

**AGENCY:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

**TITLE:** Chesapeake Bay Program Office Fiscal Year 2018 Request for Proposals for Geospatial Analysis Support for Implementation of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement's Goals and Outcomes

**ANNOUNCEMENT TYPE:** Request for Proposals (RFP)

**RFP NUMBER:** EPA-R3-CBP-18-02

**CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE (CFDA) NUMBER: 66.466**

### **IMPORTANT DATES**

02/13/2018	Issuance of RFP
04/16/2018	Proposal Submission Deadline (see Section IV for more information)
05/31/2018	Approximate date for EPA to notify applicants of results
06/25/2018	Approximate date for applicant to submit federal cooperative agreement application
08/09/2018	Approximate date of award

EPA will consider all proposals that are submitted via Grants.gov on or before 11:59 pm EST on **April 16, 2018**. Any proposals submitted after the due date and time will not be considered for funding. No proposals will be accepted by facsimile or e-mail. EPA will only accept proposals submitted via Grants.gov, except in limited circumstances where applicants have no or very limited Internet access (see section IV.).

### **SUMMARY**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Chesapeake Bay Program Office (CBPO) is announcing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for applicants to provide the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) partners with a proposal for providing geospatial analysis support for the CBP partnership in support of the targeted implementation of actions in support of reaching the goals and outcomes of the 2014 *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement*. Proposals will also provide for technical support for of the implementation of the jurisdictions' Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) and implementation of the most cost-effective, efficient, and targeted nutrient and sediment reduction actions for the protection and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed. CBP partners include federal agencies, seven watershed jurisdictions, and many non-federal organizations; however, work funded under this RFP will support the seven watershed jurisdictions and other non-federal partners. The seven watershed jurisdictions are Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

**FUNDING/AWARDS:** This RFP will cover the project period up to and including six years from an expected start date of **August 09, 2018**. EPA CBPO plans to award from one to four cooperative agreements under this RFP.

The total estimated funding for six years is approximately \$540,000 to \$3,900,000 per activity with an estimated \$90,000 to \$650,000 available for the first year and each additional year per activity. However, it should be noted that these ranges are a broad representation of all the activities combined, and specific funding ranges may vary by activity as noted in this RFP. Therefore, applicants should refer to each specific activity for the actual funding amount when developing its proposal(s). There is no guarantee of funding throughout this period or beyond.

Applicants may apply for any or all of the four activities. Applicants may apply for more than one of the activities described in Section I.B but can only submit one application per activity. Each application must be separately submitted. Each application must address only one activity. If an applicant submits more than one application per activity, EPA will contact the applicant to determine which one to review.

## **FULL TEXT OF ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **I. Funding Opportunity Description**

### **II. Award Information**

### **III. Eligibility Information**

### **IV. Proposal and Submission Information**

### **V. Proposal Review Information**

### **VI. Award Administration Information**

### **VII. Agency Contacts**

### **VIII. Other Information (Appendices)**

## **I: FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION**

### **A. Background**

#### ***1. About the Chesapeake Bay Program***

The Chesapeake Bay is North America's largest and most biologically diverse estuary. A resource of extraordinary productivity, it is worthy of the highest levels of protection and restoration. Authorized by Section 117 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. Section 1267, the Chesapeake Bay Program is responsible for supporting the Chesapeake Executive Council through a number of actions, including the coordination of federal, state, and local efforts to restore and protect living resources and water quality of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed. Section 117 also authorizes EPA to provide assistance grants to support the goals of the program.

The Chesapeake Bay Program is a unique regional partnership that has led and directed the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay since 1983. The CBP partners include the states of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; the District of Columbia; the Chesapeake Bay Commission, a tri-state legislative body; EPA, representing the federal government; and participating citizen, local government, and scientific and technical advisory groups.

The Chesapeake Bay Program partnership (the Partnership) is guided at the direction of the Chesapeake Executive Council (Executive Council), which, through its leadership, establishes

the policy direction for the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed and exerts its leadership to rally public support for Chesapeake Bay and watershed restoration and protection and signs directives, agreements, and amendments that set goals and guide policy for Chesapeake Bay and watershed restoration and protection.

The Principals' Staff Committee acts as the senior policy advisors to the Executive Council, accepting items for their consideration and approval and setting agendas for Executive Council meetings. The Principals' Staff Committee also provides policy and program direction to the Management Board.

The Management Board provides strategic planning, priority setting, and operational guidance through implementation of a comprehensive, coordinated, accountable implementation strategy for the Chesapeake Bay Program. It directs and coordinates all of the Goal Implementation Teams (GITs) and their respective workgroups.

The membership of the GITs and the Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting Team include federal and non-federal experts from throughout the watershed. Thus, academic experts, advocacy organizations, and others become active members of the broad Chesapeake Bay and watershed restoration and protection partnership.

Pursuant to Clean Water Act Section 117(b)(2), 33 U.S.C. Section 1267 (b)(2), the Chesapeake Bay Program Office is the office within EPA charged with providing support to the Executive Council in the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay Program Office and Chesapeake Bay Program, both mentioned above, are two distinct entities.

## **2. 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement and Executive Order 13508**

On June 16, 2014, the Chesapeake Executive Council, the Chesapeake Bay Program's governing body signed a new voluntary Chesapeake Bay agreement (referred to as *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement* throughout this RFP) that will guide the CBP partnership's work into the future. For the first time, Delaware, New York, and West Virginia signed the agreement as full CBP partners in the overall effort. This agreement is one of the most comprehensive restoration plans developed for the Chesapeake Bay region, providing greater transparency and accountability of all CBP partners. With 10 interrelated goals and 31 outcomes, this watershed-wide accord advances the restoration, conservation, and protection of all the lands and waters within the 64,000-square-mile watershed by promoting sound land use, environmental literacy, stewardship, and a diversity of engaged citizens. Additionally, the goals and outcomes aim to better protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay's living resources, water quality, and vital habitats. The *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement* also recognizes the unique and vital role local governments play and how they are essential to the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed.

The cooperative agreement(s) to be awarded under this announcement will help support all of the goals in the *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement* and further the following principles as stated in the Agreement: operate with transparency in program decisions, policies, actions and reporting to strengthen public confidence in our efforts, adaptively manage at all levels of the partnership to foster continuous

improvement, and engage citizens to increase the number and diversity of people who support and carry out the conservation, protection and restoration activities necessary to achieve the goals and outcomes of the *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement*.

### ***3. The Chesapeake Bay TMDL, WIPs, and the Midpoint Assessment***

The EPA has established the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), a historic and comprehensive “pollution diet” with rigorous accountability measures to initiate sweeping actions to restore clean water to the Chesapeake Bay and the watershed’s streams, creeks and rivers.

The Chesapeake Bay TMDL – the largest ever developed by EPA – identifies the necessary pollution reductions of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment across Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia and sets pollution limits necessary to meet applicable state water quality standards in Chesapeake Bay, its tidal tributaries and embayments. These pollution limits were further divided by jurisdiction and major river basin based on state-of-the-art modeling tools, extensive monitoring data, peer-reviewed science and close interaction with jurisdictional partners.

Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) are plans for how each of the seven Chesapeake Bay watershed jurisdictions (jurisdictions), in partnership with federal and local governments, will achieve their respective Chesapeake Bay TMDL allocations and planning targets. The Phase I WIPs were developed in 2010 by the jurisdictions to inform the 2010 Chesapeake Bay TMDL waste load and load allocations. The Phase II WIPs were developed in 2012 by the jurisdictions to meet nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment planning targets based on updated information generated through CBP Partnership’s Phase 5.3.2 Chesapeake Bay watershed model. The goal of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and supporting jurisdictional WIP process is to implement by 2025 all nutrient and sediment pollutant load reduction and prevention measures needed to fully restore water quality in Chesapeake Bay and its tidal rivers.

EPA expects practices in place by 2017 to meet 60 percent of the necessary reductions, and the partnership is conducting a Chesapeake Bay TMDL Midpoint Assessment to review progress and adjust nutrient and sediment goals if necessary. The CBP Partnership is currently updating and reviewing the latest science, data, models, and decision support tools to be used in estimating progress in nutrient and sediment pollutant load reductions. Phase III WIPs will be developed by jurisdictions based on a midpoint assessment of progress and new information provided by the Phase 6 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model and related updates of the Chesapeake Bay Airshed Models and the Chesapeake Water Quality and Sediment Transport Model. The Phase III WIPs will provide information on actions the seven watershed jurisdictions intend to implement between 2018 and 2025 to meet their respective Chesapeake Bay TMDL goals.

### ***4. Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership’s Environmental Models***

Models of the Chesapeake Bay’s airshed, watershed, estuary, and living resources have been developed by the partners and linked together over the past 30 years. The CBP partnership’s suite of models assists in understanding the important processes affecting the health of the watershed and the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. These modeling tools provide the Chesapeake Bay watershed state and local jurisdictions with an understanding of the effect of various control

strategies on pollutant levels and the level of nutrient and sediment load reductions needed to restore the Chesapeake Bay and achieve the states' water quality standards for dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll *a*, underwater bay grasses and water clarity. By quantifying the management actions necessary to restore Chesapeake Bay habitats and the living resources dependent on those habitats, these integrated CBP partnership models provide guidance to environmental managers and citizens on where the most cost-effective reductions can be made so that controls are equitable and broadly supported.

Development and application of the next generation of Chesapeake Bay models will require an unprecedented level of direct involvement of a wide array of non-federal CBP partners and stakeholders in each step of the planning, development, calibration, verification, management application, and continued refinement/enhancement. Given that Bay restoration decision-making occurs at a very local scale as a result of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, the jurisdictions' WIPs, and the greatly expanded level of accountability, the next generation of the partnership's Chesapeake Bay models must reflect these shifts in scale and accountability. These models must be developed for direct application by state and local jurisdictional partners, academic partners, and stakeholders alike, feeding directly into their respective and unique decision-making processes and supporting adaptive management at all scales.

Through the application of airshed, watershed, estuarine, and living resource modeling activities, the CBP's state and local jurisdictional partners gain access to information that is used directly in decision-making for Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration efforts. Chesapeake Bay environmental models are developed, calibrated, verified, and applied through an expanding cooperative network of state, federal, regional and local agencies, non-governmental organizations, and academic institutional partners. These partnership models help set the pace and direction of Chesapeake Bay restoration by providing information on water quality and biological resource responses to different management actions.

### ***5. Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership's Monitoring Networks***

Undergoing adaptive changes over the past three decades as the partnership's management needs and requests have significantly evolved over time, the Chesapeake Bay tidal monitoring network now includes: tidal water quality monitoring for 26 parameters at over 150 stations distributed over the 92 Chesapeake Bay tidal segments across Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; shallow-water monitoring addressing a select set of segments on a rotational basis; benthic infaunal community monitoring at fixed and random stations across the tidal waters; annual aerial and ground surveys of underwater Bay grasses; decadal records of phytoplankton and zooplankton monitoring; and fisheries independent population monitoring programs and surveys.

Each component of the tidal monitoring network has been designed to support the decision making of the four Bay jurisdictions' tidal water Clean Water Act Section 303(d) listing determinations,-- addressing dissolved oxygen, water clarity, underwater bay grasses, and chlorophyll *a* criteria attainment assessments and benthic infaunal community-based impairment decisions. The Chesapeake Bay tidal monitoring network is funded, operated, and maintained through a longstanding state-federal-university partnership that produced the fundamental monitoring data supporting Chesapeake Bay TMDL development. This data is also utilized in

public reporting on the health of Chesapeake Bay, its tidal tributaries and embayments, and supporting ecosystem; assessment of achieving the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions' Chesapeake Bay water quality standards regulations; evaluation of the effectiveness of actions to reduce nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment pollution loadings from the surrounding watershed; developing, calibrating, verifying and applying models; and generating and reporting water quality and living resource indicators.

The Chesapeake Bay watershed monitoring network is a network of 115 streamflow gauges and water-quality sampling sites operated across the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The network is an essential component to reporting, tracking, and modeling stream flow as well as nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment concentrations and loads across the Chesapeake Bay watershed as it provides the only consistent, coordinated monitoring effort across all seven Chesapeake Bay watershed jurisdictions.

The Chesapeake Bay watershed monitoring network is designed to measure the discharge of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment loads with routine samples collected monthly with additional storm-event samples to obtain a range of discharges and loadings. The seven jurisdictions, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) all use the same set of standardized CBP protocols that are based on USGS sampling methods and EPA-approved analytical methods.

#### ***6. Chesapeake Bay Watershed-wide Land Cover Data***

Accurate land use and land cover information is one of the most important spatial datasets needed for environmental management in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Used for everything from ecological habitat mapping to tracking development trends, land use and land cover data play a central part of the CBP partnership's modeling and management efforts. Existing land use and land cover datasets, such as the National Land Cover Dataset, have proven extremely useful in identifying priority watersheds in need of conservation and restoration. However, these data often lack the resolution needed to track fine-scale trends in land conversion or make field-scale decisions about where to focus land conservation actions, habitat restoration projects, or pollutant reducing efforts to maximize water quality benefits while protecting critical habitats.

To help provide the CBP federal, state, and local partners with the level of detailed land cover data needed, the Partnership supported a basinwide effort to acquire, interpret and map high resolution land cover across the entire Chesapeake Bay watershed. The result was the acquisition of a consistent high resolution, extremely accurate land cover dataset for all of the counties that comprise the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Using publicly available aerial imagery from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Agriculture Imagery Program, and LiDAR elevation data from states and the US. Geological Survey, a scalable and replicable methodology was used to generate land classification datasets with a resolution of 1 meter and an overall accuracy that was close to 95 percent. The aerial imagery was segmented and classified into eight classes.

#### **B. Scope of Work**

This RFP is soliciting cost-effective proposals from eligible applicants to provide technical analysis and programmatic evaluation support of non-federal agencies and organizations that are members of the CBP partnership. While the CBP partnership is comprised of federal and non-federal agencies and organizations, the activities funded under this RFP shall only support the non-federal partners. The recipient(s) of the cooperative agreement(s) awarded under this RFP may work directly with federal agencies, but the nature and principal purpose of that work will result only in direct benefit to the non-federal agencies, organizations, partners, and the general public. The non-federal partners of the CBP will provide programmatic direction to the cooperative agreement recipient(s) through the CBP partnership's Water Quality, Habitat and Stewardship Goal Implementation Teams and their respective workgroups, the CBP partnership's Scientific, Technical, Assessment and Reporting Team and its workgroups, and the CBP partnership's Management Board.

The U.S. EPA CBPO plans to award from one to four cooperative agreements under this RFP to an organization or organizations oriented towards providing highly specialized scientific, technical, and programmatic support. The selected organization or organizations will support the CBP's mission of taking actions necessary to achieve the goals and outcomes of the 2014 *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement*. This mission also includes:

- Building the capacity for targeting implementation of the most cost-effective and efficient pollution reduction practices and technologies, working directly with federal, state, regional, and local governmental and non-governmental implementation efforts;
- Building the capacity for targeting implementation of the most cost-effective and efficient habitat restoration and land conservation practices and approaches working directly with federal, state, regional, and local governmental and non-governmental implementation efforts;
- Enhancing the capabilities of state, local and non-profit partners to track, verify and report on practices providing nutrient and sediment pollutant load reductions as well as other benefits for estuarine and watershed restoration; and
- Expanding the development, acquisition, maintenance, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of geospatial data and information important to the on-the-ground implementation actions being taken by CBP partners.

The proposing organization should be oriented towards supporting the collaborative enhancement of the capacity of regional, state and local agencies and organizations to implement practices, restore habitats and conserve lands and working within the partnership-oriented, implementation-focused structure of the CBP. The above areas of emphasis need not be the sole missions of the proposing organization.

The total estimated funding for six years is approximately \$540,000 to \$3,900,000 per activity with an estimated \$90,000 to \$650,000 available for the first year and each additional year per activity. EPA makes no commitment of annual funding amounts for any fiscal year(s), as funds may be limited based on funding availability, satisfactory performance, Agency priorities, and other applicable considerations.

If your organization has an interest in this project, has the skills to accomplish the activities, and is eligible to receive a federal assistance agreement as described in Section III of this announcement, we encourage you to submit a proposal(s). Each eligible proposal will be evaluated using the criteria described in Section V. The activities are multi-year projects, so the proposal should have a work plan, budget, and budget detail for the first and all subsequent years.

For a proposal to be considered eligible for funding, substantive project-related work included in the proposal must take place within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, which includes portions of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, and all of the District of Columbia. The activities identified below are covered under this announcement.

Applicants may apply for more than one of the activities described in Section I.B but can only submit one application per activity. Each application must be separately submitted. Each application must address only one activity. If an applicant submits more than one application per activity, then EPA will contact the applicant to determine which one to review.

Each application must address each item identified under each activity.

### **Activity 1: Long-term Land Cover/Land Use Monitoring Program Development and Implementation**

**Estimated Funding: \$350,000-650,000 per year**

#### **Updating the Phase 6 High-resolution Land Cover and Land Use Datasets**

Remapping the Chesapeake Bay watershed's high-resolution land cover data will require a multi-year effort, and will include up-front investments in long-term, monitoring-plan development and project preparation through data dissemination and public outreach. Year 1 should be focused on addressing the recommendations in *Lessons Learned from the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership's High-Resolution Land Cover Classification Project* report, setting the specifications for both the land cover and land use products, conducting outreach to promote the project, acquiring ancillary data, etc. Years 2-3 should focus on imagery acquisition and data preparation with continued outreach to counties and states. Years 3-4 should include production, review, and quality assurance/quality control of both land cover and land use data. Years 5-6 should include additional outreach via webinars, workshops, and email updates, as well as planning for subsequent future land cover/use updates.

#### **Watershed-wide Stakeholder Outreach and Local Data Collection**

Another essential component of CBP's mapping efforts will include a prioritization of outreach to local and state governments before, during, and after land cover and land use mapping. This will allow stakeholders to be more engaged throughout the data creation process, cultivate a network of users who are invested in the resultant products, and provide time for collecting ancillary data and integrating feedback into the final product. Ancillary data will include those data needed to improve the land cover/use classification and forecasting land use change, e.g., local land use, sewer service areas, parcels, and zoning. More recommendations can be found in *Lessons Learned from the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership's High-Resolution Land Cover Classification Project* report. This work should also leverage and expand the extensive



independent reviews, partnership reviews, feedback and communication infrastructure that was sought throughout the entire process for development of the Partnership's Phase 6 land cover and land use data sets.

### **Change Detection and Landscape Monitoring**

Building upon significant research and funding invested in understanding the various modeling possibilities for detecting landscape changes, the Partnership is seeking the creation of a faster, less labor-intensive, and more efficient monitoring workflow that would identify hotspots where land cover change has occurred and flag them for more time-intensive land cover updates that would augment the Chesapeake Bay High-resolution Land Cover Dataset. In this way, the land cover could be updated on an interim basis every one to two years, between the wall-to-wall classification high-resolution change detection and land cover mapping. The Partnership seeks insights into the use of satellite imagery at the 4-10-meter and 30-meter resolution as well as higher-resolution imagery or Lidar data to evaluate change at a level of precision relevant to county and small-watershed-scale decisions. Such techniques can be used to create spatially- and temporally-accurate information that will improve capacity to monitor landscape changes. Efforts should be invested in understanding the role of alternative approaches to change detection and landscape monitoring, as well as in the identification of reliable accuracy-assessment methodologies, plans for setting a refresh rate for data products, and the selection of the best source data for change detection and mapping.

### **Continued Innovation in Delivery of Land Cover/Land Use Data and Change Detection**

The Partnership is seeking continued work towards automating the remote sensing portion of land cover data production and change detection recognizing that manual corrections will still need to be applied to the automated output. The CBP is seeking workflows that could be made less expensive or time-consuming through computational advances and streamlining. From creating the base land cover classification product to streamlining the further watershed-wide land use mapping work, topics to investigate could include the number of classes that automation processes can accurately map, the ability to detect landscape changes of different types, the possibility of automated land cover updates, and manual correction workflows that are more efficient and cost-effective.

### **Activity 2: Hydrology Mapping Supporting Targeted Restoration and Protection Implementation Actions**

**Estimated Funding: \$100,000- \$200,000 per year**

#### **Roadside Ditch Mapping**

In 2017, the CBP commissioned research into methods for mapping the extent of the roadside ditch network in two Pennsylvania counties: York and Lancaster. This investment produced a methodology as well as a roadside ditch network dataset for the pilot areas (October 2017 report entitled *Lidar-based roadside ditch mapping in York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania*). Many steps could be taken to expand and improve upon the workflow. One of these would be for the Chesapeake Bay Roadside Ditch Management Team to agree on a geospatial definition for ditches. Furthermore, the pilot methods described above rely on the use of visually-determined rather than statistically-derived thresholds for mapping roadside ditches. This approach would not be scalable across the watershed as it would rely on a trained analyst to visually inspect

possible roadside ditches for the entire area of the Chesapeake Bay watershed and set thresholds to capture the ditch extents while minimizing errors. To aid in the development of an automated or semi-automated approach, fieldwork should be conducted to create a ground-truthed dataset that documents the full extent (i.e. from start of ditch to end of ditch) of a number of ditches of varying depths, widths, and bank slopes for each of the six watershed states. Research should be conducted comparing the extents of the field-surveyed ditches to those of remotely-sensed ditches to establish a scalable and automated/semi-automated approach for roadside ditch mapping. If Bay states were to request, the awarded entity shall have the capacity to apply the methodology to agricultural ditches in defined areas identified by the state(s).

### **Chesapeake Bay Hydrology Mapping**

In June 2018, the CBP Land Use Work Group will receive a methodology and sample data for mapping hydrologic channels throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed at a 1:2000 - 1:2500 scale. The workflow will rely on direct detection methods and regional thresholds for GIS-based terrain layers; thresholds will be adapted to different physiographic regions and local conditions so that geographic variations in channel initiation are incorporated. The Partnership's goal is to improve upon the resolution of the National Hydrography Dataset, as well as current Lidar-based methods that rely on constant contributing area thresholds and overestimate the extent of low-order channels. While sample data may be limited to the 14 small watersheds already examined, the methodology will need to be applied more broadly, across the Chesapeake Bay watershed, where Lidar data of sufficient quality are available. An accuracy assessment and quality control effort will need to be developed and applied to the final product.

### **Activity 3: BMP Planning and Reporting Program Area** **Estimated Funding: \$100,000- \$200,000 per year**

#### **Best Management Practices and Benefit Quantification**

High-resolution land cover and hydrology data open many new possibilities for siting the placement of Best Management Practices (BMPs), optimization of the selection of BMPs, enabling a pay-for-performance restoration crediting system, and for developing a system to credit land conservation. However, there is a need to document and research the role of high-resolution datasets in developing these targeting, optimization, accounting and crediting systems. Additionally, with the availability of parcel-scale spatial information gained through the high-resolution land cover product, planners need to understand if and/or how this magnification will impact existing models for selecting and crediting projects. They also need information about the limitations of the high-resolution land cover, including the presence of noise and errors in the datasets.

The Partnership is seeking expert technical support and coordination with state and federal science agencies in exploring the many possible applications of the land cover data in planning for the implementation, verification, and evaluation of the effectiveness of BMPs. Examples include the quantification of restoration opportunities across categories of BMPs, i.e. available acreage for riparian buffer restoration throughout the watershed or land cover composition within drainage areas of existing buffers. Another example is the prioritization, based on variables like drainage area size and land cover composition, of restoration opportunities for various BMPs. Currently, these prioritizations and assessments are being developed on an *ad hoc* basis;

therefore, the Partnership is seeking support in the collaborative development and watershed-wide application of such priority applications identified by the Partnership.

### **Integrating and Standardizing Basinwide and Local BMP Tracking and Reporting**

Because of barriers associated with reporting BMP projects, localities forego opportunities to gain credit for restoration practices; states often struggle to manage and verify BMP reports from counties or municipalities; and CBP partners ultimately lack spatial knowledge of specific restoration projects. Building from the existing BMP tracking, verification and reporting systems developed and approved by the CBP partnership over the past three decades, the Partnership is seeking technical support to take greater advantage of both the opportunities afforded by high-resolution land cover and other elevation and hydrologic data as well as other BMP tracking and reporting tools in use across the watershed. Solutions like using a platform with a customizable user interface and a standardized back-end would enable stakeholders at each of these scales to work more efficiently toward Bay restoration goals the Partnership is seeking. Such enhancements to the existing BMP tracking and reporting system would need to be constructed with minimal reporting inputs and be flexible enough to accommodate local reporting requirements. Beyond basic fields, reporting specifications should differentiate based on a user's login. In other words, state-by-state, the reported information could be tailored. From the back-end, CBP staff could see all of the BMP projects reported across the watershed while users with state or county logins would see all BMPs within their respective jurisdictions. This would make reporting, monitoring, and verification of projects easier. Such solutions would also need to address privacy concerns for agricultural conservation practices.

The Partnership is seeking opportunities for the further integration of its decision support tools, like the Chesapeake Analysis and Scenario Tool or CAST, with existing or planned tools commonly used by counties, municipalities, environmental planners, engineers, etc. This would enhance the functionality of those tools and enable the users to take full advantage of the ever-evolving sets of information being continually updated in CAST and other Partnership tools. Ideally, these tools could incorporate the minimum information requirements about locally-implemented BMP projects and provide users with a summary of estimated pollution reductions.

### **Activity 4: Partnership Geospatial and Web Mapping Support**

**Estimated Funding: \$90,000- \$150,000 per year**

#### **Geospatial Support**

The Partnership is seeking geospatial support for data management, geospatial analyses and communication products to assist the CBP GIS Team in addressing geospatial needs identified by the GITs and their technical and programmatic and policy workgroups in their planning and reporting roles directed toward implementation of the 2014 *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement's* goals and outcomes. Examples of the technical support needed include developing standards for states and counties to follow when developing datasets and layers that are inputs for watershed-wide modeling efforts, such as protected lands, regulated areas, parcel boundaries, or planimetric information; preparing data inputs for watershed-wide modeling efforts; developing data that can be used to help explain trends in water quality throughout the watershed and estuary; data documentation, including metadata development for modeling and monitoring

data; and implementation of data-dissemination strategies developed by the CBPO, including developing and populating content into web-based map and data portals.

### **Web Mapping Support**

The Partnership seeks support for data dissemination and visualization of land cover, land use, hydrology, and other data via the web in both raster and vector formats and for enabling “clip, zip, and ship” options to facilitate data transfers to users’ areas of interest. This may include populating web-based geospatial data portals and developing web maps, web map applications, story maps, or other web-based geographic communication products or web map components of other decision support tools (e.g. CAST) requested by the CBPO.

## **C. EPA Strategic Plan Linkage & Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs**

Pursuant to Section 6a of EPA Order 5700.7, “Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements,” EPA must link proposed assistance agreements to the Agency’s Strategic Plan. EPA also requires that grant applicants and recipients adequately describe environmental outputs and outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements (see EPA Order 5700.7, Environmental Results under Assistance Agreements, accessible at <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-order-57007a1-epas-policy-environmental-results-under-epa-assistance-agreements>).

### **1. Linkage to EPA’s Strategic Plan**

The overall objective of this competition is to provide geospatial analysis support for the CBP partnership in support of the most cost-effective, efficient, and targeted pollutant load reduction, habitat restoration and protection, land conservation, and other implementation actions toward reaching the goals and outcomes of the 2014 *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement* under Section 117(d)(1) of the Clean Water Act.

EPA’s Strategic Plan is available at <http://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/strategicplan.html>. The activities to be funded under this announcement are intended to further EPA’s current priorities to provide for clean and safe water as the activities will help promote waters that are clean through improved water infrastructure and, in partnership with states and tribes, sustainably manage programs to support drinking water, aquatic ecosystems, and recreational, economic and subsistence activities. Applicants must explain in their proposal how their project will further these current priorities

[EPA Order 5700.7A1](#) also requires that grant applicants adequately describe environmental outputs and outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements. Applicants must include specific statements describing the environmental results of the proposed project in terms of well-defined outputs and, to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes that will demonstrate how the project will contribute to the priorities described above.

### **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. Expected outputs from the activities to be funded under this announcement may include the following:

- Web-based access to Chesapeake Bay watershed land cover and land use data and interpreted products and analysis at scales relevant to the users.
- Effective and targeted dissemination of the BMP tracking, verification and reporting tools and systems tailored to the CBP partners and stakeholders.
- Partnership and public access to a wide array of geospatial map and interpretative products at a multitude of scales relevant to the users.

Progress reports and a final report will also be required outputs, as specified in Section VI.C., Reporting, of this announcement.

### **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 achievable within an assistance agreement funding period. Example outcomes under this proposal could include the following:

- More cost-effective, pollutant load reduction efficient implementation of the jurisdictions’ Phase III WIPs when compared with the Phase II WIPs.
- Enhanced multi-partner, consensus-based environmental decision-making in the Chesapeake Bay watershed through applications of BMP and conservation targeting tools leading to more effective and cost-efficient decisions supporting restoration of the Chesapeake Bay and surrounding watershed ecosystems.

### **D. Authorizing Statutes and Regulations**

The grant made as a result of this announcement is authorized under the Clean Water Act Section 117(d), 33 U.S.C. Section 1267(d). Under Clean Water Act Section 117(d) (1), 33 U.S.C. Section 1267(d)(1), EPA has the authority to issue grants and cooperative agreements for the purposes of protecting and restoring the Chesapeake Bay's ecosystem. This project is subject to the Office of Management and Budget’ (OMB) Uniform Grants Guidance (2 CFR Part 200) and EPA-specific provisions of the Uniform Grants Guidance (2 CFR Part 1500).

## **II: AWARD INFORMATION**

### **A. Funding Amount and Expected Number of Awards**

The U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office plans to award one to four cooperative agreements under this RFP. The total estimated funding for six years is approximately \$540,000 to \$3,900,000 per activity with an estimated \$90,000 to \$650,000 available for the first year and each additional year per activity. However, it should be noted that these ranges are a broad representation of all the activities combined and specific funding ranges vary by activity as noted in the RFP. Therefore, applicants should refer to each specific activity for the actual funding amount when developing its proposal(s).

EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards under this announcement or less than expected. Funding for each activity depends on funding availability, satisfactory performance, Agency priorities, and other applicable considerations. EPA makes no commitment of annual funding amounts for any fiscal year(s), as funds may be limited based on these applicable considerations.

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 selection is made. Any additional selection for awards will be made no later than six months after the original selection decision.

## **B. Award Type**

Successful applicants will be issued a cooperative agreement as appropriate. 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 projects in which 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.

For this project, federal involvement would typically be in the form of participation with other CBP partners and stakeholders in an advisory capacity to the grantee. This participation is expected to include involvement through the various CBP Goal Implementation Teams and related committees and workgroups (on which EPA also participates to ensure that all the recommendations for technical work support the CBP partners). All work conducted is to support the efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem and its surrounding watershed.

## **C. Partial Funding**

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 project, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice the applicant or affect the basis upon which the proposal or portion thereof was evaluated and selected for award and therefore maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.

## **D. Expected Project Period**

The expected project period for the cooperative agreement is six years, with funding provided on an annual basis. No commitment of funding can be made beyond the first year. The expected start date for the award resulting from this RFP is **August 09, 2018**.

## **E. Pre-Award Costs**

Recipients may incur otherwise eligible and allowable pre-award costs up to 90 days prior to award at their own risk without prior approval of EPA's award official. Pre-award costs must comply with 2 CFR 200.458 and 2 CFR 1500.8. If EPA determines that the requested pre-award costs comply with the relevant authorities, and that the costs are justified as allocable to the project, then these costs may be included as allowable expenditures at the time that the assistance award document is prepared.

However, if for any reason EPA does not fund the proposal or the amount of the award is less than the applicant anticipated, then EPA is under no obligation to reimburse the applicant for these costs incurred. Thus, applicants incur pre-award costs at their own risk. Costs incurred more than 90 days prior to award require the approval of EPA Region 3's grant official.

## **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. For-profit organizations are not eligible to submit proposals in response to this RFP.

### **B. Cost-Share or Matching Requirements**

Pursuant to Clean Water Act 117(d)(2)(A), 33 U.S.C. Section 1267(d)(2)(A), the agency shall determine the cost-share requirements for awards. The CFDA Number 66.466 states that assistance agreement applicants must commit to a cost-share ranging from five to 50 percent of eligible project costs as determined at the sole discretion of EPA. For this RFP, EPA has determined that an applicant must provide a minimum of five 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 the 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 five percent match will be met will be rejected.

### **C. Threshold Eligibility Criteria**

Only proposals from eligible entities (see Section III.A above) that meet the following threshold eligibility criteria will be evaluated against the criteria in Section V.B. 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. 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.
2. In addition, initial proposals must be submitted through [Grants.gov](https://www.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 of this announcement to ensure that their proposal/application is timely submitted.
3. 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](https://www.grants.gov) or relevant [SAM.gov](https://www.sam.gov) system issues. An applicant's failure to timely submit their proposal/application through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) because they did not timely or properly register in [SAM.gov](https://www.sam.gov) or [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) will not be considered an acceptable reason to consider a late submission. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposal with James Hargett at [hargett.james@epa.gov](mailto:hargett.james@epa.gov) (see Section VII, Agency Contact) as soon as possible after the submission deadline—failure to do so may result in your proposal [or application] not being reviewed.
4. For a proposal to be considered eligible for funding, substantive project-related work included in the proposal must take place within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, which includes portions of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, and all of the District of Columbia.
5. Proposals must show how they will meet the five percent cost-share requirement of Section III.B.
6. Proposals requesting more than the maximum funding amount listed in the range for the applicable (or relevant) activity will be rejected.
7. Applicants may apply for more than one of the activities described in Section I.B but can submit only one application per activity. Each application must be separately submitted. Each application must address only one activity. If an applicant submits more than one application per activity, EPA will contact the applicant to determine which one to review.
8. Applicants must address each item under each activity for which they apply
9. If a proposal is submitted that includes any ineligible tasks or activities, that portion of the proposal will be ineligible for funding and may, depending on the extent to which it affects the proposal, render the entire proposal ineligible for funding.



## **IV: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION**

### **A. How to Obtain a Proposal Package**

Applicants can download individual grant application forms from Grants.gov.

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

Each proposal will be evaluated using the criteria referenced in Section V.B. of this announcement. You must submit a single-spaced narrative proposal of up to 15 pages in length by the date and time specified in Section IV.C below. Excess pages will not be reviewed. 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 8 of 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 or visiting their website at <http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform>.
- 2. SF-424A, Budget Information** – Complete the form. There are no attachments. The total amount of federal funding requested for the project period should be shown in Section A on Line 5(e) and on Line 6.k of Column (1) of Section B while recipient's total cost-share should be shown in Section A on Line 5(f) and Line 6.k of Column (2) of Section B. The amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (i.e., a percentage), the base (e.g., personnel costs and fringe benefits), and the amount should also be indicated on line 22.
- 3. Narrative Proposal** – The format for this proposal and the budget detail are contained in Appendix A of this announcement. Review the directions for the preparation of the proposal.
- 4. Budget detail** – The detail should include a spreadsheet that shows each year's cost for the salaries, fringe benefits, total salaries/wages, travel expenses, equipment, supplies, contractual expenses, other cost, and indirect cost.

## **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 **15** 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 **15** pages include all supporting materials such as resumes or *curriculum vitae* and letters of support. Documentation for the budget detail, non-profit status, cost-share letters of commitment, and the SF-424 and SF-424A forms are **not** covered by the page limit.

### **D. Funding Restrictions**

#### **Administrative Cost Cap Requirement under Statutory Authority**

Grantees applying for CBP assistance agreements must adhere to the requirements for “Administrative Costs” under the Section 117 (d)(4) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. Section 1267 (d)(4), which states that administrative costs shall not exceed 10 percent of the annual grant award (annual grant award = federal share plus cost-share). **Appendix B: Administrative Cost Cap Worksheet** is provided as an example of a method to calculate the 10-percent limitation. You are not required to submit Appendix B with your proposal.

#### **Allowable Costs**

EPA assistance agreement funds may only be used for the purposes set forth in the grant 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 the provisions of 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E, Cost Principles. During the grant negotiation, any ineligible costs outlined in the proposal (i.e. lobbying activities) will be excluded in the final grant award.

### **E. 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 Jessica Durand  
USEPA Headquarters  
William Jefferson Clinton Building  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N. W.

Mail Code: 3903R  
Washington, DC 20460

Courier Address:  
OGD Waivers  
c/o Jessica Durand  
Ronald Reagan Building  
1300 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Rm # 51278  
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, 2018, it is valid for any competitive or non-competitive application submission to EPA through December 31, 2018). 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, 2017 with a submission deadline of January 15, 2018, the applicant would need a new exception to submit through alternative methods beginning January 1, 2018.

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.

## F. Submission Instructions

The electronic submission of your application must be made by an official representative of your institution who is registered with [Grants.gov](https://www.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](https://www.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](https://www.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](https://www.Grants.gov), [SAM.gov](https://www.SAM.gov), and DUNS number assignment is FREE.

Applicants need to ensure that the AOR who submits the application through [Grants.gov](https://www.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](https://www.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](https://www.adobe.com/reader/compatibility/grants).

You may also be able to access the application package for this announcement by searching for the opportunity on [Grants.gov](https://www.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-R3-CBP-18-02 or the CFDA number that applies to the announcement (CFDA 66.466), in the appropriate field and click the Search button

**Please Note:** All applications must now be submitted through [Grants.gov](https://www.Grants.gov) using the “Workspace” feature. Information on the Workspace feature can be found at the [Grants.gov Workspace Overview Page](#).

### Application Submission Deadline

Your organization’s AOR must submit your complete application package electronically to EPA through [Grants.gov](https://www.Grants.gov) between **February 13, 2018** and **April 16, 2018**. 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

### Application Materials

The following forms and documents are required under this announcement:

The following forms and documents are required under this announcement:

1. **Narrative Proposal** – The format for this proposal is contained in Appendix A of this announcement. Review the directions for the preparation of the proposal-project narrative attachment form.

2. **Budget detail** – The proposal package should include a spreadsheet that shows each year’s cost for the salaries, fringe benefits, total salaries/wages, travel expenses, equipment, supplies, contractual expenses, other, and indirect costs. The budget detail does not count toward the **15**-page limit. Use *Other Attachments* form to submit through grants.gov. More information on the budget detail is in Appendix A.

3. **Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)** – Complete the form. There are no attachments. Please be sure to include organization fax number and email address in Block 8 of 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 or visiting their website at <http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform>.

4. **Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)** – Complete the form. There are no attachments. The total amount of federal funding requested for the project period should be shown in Section A on Line 5(e) and on Line 6.k of Column (1) of Section B while recipient’s total cost-share should be shown in Section A on Line 5(f) and Line 6.k of Column (2) of Section B. The amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (i.e., a percentage), the base (e.g., personnel costs and fringe benefits), and the amount should also be indicated on Line 22.

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 James Hargett at [hargett.james@epa.gov](mailto:hargett.james@epa.gov). Failure to do so may result in your application not being reviewed.

### **G. 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](https://www.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](https://www.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](https://www.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](https://www.grants.gov). It is essential to allow sufficient time to ensure that your application is submitted to [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) BEFORE the due date identified in Section IV of the solicitation. The [Grants.gov](https://www.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.

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 James Hargett with the FON in the subject line. If you are unable to email, contact James Hargett at 410-267-5743. Be aware that EPA will only consider accepting applications that were unable to transmit due to [Grants.gov](https://www.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](https://www.sam.gov) or [Grants.gov](https://www.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](https://www.grants.gov) representative by calling 606-545-5035. Be sure to obtain a case number from [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov). If the problems stem from unforeseen exigent circumstances unrelated to [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov), such as extreme weather interfering with internet access, contact James Hargett at 410-267-5743.

b. Unsuccessful transfer of the application package: If a successful transfer of the application cannot be accomplished even with assistance from [Grants.gov](https://www.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](https://www.grants.gov), send an email message to James Hargett at [hargett.james@epa.gov](mailto:hargett.james@epa.gov) prior to the application deadline. The email message must document the problem and include the [Grants.gov](https://www.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](https://www.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 James Hargett at [hargett.james@epa.gov](mailto:hargett.james@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](https://www.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.

**H. 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 sub-awards 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: APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION**

**A. Evaluation Process**

After EPA reviews proposals for threshold eligibility purposes as described in Section III, CBPO will conduct a merit evaluation of each eligible proposal. Reviews will be performed by a team of professionals from EPA and other CBP partner organizations with a working knowledge of the technical analysis and programmatic evaluation needs of CBP partnership. All reviewers will sign a conflict of interest statement indicating they have no conflict of interest.

**B. Evaluation Criteria: Maximum score: 100 points**

Criteria	Points
<p><b>1. Organizational Capability, Scope and Approach:</b> Under this criterion, reviewers will evaluate the proposal based on:</p> <p>a. The quality of the proposal and how it demonstrates the ability to timely and successfully achieve the relevant activity to support the CBP partners described in Section I.B. regardless if the proposal encompasses one of the examples provided or puts forth an alternative approach that achieves the goal of the respective activity. <b>(15 points)</b></p> <p>b. How well the proposal demonstrates that the applicant has the skill and experience working with and supporting multiple management agencies, research institutions, non-governmental organizations, and stakeholder collaborative efforts to provide technical and scientific expertise to enhance environmental protection decision-making. <b>(10 points)</b></p>	<p>45</p>

<p>c. How well the proposal demonstrates that the applicant has the skill and experience in the proposed activity from Section I.B as follows: areas of land cover and land use mapping and change detection (Activity 1); hydrology mapping supporting targeted restoration and protection implementation actions (Activity 2); integrating and standardizing regional and local scale BMP tracking and reporting (Activity 3); and geospatial data management, analyses and communication (Activity 4). <b>(20 points)</b></p>	
<p><b>2. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance:</b> Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account the applicant's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) - Past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in the narrative proposal; <b>(6 points)</b></li> <li>(ii) - History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in the narrative proposal 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; <b>(5 points)</b></li> <li>(iii) - Organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project; and <b>(5 points)</b></li> <li>(iv) - Staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. <b>(5 points)</b></li> </ul> <p>Note: In evaluating applicants under items i and ii of this criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided 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 supplied 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 subfactors (items i and ii above-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.</p>	21
<p><b>3. Cost-effectiveness:</b> Under this criterion, reviewers will evaluate each proposal based on the degree of cost-effectiveness, considering the following factors: organizational overhead, budget breakdown, and ability to control cost for the relevant activity listed in Section I. <b>(10 points)</b></p>	10
<p><b>4. Transferability of Results to Similar Projects and/or Dissemination to the Public:</b> Under this criterion, reviewers will evaluate the proposal based on the degree to which the proposal includes an adequate plan to gather information and lessons learned from the project <u>and</u> transfer the documentation/information/</p>	6



data/results/recommendations to CBP partners and stakeholders across the Chesapeake Bay watershed in a timely manner. (6 points)	
<b>5. Seamless Transition:</b> Applicants will be evaluated based on how well they can become fully functional in the roles described in the announcement once a cooperative agreement is awarded and how the applicant will bring about a “seamless” transition in the provision of the described support to the CBP partnership and its management structure. (6 points)	6
<b>6. Timely Expenditure of Grant Funds:</b> Under this criterion, reviewers will evaluate the proposal based on the approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. (6 points)	6
<b>7. Environmental Results:</b> Applicants will be evaluated based on their plan and approach for tracking and measuring their progress towards achieving the environmental outputs and outcomes identified in Section I.C of the RFP. (6 points).	6

### C. Review and Selection Process

Eligible proposals will be evaluated and ranked using the criteria stated in Section V.B. above by a panel of reviewers from EPA and other CBP partner organizations with a working knowledge of the technical analysis and programmatic evaluation needs of the CBP partnership. The review team will then forward the highest-ranked proposals to the director or deputy director of CBPO for final selection. In making the final funding decisions, the selection official may also consider programmatic goals and priorities, including those described in the 2014 *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement* at [https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/what\\_guides\\_us/watershed\\_agreement](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/what_guides_us/watershed_agreement).

### D. Additional Provisions

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 at EPA Solicitation Clauses. These points and the other provisions that can be found at the website link <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-solicitation-clauses>, 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.

## VI: AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

### A. Award Notices and Instructions for Submission of Final Application

It is expected that applicants will be notified in writing of funding decisions on or around **May 31, 2018** either via email or U.S. Postal Service. 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 EPA Region 3 grants office. Applicants are cautioned that only a grant award official 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 grant award official, is the authorizing document and will be provided through electronic or postal mail.

Notification of selection does not indicate that the applicant can start work on the project. The selected applicant will 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 for this particular cooperative agreement award is expected to take 60 days.

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

If your proposal is selected, the following information will be helpful in preparing your cooperative agreement application. Any information about general EPA regulations applicable to the award of assistance agreements may be found at:  
<https://www.epa.gov/grants/>.

### **Federal Requirements**

An applicant whose proposal is selected for federal funding must complete additional forms prior to award. 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.

### **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 federal cost principles in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E (Section 200.414), and Appendix III and IV to Part 200, within 90 days from the effective date of the award. Per 2 CFR Section 200.414(f), if your organization has never received a negotiated indirect rate, it may opt to charge a *de minimis* rate of 10 percent of modified total direct costs (MTDC), which may be used indefinitely. Applicants are strongly encouraged to carefully review the aforementioned regulations regarding indirect costs.

If a state or 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 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E (Section 200.414), and Appendix VII to Part 200. The state or 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 months after the close of the governmental unit's fiscal year. If the cognizant federal agency has not been identified by OMB, the state or local government recipient must still develop (and when required, submit) its proposal within that period. Per 2 CFR Section 200.414(f) and Appendix VII to Part 200, Section D.1.b, if the state or local government has never received a negotiated indirect rate and if it receives \$35,000,000 or less in direct Federal funding, it may opt to charge a *de minimis* rate of 10 percent of modified total direct costs (MTDC), which may be used

indefinitely. Applicants are strongly encouraged to carefully review the aforementioned regulations regarding indirect costs.

### **Incurred Costs**

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.

### **EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans and Quality Assurance Plans**

In accordance with 2 CFR Section 1500.11, 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 <https://www.epa.gov/quality/epa-qar-2-epa-requirements-quality-management-plans>, Chapter 2). 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 <https://www.epa.gov/quality/template-developing-generic-quality-assurance-project-plan-or-plan-elements-model>.

### **Deliverables**

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

### **C. Reporting**

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

### **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) which can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/grants/grant-competition-dispute-resolution-procedures>. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting the person listed in Section VII of the announcement.

### **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 CONTACT**

For administrative and technical issues regarding this RFP, please contact James Hargett via email at [hargett.james@epa.gov](mailto:hargett.james@epa.gov). All questions must be received in writing via email or fax at 410-267-5777 with the reference line referring to this RFP (Re: RFP EPA-R3-CBP-18-02). All questions and answers will be posted on <https://www.epa.gov/grants/grants-your-region-information-specific-epa-region-3>.

### **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.

*Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement and Management Strategies*  
[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/what\\_guides\\_us/watershed\\_agreement](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/what_guides_us/watershed_agreement)

Electronic copy of the *CBP Guidance for Data Management*  
[https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-01/documents/attachment8cimsgrant\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-01/documents/attachment8cimsgrant_guidance.pdf)

Electronic copy of the *Chesapeake Bay Program Office Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance*  
<https://www.epa.gov/restoration-chesapeake-bay/chesapeake-bay-program-grant-guidance>

EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans and Quality Assurance Plans  
<https://www.epa.gov/grants/implementation-quality-assurance-requirements-organizations-receiving-epa-financial>

Please visit the EPA Grants website (<https://www.epa.gov/grants>), the EPA Region 3 Grants website (<https://www.epa.gov/grants/grants-your-region-information-specific-epa-region-3>) or the Chesapeake Bay Program website (<https://www.epa.gov/restoration-chesapeake-bay>)

bay/chesapeake-bay-program-grant-guidance) if you have questions about grant issues such as costs or eligibility.

Further information on CBP committees is located at:  
[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/how\\_we\\_are\\_organized](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/how_we_are_organized).

**Appendix A**  
**Narrative Proposal Format**  
**U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, Region III**  
**Chesapeake Bay Program Office Fiscal Year 2018 Request for Proposals (RFP) for**  
*Geospatial Analysis Support for Implementation of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed*  
*Agreement's Goals and Outcomes*  
EPA-R3-CBP-18-02

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

- A. **Narrative Proposal Format:** Narrative proposals as described below shall not exceed 15 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 15-page limit includes all supporting materials, resumes or *curriculum vitae*, and letters of support but **excludes** the budget detail, documentation of non-profit status, and the SF 424 and 424-A forms. Applicants must ensure that the proposal clearly identifies the activity number. 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) Project title.
- ii) Brief description of your organization.
- iii) Documentation of non-profit status, if applicable.
- iv) Brief biographies of applicant lead(s) including resumes and/or curriculum vitae.
- v) Funding requested. Specify total cost of the project. Identify funding from other sources, including cost-share or in-kind resources.
- vi) DUNS number — See Section VI of RFP.

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

- i) A clear and concise discussion of how your organization will meet the objectives and requirements of the Program as described in Section I of the announcement for the relevant activity;
  - ii) Environmental Results – Outputs and Outcomes: Address how the proposal will meet the expected outputs and outcomes of this project and your plan for tracking and measuring your progress towards achieving them.
1. Output: An output is an environmental activity, effort, or work product related to an environmental goal or objective that will be produced within the assistance agreement period.

Expected outputs from the activities to be funded under this announcement are identified in Section I of this solicitation.

2. Outcome: An outcome is a result, effect, or consequence that will result from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes are quantitative measures that may not necessarily be achievable within the assistance agreement period. Examples of potential outcomes under activities 1 and 2 of this announcement are identified in Section I of this solicitation.
- iii) Review Criteria: Address in narrative form each of the review criteria identified in Section V.B of the RFP. Identify by the review criteria number and title followed by your narrative.

With specific respect to the Programmatic Capability Past Performance factor in V.B: Submit a list of 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 that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than five 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 addition, provide information on your organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project as well as your staff's expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources, or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

- B. Budget Detail - For the first year and each of the subsequent years, provide a budget detail breakdown by the major budget categories (i.e. personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual, construction, other, and indirect). In each of the budgets, include the cost-share amount (a minimum of five percent for each of the total project costs) and demonstrate how the cost-share will be met, including, if applicable, letters of commitment from any third-party contributors. Please note that subaward costs must be itemized under a separate sub-line item within the "Other" budget cost category.

In addition, grantees applying for CBP assistance agreements must adhere to the requirement for "Administrative Costs" under the Clean Water Act Section 117 (d)(4), 33 U.S.C. Section 1267 (d)(4), which states that administrative costs shall not exceed 10 percent of the annual grant award. Information on how to calculate the 10 percent administration cost cap is located in Appendix B: Administrative Cost Cap Worksheet. To calculate the specific cost-share amount, follow these two-steps:

- 1) EPA amount (including any in-kind) ÷ 95% = 100% of Total Grant Amount
- 2) 100% of Total Grant Amount × 5% = Applicant's Cost-Share Amount

**Appendix B  
EPA-R3-CBP-18-02**

**SAMPLE  
(DO NOT SUBMIT WORKSHEET WITH APPLICATION)**

**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COST  
CAP WORKSHEET**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In accordance with Section 117(d)(4) and 117(e)(6) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the costs of salaries and fringe benefits incurred in administering a grant under Section 117(d) or 117(e) of the CWA shall not exceed 10 percent of the annual grant award. The annual grant award is the total costs including Federal and cost share amounts. The worksheet below is provided to assist you in calculating allowable administrative costs. **The Budget Detail of your Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) should reflect how your administrative costs will comply with the cap. For specific guidance refer to page 2 of this sample “Compliance with CWA Section 117 Requirements Restricting Administrative Costs.”**

Total Costs	\$ _____
Cap %	X .10
<b>Limit on Administrative Costs</b>	\$ (a) _____
List Administrative Costs: (Budgeted costs for application)	
_____	\$ _____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
<b>Total</b>	\$ (b) _____

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



## **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 (d) or (e) must adhere to the requirement on administrative costs as follows:**

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 10 percent of the annual grant award.

Under Section 117(e)(6) - Administrative Costs. -Administrative costs shall not exceed 10 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 (d) and (e) 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 10% of the annual grant **award (Federal and cost share)**. 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

In order to ensure compliance with this requirement, use the format above or a similar format to calculate the costs and include in the Budget Detail of your Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424).

#### 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.