controlled demonstrations. Projects should reach new target audiences, demonstrate the technology or practice in a new region, and/or develop programs to accelerate widespread adoption. Such demonstrations should be designed to provide projections of nutrient and sediment reductions associated with implementation of the technology or practice in a range of scenarios.



- amount of nitrogen, phosphorus, and/or sediment (in pounds) reduced or prevented from entering the tidal waters of the Chesapeake Bay.
- stormwater runoff reduction of peak flows, total volume, and flow duration, based on before- and after-project measurements
- recovery of healthy aquatic life in nearby surface waters based on before- and after-project measurements
- cost savings resulting from project implementation.
- improved collective knowledge about how the Bay is cleaned up; resulting in reduction in the amount of nutrients in the CB and an improvement in living resources of the Bay.

**5. Programmatic Capability and Environmental Results Past Performance:** See below.

**6. Review Criteria:** Address in narrative form each of the following review criteria as identified in Section V.B. (Identify by the review criteria number and title followed by your narrative.)

**APPENDIX B**

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY -- REGION III**  
**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COST CAP WORKSHEET**  
**SPECIFICALLY FOR**

Chesapeake Bay Program Office Fiscal Year 2009 Request for Proposals (RFP) for the  
Development and Implementation of a  
Chesapeake Bay Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Program  
**EPA-R3CBP- 09-06**

EPA Assistance No. (if known): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant/Recipient: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS: In accordance with Section 117(d)(4) and 117(e)(6) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and this RFP, the costs of salaries and fringe benefits incurred in administering a grant under Section 117 of the CWA shall not exceed 5 percent of the annual Federal grant award. In order to ensure compliance with this requirement, complete this form or a form containing similar information and submit it to EPA with your Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) and with your annual Financial Status Report (SF-269 or SF-269A).

Federal grant amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Cap % X .05

**Limit on Administrative Costs** \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (a)

List Administrative Costs:  
(Budgeted costs for application or actual costs for FSR)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Total** \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (b)

**Line (b) cannot exceed Line (a).**

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B (con't)

### COMPLIANCE WITH CWA SECTION 117 RESTRICTING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

#### Statutory Authority

Under statutory authority, grantees applying for Chesapeake Bay Program grants/cooperative agreements under Section 117 must adhere to the requirement in the Clean Water Act, Section 117 C “Administrative Costs.” This section requires a 10 percent cap for administrative costs.

**NOTE: A determination has been made for grantees applying under this RFP, the administrative cost shall not exceed 5 percent.**

Under Section 117(a)(1) Administrative Cost - The term “administrative cost” means the cost of salaries and fringe benefits incurred in administering a grant under this section.

Under Section 117(d)(4) - Administrative Costs. - Administrative costs shall not exceed 5 percent of the annual grant award.

#### Guidance for Determining Administrative Costs

As determined by EPA/CBPO, the following provides guidance in determining administrative costs for grants/cooperative agreements under Section 117 of the Clean Water Act.

#### 1. Administrative Costs

Salaries and fringe benefits charged against the project or program element for the sole purpose of administering the grant/cooperative agreements shall not exceed 5% of the annual Federal grant. One hundred percent of the salaries and fringe benefits related to these functions are considered administrative costs. Examples of administrative costs include, but are not limited to:

- preparation and submission of grant applications
- fiscal tracking of grants funds
- maintaining project files
- collection and submission of deliverables

#### 2. Non-administrative Costs

Salaries and fringe benefits related to the implementation of the project or program element of the grant/cooperative agreement are not considered administrative costs. None of the salaries and fringe benefit costs related to these functions shall be considered administrative costs. Example:

- the salaries and fringe benefits for technical staff to conduct work to accomplish specific Bay Program goals as outlined in the program or project elements are not administrative costs.

#### 3. Calculation of Administrative Costs

The EPA Region III Grants Office has prepared a worksheet to be completed by the States for calculating their 5 percent limit on administrative costs for Chesapeake Bay Program grants/cooperative agreements. States must complete the attached Chesapeake Bay Administrative Cap Worksheet or a form containing similar information and submit to EPA with the Application for Federal Assistance (SF424) and with their annual Financial Status Report (SF269 and SF269A).

#### 4. Questions Regarding Administrative Costs

The grantees shall direct questions to the EPA Project Officer who will determine what costs should be included as administrative costs on a case-by-case basis.