

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10

**Protecting Coastal Watersheds, Water Quality and Aquatic Resources from
the Impacts of Growth**

FFY2009 Request for Proposals

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

Funding Opportunity Name: West Coast Estuaries Initiative

Announcement Type: Initial Announcement

Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-R10-WEI1-2009

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers: 66.119

Overview

U.S. EPA Region 10 (EPA) is soliciting proposals to support the protection and restoration of high value, coastal resources in areas threatened by growth pressure. Through comprehensive watershed protection and management approaches, these grant funds will assist local and tribal governments in managing land uses while protecting watershed functions and values. Successful projects will match proposed activities to the appropriate watershed scale to ensure environmental results.

Federally recognized Indian Tribal governments located within or governing territory within the coastal watersheds west of the Cascade Mountain divide of Washington and Oregon, including those watersheds entering the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam, are eligible to apply. Local governments located within or governing territory within the coastal watersheds west of the Cascade Mountain divide of Washington and Oregon, including those watersheds entering the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam, are also eligible to apply. Also eligible to apply are special purpose districts including, but not limited to, irrigation districts, conservation district and water & sewer districts located within the coastal watersheds west of the Cascade Mountain divide of Washington and Oregon, including those watersheds entering the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam. Similar entities in three specific coastal watersheds in Alaska will also be eligible to apply. Because population growth in Alaska is focused in the Upper Cook Inlet, those watersheds are the Lower Susitna, Matanuska and Anchorage Borough watersheds.¹

EPA anticipates awarding up to seven cooperative agreements under this RFP. Awards will range from approximately \$400,000 to \$600,000 and have a project period of two to four years. The total amount available for all awards is approximately \$2.8 million dollars through the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008, Public Law 110-161. Applicants must

¹ Please see the Frequently Asked Questions for the specific provisions of state law that define special purpose districts. The Frequently Asked Questions can be found at:
<http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP>

provide a minimum non-federal match of 1/3 of the federal funds requested or 25 percent of the total cost of the proposal (federal + match).

Important Dates:

February 19, 2009	Proposals received in hardcopy by EPA Region 10 by 4:30 PM Pacific Standard Time <u>or</u> stamped electronically through Grants.gov ² by 5:00 PM Pacific Standard Time.
May 1, 2009	Finalists notified and requested to negotiate and submit grant application and work plan.
June 30, 2009	Grant applications and work plan received via hardcopy <u>or</u> Grants.gov.
September 30, 2009	Awards made.

Other than February 19, 2009, the above dates are estimated and subject to change.

EPA reserves the right to amend this solicitation. Amendments could be administrative (e.g., change of dates or location), technical (e.g., change in requirements), or affect the anticipated funding. EPA will post amendments at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP> and at <http://www.grants.gov> . Please check periodically for changes.

Contents of Announcement:

I.	Funding Opportunity Description	Page 3
II.	Award Information	Page 10
III.	Eligibility Information	Page 11
IV.	Application and Submission Information	Page 14
V.	Application Review Information	Page 22
VI.	Award Administration Information	Page 26
VII.	Agency Contact	Page 28
VIII.	Other Information	Page 28

Appendix A: Instructions for Grants.gov

Appendix B: Logic Model Examples

² Applicants must register at Grants.gov at least one week before submitting a proposal.

U.S. EPA Region 10 West Coast Estuaries Initiative:
2009 Request for Proposals

Protecting Coastal Watersheds, Water Quality and Aquatic Resources
from the Impacts of Growth

Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-R10-WEI1-2009

I. Funding Opportunity Description

U.S. EPA Region 10 (EPA) is soliciting proposals under this announcement to support the protection and restoration of high value, aquatic resources in coastal watersheds threatened by growth pressure through comprehensive watershed protection and management approaches at the local level. Proposals should integrate watershed management and land use decisions in an effort to accommodate growth and protect water quality, habitat and hydrologic processes.

Growth and development impact coastal watersheds, and the humans, salmon, shellfish, and other species that depend on clean water and sustainable habitat. Extensive scientific research shows that *where development is located, how much development occurs, and what practices are used when developing* greatly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of marine and fresh waters. The cumulative result can be excessive stormwater that scours fish habitat and delivers pollutants, pathogens, and excess nutrients to surface waters and significantly reduces water in streams during dry summer months.

The responsibility for managing watersheds and growth falls largely on local governments and tribes. Yet there are not strong connections between the watershed planning processes and the land use mandates that influence development, watersheds resources, and the generation of stormwater. Without this linkage, we are often left with costly and ineffective restoration efforts.

In addition to development pressures, forecasted changes in climate pose serious challenges to coastal watersheds managers. The impacts of climate change threaten to erode environmental progress and create new problems. Developing policies and programs that protect the resiliency and buffering capacity of watersheds is taking on new urgency. We need watersheds that store water longer and can adapt to sea level rise as well as changes in temperature and precipitation.

Emerging Tools: There are many tools available to assist local managers in protecting watersheds including the use of incentives, alternative scenario development and smart growth concepts. You are not required to incorporate new tools into your proposals. However, we encourage you to use this funding opportunity to consider some of the many tools and approaches available. Below we highlight just two examples of emerging tools, the ecosystem services approach and low impact development.

1. Ecosystem Services Approach: Ecosystem services are the benefits people receive from ecosystems. An ecosystem services approach is used to better understand the inter-relationship between people and their ecosystems, including the: 1) monetary and non-monetary value of the ecosystem services to people, 2) dynamic nature of the ecosystem, and 3) impacts by people on the ecosystem and by the ecosystem on people.

Addressing ecosystem issues requires a multi-disciplinary approach. This approach allows us to better understand and address both short-term and long-term planning. Utilizing an ecosystem services approach could provide a means for addressing common sense, cost-effective solutions. For more information on ecosystem services approach, please see the Frequently Asked Questions webpage at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP>

2. Low Impact Development/Green Infrastructure: Low Impact Development and Green Infrastructure strategies reduce and locally manage stormwater through infiltration, reuse, and evapotranspiration. Some examples include rain gardens, pervious pavement, clustering development and retaining natural vegetation, garden roofs, amended construction site soils, rain barrels, and natural drainage systems. These strategies are supported by both National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and grant funding. NPDES Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits dictate activities to be conducted throughout a jurisdiction and may contain language regarding low impact development. This funding provides regulated jurisdictions the opportunity to 1) go beyond required activities, and 2) focus on a watershed where results could be discretely attained and measured. See Eligible Activities below and Section III.D for additional information.

Examples of Eligible Activities: Local and tribal governments and special purpose districts are at various stages of developing and applying integrated watershed protection programs. Some need to improve the scientific understanding of their watersheds. Others understand how their watersheds work and need assistance implementing a plan. Therefore, a wide range of activities are eligible for funding consideration under this solicitation including, but not limited to, activities that:

- Enhance and implement watershed protection and restoration plans, land use and transportation plans, basin plans, stormwater controls and/or land development standards to maintain native vegetation and natural hydrology by protecting and restoring wetland, riparian, upland, and near shore habitats and ecological processes.
- Implement watershed protection by enhancing state planning processes such as growth management laws and shoreline management laws through the development of watershed land use designations, development standards and other regulations or incentive programs that protect and restore watersheds.
- Refine and implement watershed, land use plans based on watershed models predicting hydrologic impacts of alternative, future land cover conditions, development scenarios and resulting aquatic resource conditions. If your proposal involves future planning scenarios, EPA strongly encourages you to also address the impacts of climate change. We recognize that addressing climate change is broad and multifaceted. In the context of this solicitation, climate change information would be an additional overlay in evaluating

proposed activities. This could lead to more robust protection or restoration of the resiliency of a watershed's hydrologic functions. Specific actions proposed could include additional wetland and flood plain protections and restoration projects that increase water storage, increased setbacks from coastal areas, enhanced stormwater management, and targeted implementation of low impact development and cluster development to increase green space and reduce transportation needs.

- Develop and carry out laws, ordinances and incentive programs to implement watershed programs such as systematic implementation of low impact development in sensitive basins (unless engineering analyses demonstrate that it is infeasible), land acquisition, and transfer of development rights approaches and techniques.
- Increase watershed data and information available to local decision-makers who write and implement laws, ordinances, and permits.
- Monitor and measure watershed indicators to report on restoration or protection activities.
- Implement watershed-based, interagency monitoring and public involvement and education efforts to establish and run stream-team type approaches that monitor and assess conditions and trends of water quality and aquatic resources.

Activities proposed by regulated MS4 jurisdictions that are required under an NPDES permit are not eligible for funding. However, activities that go beyond permit requirements are eligible for funding and may include (depending on the permit), but are not limited to, activities that:

- Develop and implement performance standards that exceed NPDES permit requirements.
- Create incentives to implement low impact development.
- Address water quality and habitat targets by minimizing the cumulative impacts of development using low impact development techniques in new development and retrofits.
- Address development below acreage threshold of permit.
- Implement impervious cover targets across a watershed.
- Assess stream hydromodification impacts and develop control strategies to reduce the extent of effective impervious surfaces using low impact development for new developments and retrofits.

Successful proposals should be multifaceted, demonstrate how activities address the impacts of growth while achieving watershed protection and restoration goals, and lead to measureable outcomes or fill critical program needs that will lead to environmental results.

Coastal Watersheds Defined: The term “watershed” refers to watersheds that can range from a small local watershed or drainage analysis unit to a larger basin or tributary systems such as an eight digit Hydrologic Unit Code, USGS watershed identification system, or a water resource inventory area, Washington State’s watershed organization system. We include in the definition of watersheds those watersheds that drain to shorelines and pocket estuaries. **Successful proposals should match proposed activities to the appropriate watershed scale to ensure activities lead to environmental results.**

Coastal watersheds eligible under this RFP include watersheds west of the Cascade Mountain divide, from the southern border of Oregon to the northern border of Washington, including those entering the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam. Because population growth in Alaska is

focused in the Upper Cook Inlet, this RFP is directed at the Lower Susitna, Matanuska and Anchorage Borough watersheds. (See <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP> for maps.)

Emphasizing Outputs and Outcomes: The priority of the West Coast Estuaries Initiative (WEI) is to support projects that are likely to achieve quantifiable and scientifically defensible results within the project period. Successful proposals are expected to achieve on-the-ground watershed protection or recovery. Proposed activities must be linked to environmental results and demonstrate how they will contribute to watershed protection. Applicants must include specific statements describing the environmental results of the proposed activities in terms of well-defined **outputs** and **outcomes**.

The term "output" means an activity, effort, or associated work product that will be produced within the timeframe of the grant or by a specific date. Output can be on-the-ground environmental improvements or behavioral, health-related, or programmatic. An example of a programmatic "output" could be increasing the watershed information available to local and state decision-makers who write and implement laws, ordinances, and permits, and create institutional changes.

The term "outcome" means an environmental result, effect or consequence that will occur from carrying out a program or activity. Outcomes may be short-term (i.e., changes in learning, knowledge, attitude, skill), intermediate (i.e., changes in behavior, practice, or decisions), or long-term (i.e., changes in condition of natural resources). Outcomes may not always be measured by environmental or water quality indicators but by institutional indicators such as the adoption and application of laws and regulations or improved management of environmental programs. We encourage you to also try to predict the outcomes in terms of an environmental benefit or reduced risk to a watershed as a result of implementing the law, regulation or program.

Ensuring outputs, outcomes, and environmental benefits may be challenging when proposing institutional indicators. Adoption of ordinance changes or revisions to a comprehensive plan often can't be a guaranteed output because of the unpredictability of public processes. One way to increase the chances of achieving the desired output or outcome is to integrate the education and inclusion of stakeholders, policy makers and the scientific community into the proposed work (see example of Chico Creek Watershed Academy link under Additional Information, page 8).

Examples of Outputs and Outcomes: Outputs and outcomes may be challenging to articulate. Below are expected results of the awards to be made under this RFP and four specific examples of outputs and outcomes associated with protection activities.

- Output: Actual on-the-ground water restoration or protection projects put in place.
- Output: Local ordinances passed aimed at protection of water quality and aquatic resources.
- Output: Enhanced community participation and awareness of water quality issues.
- Outcome: Baseline and resulting water quality monitoring data that indicate measurable and scientifically defensible environmental improvement.

- **Outcome:** Protection or reduction in risk to high quality water, Clean Water Act §303(d) delisting of streams, or increased recreational or subsistence use of water bodies.

Example 1: Using tools such as watershed characterization and modeling, local managers can predict alternative future land cover conditions and their impacts to natural hydrology and water quality. Land use decisions concerning where to develop and how to develop can then be made based in part on predicted impacts to water quality and watershed hydrology. For projects proposing such activities, impervious surface cover and other characteristics of parcel and watershed scale development and protection can be used to quantify both protection and restoration **outputs**. If future land use decisions are made in an effort to avoid impacts, the **outcome** could be expressed as reduced risk to watershed hydrology or water quality.

Example 2: For a project aimed at protecting water quality or hydrology while accommodating growth, expected **outputs** may be a watershed characterization that evaluates processes and identifies the areas suitable for protection, restoration, and development. The project could implement the recommendations through incentive and education programs for developers, incorporating development and zoning changes, and low impact development ordinances to address issues of clearing, grading and vegetation retention. Expected **outcomes** may be no net increase in effective impervious cover and stabilization or improvement of peak flows and low flows in a specified time period relative to the overall goal of protecting water quality.

Example 3: For a project aimed at protecting a salmon run, expected **outputs** may be an ecosystem services valuation, an outreach effort to educate decision makers, and follow up changes to planning and zoning documents. The expected **outcome** would indicate the anticipated acres of intact flood plain protected, acres of critical wetlands restored, feet of dike removed in a specified time period relative to the overall goal of supporting a healthy salmon run, maintaining water quality standards, delisting a water-body segment listed as impaired under CWA §303(d), or attaining a milestone under a TMDL.

Example 4: A proposal may be focused on protecting marine water quality and shellfish harvest areas. The anticipated **outputs** may be a local program that connects appropriate/innovative technologies and developments patterns (that rely on septic systems) to watershed issues. This may include innovative household scale septic systems addressing nitrogen inputs to estuarine waters or connecting the location and use of septic systems in sensitive areas to land use decisions and water quality issues. Corresponding midterm **outcomes** would include reduced pollutants in surface waters and an upgrade in shellfish harvest.

Additional information regarding environmental results in terms of "outputs" and "outcomes" can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/regulations.htm>. Scroll down to [Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements \[EPA Order 5700.7\]](#)

Linking EPA's Strategic Plan, Proposed Activities, Outputs, and Outcomes through a Logic Model: The West Coast Estuaries Initiative (WEI) implements goals and objectives in EPA's 2006-2011 Strategic Plan. Specifically, the WEI supports EPA's goals to improve and restore water quality on a watershed basis and facilitate ecosystem-scale protection and restoration under Goal 2 - Clean and Safe Water, Sub-objective 2.2.1 Protect and Improve Water Quality on a

Watershed Basis, and Goal 4 - Healthy Communities and Ecosystems, Sub-objective 4.3.1 Protect and Restore Ecosystems. (<http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>)

To ensure that proposals support EPA's national strategic plan, we require that you include a logic model with your proposal. A logic model summarizes the major elements of the proposal connecting EPA's national plan and your proposed resources, activities, outputs and outcomes. See Logic Model explanation and examples in Appendix A.

Additional Information: Below are links to additional information on efforts to connect land use decisions and watershed protection.

University of Washington Climate Impacts Group website with information on planning at the local level. <http://cses.washington.edu/cig/fpt/planning.shtml>

Protecting Aquatic Ecosystems: A Guide for Puget Sound Planners to Understand Watershed Processes. <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0506027.html>

Draft Birch Bay Watershed Characterization Pilot Study
http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/shorelines_critical_areas/workproducts.jsp

Evaluation of Economic Incentives for Decentralized Stormwater Runoff Management: Shepherd Creek Watershed Pilot Project, Water Quality Component
<http://www.epa.gov/federalregister/EPA-RESEARCH/2005/October/Day-26/r21373.htm>
<http://www.epa.gov/ORD/NRMRL/lrpcd/esm/projects/sheperdcreek.htm>

Using Market Forces to Implement Sustainable Stormwater Development
<http://www.portlandonline.com/bes/index.cfm?c=34598>

Ecosystem Services Enhanced by Salmon Habitat Conservation in the Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed
http://earthconomics.org/resources/publication_documents/WRIA_9_Ecosystem_Service_Analysis.pdf

*** For more information on the ecosystem services approach, see the Frequently Asked Questions at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP>

Subgrants and Subawards: Subgrants or subawards to third parties may be made, as appropriate, under awards from this RFP. Proposals containing a subaward project (also called mini-grants) are eligible for funding consideration but the portion to be subawarded to third parties within the watershed via a smaller-scaled competition should account for no more than 20 percent of the requested funding amount. Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or subawards to avoid requirements in EPA grant regulations for competitive procurement by using these instruments to acquire commercial services or products from for-profit organizations to carry out its assistance agreement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the sub-awardee or sub-grantee must be consistent with the standards for distinguishing between vendor transactions and sub-recipient assistance under Subpart B Section 210 of OMB Circular A-133, and the definitions of "sub-award" at 40 C.F.R. §30.2(ff) or "sub-grant" at 40 C.F.R. §31.3, as

applicable. EPA will not be a party to these transactions. See Section IV. Application and Submission Information for more details on subgrants and contracts with partners.

An eligible entity may submit multiple proposals under this RFP so long as each one is a different project. There is no limit on the number of proposals submitted by an entity.

II. Award Information

The total amount expected to be awarded under this announcement is approximately \$2.8 million of Fiscal Year 2008 funds for up to seven cooperative agreements. Awards will range from approximately \$400,000 to \$600,000 in federal dollars and have a project period of two to four years. **Proposals that request an amount in excess of \$600,000 in federal funds will not be considered for funding.**

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 any applicants 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.

Additional Awards: EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement, consistent with Agency policy and guidance, if additional funding becomes available after the original selections are made. Any additional selections must be made within 6 months of the original selection decisions.

Cooperative Agreements: Selected recipients will enter into a funding agreement with EPA Region 10 (see Section VII). The WEI will fund cooperative agreements. The cooperative agreements will be awarded under the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008, Public Law 110-161.

Cooperative agreements, as opposed to grants, permit substantial involvement between the EPA Project Officer and the applicant in the work supported by the agreement. 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 40 C.F.R. §31.36(g), 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.

EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals or applications and make no awards under this RFP, to award less than the full amount of funds available or to make fewer awards than expected.

III. Eligibility Information

A. Eligible Applicants

Federally recognized Indian Tribal governments located within or governing territory within the coastal watersheds west of the Cascade Mountain divide of Washington and Oregon, including those watersheds entering the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam, are eligible to apply. Local governments located within or governing territory within the coastal watersheds west of the Cascade Mountain divide of Washington and Oregon, including those watersheds entering the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam, are also eligible to apply. Also eligible to apply are special purpose districts including, but not limited to, irrigation districts, conservation district and water & sewer districts located within the coastal watersheds west of the Cascade Mountain divide of Washington and Oregon, including those watersheds entering the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam. Similar entities in three specific coastal watersheds in Alaska will also be eligible to apply. Because population growth in Alaska is focused in the Upper Cook Inlet, those watersheds are the Lower Susitna, Matanuska and Anchorage Borough watersheds.³

Federal and state agencies, institutions of higher learning, watershed councils, and other non-governmental entities are not eligible to directly receive financial assistance awards under this announcement. However, EPA strongly encourages local and tribal governments to solicit participation from these entities as local collaborators. State agencies, institutions of higher learning, watershed councils, and other non-governmental entities are eligible for subawards or subcontracts. See more detail on subawards in Section IV. Federal agencies are ineligible for subaward or subcontract.

B. Cost Sharing/Match Requirement

EPA requires applicants to demonstrate how they will provide the minimum non-federal match of 1/3 of the federal amount requested or 25 percent of the **total** cost of the proposal. EPA will fund a maximum of 75 percent of the total project cost (federal amount + match). In addition to cash, matching funds can come from in-kind contributions, such as volunteers, donated time, equipment, expertise, etc., consistent with the regulations governing matching fund requirements (40 C.F.R. §31.24 or 40 C.F.R. §30.23). Federal funds may not be used to meet match requirements.

Federally recognized Indian tribal governments may be exempt from the match requirement if the match requirement imposes undue hardship. Tribal governments needing an exemption from the 25 percent total match or 1/3 of the federal amount match requirement **must submit a one page written request and justification with their proposal**. If approved, the proposal will be scored as if it meets the minimum match requirement.

To determine how to meet the minimum match, the following formulas may be helpful:

³ Please see the Frequently Asked Questions for the specific provisions of state law that define special purpose districts. The Frequently Asked Questions can be found at: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP>

1. Federal amount of proposal / 3 = Amount (\$) needed for match, or
2. Total cost (\$) of proposal / 4 = Amount (\$) needed for match.

If the total federal dollars requested is \$600,000, you must provide \$200,000 in matching funds or services. In this example, the total project cost is \$800,000. If the federal dollars requested is \$400,000, you must provide \$133,333 for a total project cost of \$533,333.

C. Threshold Eligibility Criteria

Below are requirements which if not met by the time of proposal submission will result in elimination of your proposal from consideration for funding. Only proposals that meet all these criteria will be evaluated against the ranking factors in Section V.A. Applicants whose proposals are deemed ineligible as a result of the threshold review will be notified within 15 calendar days.

- 1) Applicants must meet the eligibility requirements as described in Section III.A. Eligible Applicants and must demonstrate in their proposal how they will provide the required match as described in Section III.B. Cost Sharing/Match Requirement.
- 2) Proposals must substantially comply with the proposal submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this announcement or else they will be rejected. However, where a page limit is expressed in Section IV with respect to the proposal or parts thereof, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.
- 3) Proposals must be received by the EPA or received through <http://www.grants.gov>, as specified in Section IV of this announcement, on or before the published submission deadline. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their proposals reach the designated person/office specified in Section IV of this announcement by the submission deadline.
- 4) Proposals received after the submission deadline will be considered late and returned to the sender without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling or because of technical problems solely attributable to grants.gov and not the applicant. For hard copy submissions, where Section IV requires receipt by a specific person/office by the submission deadline, receipt by an agency mailroom is not sufficient. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposal with Daniel Steinborn [(206) 553-2728 or Steinborn.daniel@epa.gov] as soon as possible after the submission deadline—failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.
- 5) Submissions that are faxed or emailed will not be accepted as described in Section IV.D. Submission Dates and Times.
- 6) Projects with an international work plan must directly and primarily benefit U.S. waters. Under this solicitation, foreign land acquisition or proposals that contain work plans with a majority of projects to be implemented outside of U.S. borders will not be considered for funding.

D. Funding Restrictions

Clean Water Act (CWA) Requirements: There are multiple Clean Water Act Programs (grant programs and permit programs) that must work together in order for local communities and watershed groups to develop and implement watershed management plans that will protect and/or restore watersheds. For stormwater related proposals, the WEI provides funding and

technical resources and the NPDES program establishes requirements that, integrated together, can be very effective catalysts for action.

However, certain projects or activities are ineligible for WEI funding. These include activities required or regulated under the CWA. Activities for the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and required activities under NPDES Phase I and II Stormwater permits will not be funded. Under the NPDES program, stormwater permit coverage is required for stormwater discharges from Phase I and Phase II MS4s.

To ensure projects/activities proposed for funding are not required in a permit, applicants for WEI grants for stormwater-related projects/activities in MS4 areas must include a statement in the proposal documenting that the work proposed for funding is not required under a storm water discharge permit.

Activities implementing the non-regulatory component of TMDLs are eligible for funding (e.g., the elements of a watershed plan that address non-point source pollution).

IV. Application and Submission Information

A. Requesting an Application Package

Grant application forms, including Standard Forms SF 424 and SF 424A, are available at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/application.htm> or by submitting an email request to Daniel Steinborn at steinborn.daniel@epa.gov.

B. Form of Application Submission

You must submit your proposal package using one of the two methods outlined below. You must include the information in Section IV.C regardless of the method you choose.

1. Hard Copy: Two hard copies of the complete proposal package, as described in Section IV.C, may be mailed, delivered by express mail or hand delivered. Please mark all submissions: **ATTN: Daniel Steinborn, West Coast Estuaries Initiative** (see Section IV.D for address).

2. Grants.gov Submission: You may submit materials electronically through the federal government's Grants.gov web site. Grants.gov allows you to download a proposal or application package template and complete the package offline. After completing the required proposal or application package, you may submit the package electronically to Grants.gov, which transmits the package to EPA. Letters of commitment, a logic model, and maps, if not in electronic format, must be scanned to Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format[®] (PDF) to submit them electronically. Proposal materials submitted through Grants.gov will be time/date stamped electronically. Complete instructions on applying through Grants.gov can be found in Appendix A.

PLEASE NOTE: YOU MUST REGISTER AT GRANTS.GOV AT LEAST A WEEK IN ADVANCE OF THE SUBMISSION DEADLINE. YOU CANNOT REGISTER AT THE LAST MINUTE OR ELSE YOUR PROPOSAL MAY BE LATE AND NOT ACCEPTED.

C. Content of Proposal Package Submission

Proposals, including the cover page and project narrative as described below, must not exceed 12 single sided or 6 double-sided pages, single spaced, and should use no less than 12-point font. Pages in excess of these page limits will not be reviewed. All proposal materials including the cover page, project narrative, budget, tables, timeline, charts, graphs, and pictures must be included within the page limit. In addition to the proposal, please submit the following documents which are not subject to the page limit:

- Signed SF 424.
- SF 424A.
- Maps.

- Letters of commitment.
- A Logic Model.

NOTE:

- The documents listed above are required if you submit electronically or in hard copy.
- Appendices will not be reviewed.
- You are responsible for the contents of your proposals.

Each proposal package must contain all of the components listed below:

Proposal including cover page and project narrative (subject to the page limit):

1. Cover page. The cover page should include:
 - . The name of the watershed to be addressed with clear identification of watershed boundary and size.
 - i. Nominee contact information: name, affiliation, address, telephone, and e-mail of the contact person.
 - ii. Abstract: Provide a proposal summary of no longer than 150 words. Include a description of the need, the proposed work, and the anticipated outputs and outcomes.
 - iii. Briefly indicate how you found out about this request for proposals.
2. Project Narrative. Applicants should ensure that the narrative addresses all of the evaluation factors identified in Section V.A. The narrative description of the proposed tasks and activities must include the following sections:

Description of the Watershed: Describe the watershed, including high value, critical or significant natural resources such as wetlands, functioning riparian areas, intact watershed processes, fish and shellfish resources, high quality waters, etc. Include a description of the physical, chemical, biological, ecological, socioeconomic, and cultural characteristics, including rural, urban, and environmental justice areas and land cover. Describe the environmental threats or problems facing the watershed including development pressures and demographics of the impacts. Discuss the existing watershed plans and efforts to address the problems and threats.

Project Need: Describe the environmental significance of the project, the problem or conservation issue(s), why it is a priority, and the relevance to the overall watershed. The objectives of the proposal and the immediate and long-term desired outcomes should be described relative to the overall environmental conditions. Include an assessment of the natural resource and environmental conditions and evidence of problem sources (existing or impending problems) along with the prioritization of the threats and impairments facing the watershed. The prioritization should focus on threats and impairments that will be addressed by the proposal. Provide evidence that sufficient planning and assessment has been completed to ensure that the proposed activities achieve scientifically defensible and sustainable environmental results.

Project Plan: Describe the work that will be done using the federal funding and the non-federal matching funds. Identify the specific outputs (deliverables) and the anticipated outcomes (i.e., defensible and quantifiable results) associated with the major project components.

Project Components: Describe in detail the tasks and activities for each year of the project period. Include milestones and timelines for accomplishing tasks. Explain how the projects fit together to benefit the watershed as a whole and are ready for implementation (i.e., feasible). Include a statement explaining why the proposal will be effective and what makes it innovative. If the proposal is a market-based trading project, describe the drivers, buyers and sellers, and the scheme already in place so that trading can begin.

Partnering: Describe how you will engage partners, knowledgeable scientists, and other stakeholders.

Financial Integrity/Budget: Explain the costs associated with each project. Description of costs should correspond to amounts presented in the SF 424A (see Item 5). Sample format at:

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/omp.nsf/webpage/Region+10+Grants:+Work+Plans+and+Budgets>.

Anticipated Outputs and Outcomes: Include specific statements describing the anticipated environmental results of the proposed project in terms of outputs and outcomes (see Section I for details on outputs and outcomes). The information should be summarized in the form of a logic model (see Item 7 below).

Monitoring and Measuring: Describe the biological, physical, and chemical monitoring and assessment that will be conducted consistent with the project components and a scientifically defensible plan. Identify appropriate environmental indicators to be monitored. Describe the methods for evaluating environmental improvements, considering such factors as baseline, natural variability, and targets and contingencies (if you are using adaptive management). Monitoring does not need to be paid for under this grant; however, existing monitoring should be discussed in the proposal and should be sufficient to document proposal outcomes. Describe the methodology (i.e., sampling, survey models, etc.) that will be used to measure progress toward achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes including those identified in Section I.

Environmental Results Past Performance: Submit a list of no more than five federally and/or state funded assistance agreements (preferably EPA agreements) or self-financed projects in which you reported to your elected officials that you performed within the last three years [Assistance agreements include grants and cooperative agreements and do not include contracts]. Briefly describe how you documented and reported on progress toward achieving environmental results under the agreements and if progress was not being made please indicate whether this was documented and explained why progress was not being made.

In evaluating applicants under this factor in Section V, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current and prior Federal agency grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available environmental results past performance information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for this factor under Section V. If you do not provide any response for this item, you may receive a score of 0 for this factor.

Peer Outreach and Information Transfer. Describe the outreach component, the strategy for disseminating results, and lessons learned among watershed organizations, governmental agencies, and others with similar environmental challenges in and outside the watershed. Describe how the project will promote and actively conduct technology transfer or provide technical assistance that improves the knowledge of tribal or local decision-makers.

Programmatic Capability/Technical Experience: Provide information on your organizational experience. Describe your plan for timely and successfully achieving the proposed objectives and your staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them to successfully perform the project. Also, submit a list of no more than 5 federally and/or state funded assistance agreements (an assistance agreement is a grant or cooperative agreement and not a contract) or self-financed projects similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project that your organization carried out within the last three years (preferably EPA agreements) and briefly describe (i) whether, and how, you were able to successfully complete and manage those agreements or projects and (ii) your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements including submitting acceptable final technical reports.

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

3. Map(s). A map of the watershed and the proposed work areas must accompany the text.
4. Signed and completed SF 424.
5. SF 424A. Provide a detailed breakdown of cost by category for each project on the SF 424A. Project costs include grant administration costs, matching funds, other leveraged funds, and travel (including travel to two annual conferences - see Section VIII.B). When formulating budgets for proposals, you may not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved

by the applicant's cognizant audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. See Section IV F for more information on restrictions on management fees and similar charges.

6. Letter(s) of Commitment: A minimum of one letter of commitment is required. The letter should state a commitment to match all or part of the federal amount. The letter may come from the applicant or any of the other partners committing match. It must be signed by the authorizing official from the entity committing matching funds (either cash or in-kind contributions), include the total value of the commitment, and on the official letterhead of the agency or organization.
7. Logic Model. Activities, Outputs, and Outcomes should be summarized in the form of a logic model. Please see Appendix B for more information and logic model examples.

Confidential Business Information

In accordance with 40 C.F.R. §2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their proposal/application package as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidential claims in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark proposals/applications or portions thereof that they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 C.F.R. §2.204 (c) (2) prior to disclosure. Note that under Public Law No. 105-277, data produced under an award is subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

D. Submission Dates and Times

Applicants who choose to submit their materials in hard copy must send two copies of their complete proposal packages to:

Daniel Steinborn
U.S. EPA Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900 (ETPA-086)
Seattle, Washington 98101

Hardcopy proposal packages must be received by Daniel Steinborn through standard mail courier, hand-delivery, or by express delivery service by 4:30 p.m., Pacific Standard Time, Thursday, February 19, 2009. If hand delivering, please deliver to the 12th floor Public Environmental Resource Center by 4:30 p.m.

Electronic submission through Grants.gov must be electronically stamped by Grants.gov by 4:30 p.m., Pacific Standard Time, Thursday February 19, 2009.

E. Pre-proposal/Application Assistance and Communications

In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals, provide informal comments on draft proposals, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. You are responsible for the contents of your applications/proposals. However, we will respond to questions from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the proposal, and requests for clarification about the announcement. You may find additional information in our "Frequently Asked Questions" document at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP>.

F. Management Fees

When formulating budgets for proposals, you must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicant's cognizant audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with the EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges may not be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the scope of work.

G. Partnerships, Contractors and Subawards

Contracts and Subawards Questions and Answers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

V. Application Review Information

A. Evaluation Criteria

All eligible proposals based on the Section III threshold eligibility review will be evaluated on the following criteria and weights below. Points will be awarded based on how well each evaluation criterion and sub-criterion is addressed.

Weight based on a 100 point scale.

20 points	<p>1. Environmental Significance. Proposals will be evaluated on:</p> <p>(a) Significance of Watershed. Clear identification of the targeted watershed(s), the significance or value of the watershed and/or resources in the watershed including high quality water, low levels of impervious surfaces, functioning hydrology, productive natural resources such as fish or shellfish. (5 points)</p> <p>(b) Significance of Threats and Emerging Problems: Documentation of the threat of problems or emerging problems associated with development pressure including: potential increase in impervious surfaces in the watershed, potential loss of native vegetation, flood plain volume, water quality, hydrologic integrity, or intact watershed processes and resources. (5 points)</p> <p>(c) Relevance of proposal to priorities. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates avoiding or solving environmental problems associated with growth in that watershed and reflects local, tribal, state and federal environmental priorities and goals. (5 points)</p> <p>(d) Interrelated Projects. The extent to which the proposed project(s) demonstrates an ecologically interconnected effort or is part of a larger interconnected effort to protecting or improving the water quality, hydrology and natural resources including fish and shellfish, wetlands and flood plains. (5 points)</p>
25 points	<p>2. Quality of Proposal. Proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the described project(s) is part of a multifaceted program and reflects a watershed-based approach to conservation, protection and restoration. Reviewers will evaluate whether the approach is technically/scientifically sound and/or innovative and if the methods are appropriate. Reviewers will focus on the following components:</p> <p>(a) Integration with Land Use Decisions. The extent to which the proposal addresses watershed protection and restoration by addressing <i>where development will occur, to what extent development will occur or</i></p>

	<p><i>what practices will be used in developing the land.</i> (7 points)</p> <p>(b) Multi-faceted Program. The extent to which the described project(s) encompasses, or is part, of a comprehensive/holistic watershed program and reflects a watershed-based approach to protection or restoration. (6 points)</p> <p>(c) Technical Merit and Feasibility. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates an understanding of priority water resource needs or problems within the watershed, has substantially completed the assessment and planning phase, and is prepared to begin work or the proposed assessment is part of an integrated effort to show environmental results. Reviewers will look at level of project development such as the readiness to proceed, technical merit, and expected environmental improvements. (6 points)</p> <p>(d) Innovation. The extent to which the proposal describes unique, creative or novel approaches to environmental protection or restoration <u>or</u> a unique and novel approach within your jurisdiction. Emphasis will be placed on how well the proposal demonstrates a thoughtful and strategic approach to problem-solving including, but not limited to, the application of best available science, water quality trading, transfer of development rights, incentives for low impact development, use of ecosystem valuation to influence development and infrastructure investments, and expanding program results under growth management laws or shoreline management laws beyond state requirements. (6 points)</p>
10 points	<p>3. Partners. Proposals will be evaluated based on how well they demonstrate and substantiate strong collaborative partnerships and document effective working relationships among state, tribal, local entities, knowledgeable scientists, and broad-based community involvement. Scores will be based on the extent to which the applicant can show a wide variety of public, private, and non-profit participation and the level to which the applicant can demonstrate strong and diverse stakeholder stewardship and support.</p>
10 points	<p>4. Financial Integrity. Proposals will be evaluated based on the adequacy of the budget information, whether it is reasonable and clearly presented (5 points), and the extent to which the applicant can demonstrate a broad range of leveraging capacity. (5 points)</p>

15 points	<p>5. Anticipated Outputs and Outcomes. Proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which they clearly articulates a set of performance and progress measures and identified and measurable indicators as identified in <u>Section I</u>.</p> <p>(a) Outputs and Outcomes. The extent to which the outputs and outcomes address priority watershed issues or problems, demonstrate scientific defensibility, and relate to the proposed tasks and milestones. (8 points)</p> <p>(b) Measuring and Monitoring. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a scientifically defensible plan for measuring progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes. (7 points)</p>
5 points	<p>6. Outreach and Information Transfer. Proposals will be evaluated based on the design and breadth of the outreach and demonstration component. The score will be based on the extent to which you demonstrate a clear strategy for transferring the knowledge and experience garnered to other watersheds with similar environmental challenges.</p>
15 points	<p>7. Past Performance and Programmatic Capability Applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account the following factors:</p> <p>(a) Their organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project. (3 points)</p> <p>(b) Their staff expertise, qualifications, knowledge, and resources, or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project. (3 points)</p> <p>(c) Their past performance in successfully completing and managing federally and/or state funded assistance agreements (an assistance agreement is a grant or cooperative agreement and not a contract) or self-financed projects similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project within the last three years. (3 points)</p> <p>(d) Their history of meeting reporting requirements under federally and/or state funded assistance agreements (an assistance agreement is a grant or cooperative agreement and not a contract) or self-financed projects similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project within the last three years and submitting acceptable final technical reports under those agreements. (3 points)</p> <p>(e) Their past performance in documenting and/or reporting on progress towards achieving the expected outcomes and outputs (e.g., results) under</p>

federally and/or state funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include Federal grants and cooperative agreements but not Federal contracts) or self financed projects performed within the last 3 years and, if such progress was not made, whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explained why not. (3 points)

NOTE: In evaluating applicants under items c, d and e 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). Applicants with no relevant or available past performance or reporting history will receive a neutral score for those elements under this criterion. 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.

B. Review and Selection Process

All proposals received by EPA or submitted electronically through Grants.gov by the deadline will be evaluated against the threshold criteria listed in Section III. Proposals that do not pass the threshold review will not be considered for funding and the applicant will be notified. EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals or applications and make no awards under this RFP.

All eligible proposals will be reviewed and scored by a panel of EPA Region 10 staff and representatives from outside agencies using the evaluation criteria outlined in Section V.A. Based on the review, the panel will develop a list of the rated proposals. Final funding decisions will be made by the Approving Officials (Directors of the U.S. EPA Region 10 Office of Water and Watersheds and the Office of Ecosystems, Tribal and Public Affairs) based on the rankings, and preliminary recommendations of the review panel. In making the final funding decisions, the Approving Official may also consider national and regional programmatic priorities, the Region 10 strategy (published at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/EXTAFF.NSF/Reports/2007-2011+Region+10+Strategy>), geographic diversity and the balance of funds available.

VI. Award Administration Information

A: Award Notices

EPA expects to announce selections in the spring of 2009. A list of successful proposals will be posted on EPA Region 10's website at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Office+of+Water/WEI08RFP> at the end of the competition. All applicants, including those who are not selected for funding, will be notified by mail.

Successful applicants will be invited to negotiate and submit a complete application package (see 40 C.F.R. §30.12 and §31.10) due approximately 60 days after notification. EPA will provide the required forms and instructions for preparing and submitting a complete application.

The amount of funds awarded, specific activities, duration of the projects, and role of the EPA Project Officer will be determined in the pre-award negotiations between the selected applicant and EPA. EPA reserves the right to negotiate and adjust the grant amount and work plan content before award consistent with Agency policy, including the Assistance Agreement Competition Policy, EPA Order 5700.5A1. An approvable work plan must include:

1. Work plan components to be funded under cooperative agreement.
2. Estimated work years and the estimated funding amounts for each work plan component.
3. Work plan commitments for each component and a timeframe.
4. Performance evaluation process and reporting schedule.
5. Roles and responsibilities of the recipient and EPA.

In addition, successful applicants will be required to certify that they have not been debarred or suspended from participation in federal assistance awards in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Part 32.

Cooperative agreement applicants will receive notice of award through postal mail. The notice of award, signed by the Award Official in the Grants Administration Unit, is the authorizing document and will be mailed to the individual who signed the original application.

B. Instructions for Final Application Submission

Following EPA's evaluation of proposals/applications, all applicants will be notified regarding their status. Final applications will be requested from those eligible entities whose proposal has been successfully evaluated and preliminarily recommended for award. Those entities will be provided with instructions and a due date for submittal of the final application package.

C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

The general award and administration process for West Coast Estuary Initiative Grants is governed by regulations at 40 C.F.R. Part 31 "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments" and includes Indian Tribal Governments.

D. DUNS Number

All applicants must provide a number from the Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) when applying for federal assistance agreements. Organizations can receive a DUNS number in one day at no cost by calling the dedicated toll-free request line at 1-866-705-5711 or by visiting the web site at <http://www.dnb.com/us/> .

E. Reporting

Project monitoring and reporting requirements can be found in 40 C.F.R. Part 30.50-30.52, 40 C.F.R. Part 31.40-31.41. In general, recipients are responsible for managing the day-to-day operations and activities to assure compliance with applicable federal requirements and to ensure that milestones and performance goals are achieved. Performance reports and financial reports must be submitted semiannually and are due 30 days after the reporting period. The format for the reports will be identified during the grant application process and includes reporting on performance measures such as goals, outputs, and outcomes. The final report is due 90 days after the cooperative agreement expires.

F. Dispute Process

Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005), which can be found at: http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getpage.cgi?position=all&page=3629&dbname=2005_register. Copies of these procedures may also be requested from Daniel Steinborn at Steinborn.Daniel@epa.gov.

G. Use of Grant Funds

EPA policy and OMB circular state that any recipient of funding must agree not to use assistance funds for fund-raising, or political activities such as lobbying members of Congress or lobbying for other federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts. EPA grant funds may be used only for the purposes set forth in the grant agreement and must be consistent with the statutory authority for the award. Grant funds may not be used for matching funds for other federal grants, 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.

H: Allowable Costs

All costs incurred under this program must be allowable under the applicable Code of Federal Regulations (formerly Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Cost Circular: 2 C.F.R. §225 (formerly A-87) for State and Local and Indian Tribal Governments. You may find copies of this circular at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/> . In accordance with EPA policy and the OMB circulars, as appropriate, any recipient of funding must agree not to use assistance funds for lobbying, fund-raising, or political activities (i.e., lobbying members of Congress or lobbying for other Federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts).

VII. Agency Contact

For additional information, please contact:

Daniel Steinborn
US EPA Region 10
1200 6th Ave. Suite 900 (ETPA 086)
Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: 206-553-2728
Email: Steinborn.Daniel@epa.gov

VIII. Other Information

A: Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC)

All projects collecting environmental data will require a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).

Certain quality assurance and/or quality control (QA/QC) and peer review requirements are applicable to the collection of environmental data. Environmental data are any measurements or information that describe environmental processes, location, or condition, ecological or health effects and consequences, or the performance of environmental technology. Environmental data also include information collected directly from measurements, produced from models, and obtained from other sources such as data bases or published literature. Regulations pertaining to QA/QC requirements can be found in 40 C.F.R. Parts 30.54 and 31.45. Additional guidance can be found at http://www.epa.gov/quality/qa_docs.html#noeparqt.

Applicants should allow sufficient time and resources for development and approval of a QAPP in their proposed projects. If your organization does not have a Quality Management System in place, one must be developed. For successful proposals, a project specific QAPP must be submitted and approved by EPA. Allow one month for approval in your timeline.

B. Allowance for Collection of Geospatial Information

Grants awarded under this announcement may involve the collection of Geospatial Information. Geospatial data generally means information that identifies, depicts, or describes the geographic locations, boundaries, or characteristics of inhabitants and natural or constructed features on the Earth. This includes such information derived from, among other sources, socio demographic analysis, economic analysis, land information records and land use information processing, statistical analysis, survey and observational methodologies, environmental analysis, critical infrastructure protection, satellites, remote sensing, airborne imagery collection, mapping, engineering, construction, global positioning systems, and surveying technologies and activities. It also includes individual point or site specific data that are referenced to a location on the earth and digital aerial imagery of the earth.

This information may be derived from, among other things, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Global Positioning Systems (GPS), remote sensing, mapping, charting, and surveying technologies, or statistical data. For purposes of EPA grants, this refers to geographically based

information or data or the tools, applications or hardware that allow one to collect, manage, analyze, store or distribute data in a geographic manner.

C. Data Access and Information Release

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

D. Assistance Agreement Terms and Conditions

1. Annual Grantee Conference. The grantee must attend the annual National Targeted Watersheds Grantee Conference at the initiation of the project and a subsequent annual conference to be determined in consultation with the EPA Project Officer. Attendance at two conferences is mandatory. The purpose of these conferences is to provide watershed organizations with training and support to better restore, protect, and manage their watersheds, provide help and assistance regarding Agency grants management requirements and provide grant recipients with opportunities to share successful approaches with each other.

The recipient will be allowed to use award funds to pay for travel and lodging and can be included in the proposed budget. The cost of hosting the conference will be paid for by EPA.

2. Information Technology. Recipients are required to institute standardized reporting requirements into their work plans and can include such costs in their budgets. All environmental data must be entered into the Agency's Storage and Retrieval data system (STORET) and recipients may need to purchase appropriate ORACLE software to do so. If you need to purchase ORACLE, you may include the purchase in your budget. STORET is a repository for water quality, biological, and other physical data used by state environmental agencies, EPA and other federal agencies, universities, private citizens, and many other organizations. EPA will provide information regarding training to input data. More information about STORET can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/STORET>.

E: Exchange Network

EPA, states, territories, and tribes are working together to develop the National Environmental Information Exchange Network, a secure, Internet- and standards-based way to support electronic data reporting, sharing, and integration of both regulatory and non-regulatory environmental data. States, tribes and territories exchanging data with each other or with EPA, should make the Exchange Network and the Agency's connection to it, the Central Data Exchange (CDX), the standard way they exchange data and should phase out any legacy methods they have been using. More information on the Exchange Network is available at <http://www.exchangenetwork.net>.

Appendix A

Instructions for Grants.Gov Electronic Submissions

How to submit your proposal through Grants.gov:

At <http://www.grants.gov>, you will find step-by-step instructions which will help you to apply under this announcement. Proposals submitted through Grants.gov will be time/date stamped electronically.

If you wish to apply electronically via Grants.gov, the electronic submission of your proposal package must be made by an official representative of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov and authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on "Get Registered" on the left side of the page. Note that the registration process may take a week or longer to complete. If your organization is not currently registered with Grants.gov, 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: YOU MUST REGISTER IN ADVANCE ON Grants.gov (A WEEK OR LONGER), AND YOU CANNOT DO THIS AT THE LAST MINUTE OR ELSE YOUR PROPOSAL MAY BE LATE AND NOT ACCEPTED .**

To begin the proposal process under this grant announcement, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the "Apply for Grants" tab on the left side of the page. Then click on "Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package" to download the compatible Adobe viewer and obtain the proposal package. **To apply through grants.gov you must use Adobe Reader applications and download the compatible Adobe Reader version** (Adobe Reader applications are available to download for free on <http://www.grants.gov>). For more information on Adobe Reader, visit the [Help section](http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp) on grants.gov at <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program_status.jsp).

Once you have downloaded the viewer, you may retrieve the proposal package by entering the Funding Opportunity Number, EPA-EPA-R10-WEI1-2008, or CFDA number 66.119, in the space provided. You may also be able to access the proposal package by clicking on the Application button at the top right of the synopsis page for this announcement on <http://www.grants.gov> (to find the synopsis page, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the "Find Grant Opportunities" button on the left side of the page and then go to Search Opportunities and use the Browse by Agency feature to find EPA opportunities).

****If you have any questions regarding Grants.gov, please email the Grants.gov Contact Center at support@grants.gov or call 1-800-518-4726.**

Grants.gov Proposal Submission Deadline

Your organization's AOR (Authorized Representative) **must** submit your complete proposal package as described below, electronically to EPA via Grants.gov (<http://www.grants.gov/>) no later than **FILL IN DATE AND TIME**

Proposal Materials

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

1. Proposal including cover page and project narrative as described in Section IV.C of the announcement.
2. SF 424
3. SF 424A
4. Maps, Letters of Commitment, and a Logic Model-see Appendix B

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

For the SF 424 and SF 424A, click on the appropriate form and then click "Open Form" below the box. The fields that must be completed will be highlighted in yellow. Optional fields and completed fields will be displayed in white. If you enter an invalid response or incomplete information in a field, you will receive an error message. When you have finished filling out each form, click "Save." When you return to the electronic Grant Application Package page, click on the form you just completed, and then click on the box that says, "Move Form to Submission List." This action moves the document over to the box that says, "Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission." All additional documents may be submitted as "Attachments".

Once you have finished filling out all of the forms/attachments and they appear in one of the "Completed Documents for Submission" boxes, click the "Save" button that appears at the top of the Web page. It is suggested that you save the document a second time, using a different name, since this will make it easier to submit an amended package later if necessary.

Please use the following format when saving your file: "Applicant Name – West Coast Estuaries Initiative - Watershed Name - State." If it becomes necessary to submit an amended package at a later date, then the name of the 2nd submission should be changed to "Applicant Name – West Coast Estuaries - Watershed Name - State - 2nd Submission." Once your application package has been completed and saved, send it to your AOR for submission to U.S. EPA through Grants.gov. Please advise your AOR to close all other software programs before attempting to submit the application package through Grants.gov.

In the "Application Filing Name" box, your AOR should enter your organization's name (abbreviated where possible), the appropriate region, the fiscal year (e.g., FY09), and the grant category (e.g., Environmental Quality). The filing name should not exceed 40 characters. From the "Grant Application Package" page, your AOR may submit the application package by clicking the "Submit" button that appears at the top of the page. The AOR will then be asked to verify the agency and funding opportunity number for which the application package is being submitted. If problems are encountered during the submission process, the AOR should reboot his/her computer before trying to submit the application package again. [It may be necessary to turn off the computer (not just restart it) before attempting to submit the package again.] If the AOR continues to experience submission problems, he/she may contact Grants.gov for assistance by phone at 1-800-518-4726 or email at <http://www/grants.gov/help/help.jsp> and at the same time, should notify Wendy Wasson at 206-553-5780 or wasson.wendy@epa.gov of the problem. If you have any technical difficulties at any time during this process, please refer to <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp>.

Appendix B - Logic Model

Measuring Environmental Results: Outputs and Outcomes

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

OUTPUTS: Outputs are the activities or deliverables that are to be accomplished as a result of a grant. Outputs are generally described as deliverables or milestones in a workplan or timeline. EPA project officers track the completion of outputs to monitor the progress of a grant. Outputs include things like number of workshops held, number of volunteers trained, field work completed, study completed, watershed management plan completed, etc.

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

Medium and long-term outcomes can be costly, especially if monitoring, sampling and analysis are involved. In addition, it can take many years for the long-term impact of a grant to have a measurable effect on the environment. For small grants, we tend to focus on short and medium-term outcomes, but we want to see the grant in the context of long term goals and objectives.

- *Short-term outcomes* may include things like: increased knowledge, active stewardship program.
- *Medium-term outcomes* might include: documented widespread adoption of best management practices, documented reduction of pesticide use (3 of pounds of pesticides per acre no longer being used on 2000 acres).
- *Long-term outcomes* might include: documented reduction of nutrients in lake, documented reduction in # of children with asthma, documented improvement of indoor air quality, meeting water quality standards.

Logic Models

Logic models come in many forms and shapes. You may find that a very simple version does the trick, or you can really get into the details. In any case, they all go something like this:

We need to conduct this research
so that
Scientists and the public understand why the fish are dying
so that
Decision makers can institute protective land use policies
so that
Residents can modify detrimental behaviors
so that
Conditions in the stream improve
so that
Salmon mortality is reduced in urban streams
so that
Beneficial uses are achieved.

Logic Model Example 1

Proposal:	
-----------	--

Link to EPA Strategic Plan	Resources/Input	Activities (and targets, if any)	Stated Outputs (with targets)	Anticipated Outcomes (with targets)	Baseline
<p>Goal 2=Clean and Safe Water Objective 2.1: Protect Human Health Subobjective 2.1.1= Water Safe to Drink Objective 2.2= Protect Water Quality Subobjective 2.2.1= Improve Water Quality on a Watershed Basis 2.2.2= Improve Coastal and Ocean Waters</p> <p>Goal 4=Healthy Communities and Ecosystems Objective 4.3= Ecosystems. Protect, Sustain, and Restore the Health of Natural Habitats and Ecosystems Sub-objective 4.3.1=Protect and Restore Ecosystems Sub-objective 4.3.2=Increase Wetlands</p>	<p>Describe the resources ... funding amounts from EPA and match, in-house and/or contractor expertise, property, etc.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">← delete sub-objectives that are not relevant</p>	<p>Describe actions, not results... e.g. conducting NEPA review, developing plans for... getting public input... purchasing equipment... constructing developing ordinance... watershed characterization</p>	<p>Describe actual products, reports, meetings, plans, for each activity. Include numbers and dates expected if known. These should be accomplishments <u>during</u> the grant period.</p>	<p>Examples: Broader results that <u>continue or occur after</u> the end of the grant project period. Include numbers and dates expected if known Short Term: (1) volume of cleaner water discharged or supplied for X number of people (2) Increased infiltration, (3) Increased public support or scientific understanding of watershed. Interim: (1) Reduction of pollutant loadings. (2) Environmental awareness within community. (3) Protection of X acres of wetland. (4) Reduction of risk to watershed Long term: restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of ... or improved health of population.... Supportive of strategic subobjectives in column 1</p>	<p>Data on current conditions discharge volumes, quality, high quality waters in need of protection, impervious cover against which to measure change due to funded activity.</p>

Logic Model Example 2

INPUTS	OUTPUTS		OUTCOMES		
<p><i>EPA funds \$148768</i></p> <p><i>Logan County Planning Division Manager time in project management \$1748</i></p> <p><i>(other stated inputs)</i></p>	ACTIVITIES	PARTICIPANTS	SHORT TERM	MEDIUM TERM	LONG TERM
	<p><i>Conduct a ecosystem valuation of a small watershed in Logan County to determine cost-benefit of protecting natural systems over engineered stormwater structures.</i></p> <p><i>Develop land use designations and development standards and incentive programs to implement recommendations of valuation.</i></p>	<p><i>Logan County staff and University staff conduct valuation.</i></p> <p><i>Logan County staff, with assistance from outside contract and local citizen committee, develop land use designations and development standards and incentive programs.</i></p>	<p><i>Ecosystem Valuation</i></p> <p><i>Develop land use designations and development standards and incentive programs</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Increase in acreage protected from development.</i> • <i>No net increase in effective impervious cover.</i> • <i>Reduced risk of increased flooding in down stream flood plain.</i> 	<p><i>Preservation of the naturally functioning ecosystem/ watershed processes so that all species dependant on all the functions of that ecosystem are maintained in plentiful supply on the watershed.</i></p>
			OUTCOME MEASURES		
			<p>Final report with recommendations for implementation</p> <p>Specific land use designations in sub area plan</p> <p>Incentive program</p>	<p># of wetland acres protected</p> <p># of functioning riparian miles protected</p> <p>Peak flow hydrology maintained or reduced with increase development</p>	<p>Watershed hydrology maintained. Less need for new restoration projects. Species maintenance or recovery.</p>