

**U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service
Pacific Southwest Research Station**



With funding through the Southern Nevada Public Lands
Management Act
Announces



**A Request for Proposals (RFP) to Conduct
Research in Support of the
Lake Tahoe Restoration Act and the
Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement
Program**



Evaluation of nearshore ecology and aesthetics

**Opening February 23, 2010
Closing April 7, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.**

Notice: Please read the RFP carefully

Proposals are requested that will apply the experience and expertise of a research team to synthesize past research, monitoring, and other relevant scientific knowledge in developing products to meet management needs for a comprehensive approach to managing the nearshore ecology and aesthetics of Lake Tahoe

A. Proposal Submission

Proposals must be received by the closing time.

- Proposals must be complete and follow the formatting requirements set forth in this RFP.

PROPOSALS THAT DO NOT FOLLOW THESE GUIDELINES WILL NOT BE SUBMITTED FOR PEER REVIEW AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING.

You can apply via the www.grants.gov website OR you can submit an electronic (PDF) file containing all required documents via e-mail or on a compact disk mailed to:

Jonathan Long
Tahoe SNPLMA Science Program
Coordinator
Pacific Southwest Research Station
Tahoe Environmental Research Center, 3rd Floor
291 Country Club Drive
Incline Village, NV 89451
(775) 881-7560 x. 7482
Email: [jwlong \[at\] fs.fed.us](mailto:jwlong@fs.fed.us) JWLONG@FS.FED.US

An email confirmation of submission will be sent to the primary author within one week of receipt.

Any questions should be directed to Jonathan Long at the above address.

Important Reminders

1) Awards will be subject to the availability and authorization of SNPLMA funding

2) Proposals must be submitted in electronic format!

- Proposals can be submitted via e-mail or CD in PDF (Portable Document Format). You can create a PDF document using Adobe Acrobat software or using free, open source software such as PDF Creator Portable Document File (PDF)!
- Proposals submitted via e-mail should be no larger than 2 MB. If your total package is larger than 2 MB, you can submit the proposal by mail on a CD. **Proposals that do not meet these guidelines will not be considered.**
- Proposals can also be submitted through the www.grants.gov website. To use this route, you must complete several additional steps including submitting a SF-424 form (see Section E of this RFP).

B. Background

The Pacific Southwest Research Station, USDA Forest Service (PSW) is seeking proposals as part of the Tahoe Science Program funded by the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA). The purpose of the Tahoe SNPLMA Science Program is to provide high quality science to effectively meet environmental goals in the Tahoe Basin, as mandated in the **Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2000**. The commitment to the maintenance and restoration of Lake Tahoe for future generations has been put into action through a multi-agency initiative known as the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Launched in conjunction with the 1997 Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum, the EIP provides a strategy to help achieve the environmental goals for the Lake Tahoe basin. The strategy builds on the capital improvement approaches that have been underway within the region for over two decades. This strategy is designed to accomplish, maintain or exceed multiple environmental goals and develop a more integrated, proactive approach to environmental management based on a partnership among federal, state and local government, and private landowners. The environmental goals of the Lake Tahoe Region are defined using thresholds, which are standards established to protect the natural environment and to maintain public health and safety within the region. The nine threshold categories are: 1) water quality, 2) wildlife, 3) soil conservation, 4) scenic resources, 5) air quality, 6) recreation, 7) vegetation, 8) noise, and 9) fisheries. For more information about the Lake Tahoe EIP and associated thresholds please visit <http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=10&tabid=227>

Scientific research has played an important role in the management and restoration of the Lake Tahoe Basin by contributing information to the development of environmental thresholds, identifying trends in threshold attainment, and informing policy decisions. **The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act** calls for the best available science to prioritize and evaluate efforts to meet those environmental thresholds. Therefore, research projects funded through this program need to help answer the most pressing management questions facing land managers and regulatory agencies in the Lake Tahoe basin and to promote more effective environmental improvement projects. The program has been designed to ensure that scientific research is applicable to agency needs.

C. Subtheme Description and Expectations

Evaluation of nearshore ecology and aesthetics subtheme

The approved list of Round 10 SNPLMA science subthemes included a call for proposals to address the evaluation of nearshore ecology and aesthetics, as described below:

Management/Policy Need

A comprehensive approach to managing Lake Tahoe nearshore ecology and aesthetics is needed. The Pathway Water Quality Technical Working Group acknowledged that existing indicators, standards and monitoring plans were unlikely to be appropriate for assessing the condition of the nearshore environment. Due to the inherent complexity of the nearshore environment, collaborative development of nearshore indicators, standards, and monitoring plans was postponed. Although several studies have been funded over the last several years, an integrated effort is needed to obtain suitable environmental/ecological indicators and monitoring

plans to assess nearshore conditions, and to provide research results that can inform the selection of nearshore standards. In addition, specific sources of pollutants affecting nearshore condition need to be identified and characterized in terms of loading rates, transport mechanisms, impacts, and the effectiveness of controls.

Description

Proposals should address the following objectives:

1. Synthesize and review previous and ongoing research efforts to identify scientifically-supported environmental indicators that could be used to measure multiple dimensions of Lake Tahoe's nearshore environment.
2. Prepare a monitoring and evaluation plan that agencies can implement to measure the identified indicators and report on the long-term status and trends of the nearshore environment.
3. Complete analyses to assess how proposed new indicators compare to existing relevant indicators.
4. Synthesize and review previous and ongoing research to identify and quantify impacts to the nearshore environment from various land uses and nonpoint sources in terms of loading rates, transport processes, and the resulting impacts.
5. Evaluate the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of various measures to control or reduce the identified impacts.

T

Researchers should plan to work collaboratively with agency representatives and other research teams to ensure that the products will meet agency information and evaluation needs. A current summary of those needs are identified in the "agency needs" section below; however, we expect that the project work plans will be adjusted depending on funding constraints and priorities identified through a collaborative process.

Funding

A total of \$180,000 has been reserved for award.

Time frame

Proposed projects should extend no more than approximately 21 months, with an expected start date of June 2010, although that date is subject to change. All projects should plan to deliver products before the end of 2011, with additional time allotted for revision and close-out.

Expectations for Proposals

Explain relationships between the proposed project and relevant research, monitoring, and environmental improvement efforts: Proponents should review the Tahoe Science Plan and the PSW Tahoe SNPLMA Science Program website, including the Science Update Report and related documents to make sure that they have considered previous and current research projects relevant to the research topic. Investigators are encouraged to identify current projects or pending grant proposals to clarify any linkages or overlap among projects, as well as plans to resolve any overlap.

Demonstrate qualifications of the research team: The desire is to have a multidisciplinary team with appropriate expertise relevant to the Lake Tahoe nearshore ecology and aesthetic conditions. Investigators should explain how their individual and collective expertise and experience render them well-qualified to address the particular issues being addressed in the proposal.

Proposals should leverage existing datasets, models, model elements, and other efforts to the extent possible. Existing data can be analyzed and synthesized to further understand environmental processes, conditions and trends; in particular, these analyses should aim to extract possibly unknown, yet critical, information from existing data sets. Proponents should explain how their results could be used to evaluate environmental improvement efforts or advance management strategies and policies in the Tahoe basin.

Include plans for refinement of the workplan: The project will start by developing and refining a workplan that is responsive to specific needs articulated by the agencies and achievable within time and funding constraints. The workplan needs to clarify responsibilities for completion of tasks.

Plan to work collaboratively with agency work group: Proposals should design tasks, deliverables, budgets, and personnel to provide for a close working relationship with agency work group members, which include:

- Shane Romsos, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
- Tim Hagan, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
- Hannah Schembri, Lahontan Water Quality Board
- Daniel Sussman, Lahontan Water Quality Board
- Jacques Landy, US Environmental Protection Agency
- Jason Kuchnicki, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

Proponents are encouraged to contact agency representatives during the preparation of their proposals. **Do not include recommendation letters within the proposal. However, proponents should explain how the proposal was designed in response to articulated agency needs (as stated in the next section), and how products will be delivered to help agencies improve their nearshore monitoring and restoration efforts.**

Facilitate reporting to managers and the public: PSW expects to work with funded investigators to share their findings with managers, other researchers, and the public in the Lake Tahoe basin. Successful applicants will be expected to provide information regarding their projects to facilitate understanding of their objectives and progress. Each funded project will be featured on the PSW website including the proposal, summary, photos, and update reports. Applicants can identify and request redaction of portions of their proposal that contain confidential or proprietary information which they do not want to have published.

Review of data and publications. A goal of the Tahoe Science Program is to ensure the technical quality and relevancy of scientific products. Accordingly, all proposals should include

plans for technical and agency review of work products, as well as for public review and comment. Allow at least 3 months between delivery of draft products and finalization of products.

Proposals should also incorporate a data management plan and an appropriate timetable and budget for publishing the results when the project is completed. Researchers are encouraged to work with agency representatives to use publicly accessible platforms for housing and disseminating data and findings.

Proposals should consider these expectations in their deliverables, budgets, and timetables. The PSW Tahoe Science webpage has added a “Guidelines for Researchers” section that provides more details about requirements for funded projects. All individuals preparing proposals for this RFP should review these guidelines.

D. Agency Needs

This section provides an overview of tasks and products desired by members of the agency workgroup established to support this project. Investigators are encouraged to consider these needs in developing their proposal, particularly the approach, proposed deliverables, and budget.

- A priority is to develop a cost-effective and pragmatic nearshore monitoring plan based upon quantifiable indicators.
- Agencies expect to work closely with researchers throughout the duration of the work to ensure products are meeting agency needs. Thus, proposals should account for time to interact with the agency nearshore working group.
- Researchers are encouraged to answer the following questions during the course of developing requested products:
 - Are currently used nearshore indicators appropriate and meaningful for characterizing the biological, chemical and physical characteristics of Lake Tahoe nearshore? If not, what are the most appropriate and meaningful indicators of nearshore condition?
 - What are the baseline conditions for identified indicators?
 - Are currently adopted standards sufficient to protect nearshore beneficial uses, public values and desired conditions? If not, from a technical perspective, which standards would more appropriately reflect beneficial uses, public values and desired conditions? demonstrate proposed monitoring plan's ability to be implemented by managers through pilot testing of included field, data management, and analysis procedures
 - What actions are needed to mitigate impacts to nearshore conditions?
- Agencies are interested in completion of the following tasks:
 - 1) Provide/recommend a technical definition of the nearshore environment following review of various agency and technical definitions. This definition is needed to delineate a sampling frame and provide a basis to bound policy.
 - 2) Develop a conceptual model diagram and supporting narrative that characterizes current understanding of factors and activities/actions that affect our ability to achieve all identified nearshore-related desired conditions and objectives.
 - Use the conceptual model to inform the selection of an initial set of nearshore indicators and through the review and synthesis of applicable research. Ensure that selected indicator represent a breadth of chemical, biological and physical conditions (i.e., indicators that reflect the health of multiple aspects of the nearshore environment).
 - Screen identified indicators through criteria provided in item 3 below.
 - Document technical rationale for indicator selection.

- 3) In collaboration with agency workgroup, determine if existing indicators are technically appropriate to measure nearshore conditions. Use the following screening criteria to guide the determination of indicator suitability:
 - The indicator meets the following definition: a numerical value derived from actual measurements of a stressor, state or ambient condition, exposure, or human health or ecological condition over a specified geographic domain, whose trends over time represent or draw attention to underlying trends in the condition of the environment.
 - Decision support - The indicator provides information appropriate for informing policy decisions. It is understandable by managers, decision makers and stakeholders. The indicator answers, or helps to answer, a specific question about conditions of the nearshore environment.
 - Representativeness – The indicator reflects the environmental issue it is selected to characterize. It is significantly related to the environmental goal, objective or standard in question; in this case, a potential indicator can be evaluated in terms of its capacity to reflect public perceptions of desired nearshore water quality conditions. The data associated with the indicator are comparable across time and space, and representative of the target population. Trends depicted in this indicator accurately represent the underlying trends in the target population.
 - Sensitivity – The indicator should be able to distinguish meaningful differences in environmental conditions with an acceptable degree of resolution. The indicator is statistically defensible.
 - Data quality – Data are scientifically acceptable and support sound conclusions about the state of the system being studied. Recommended indicators are transparent, reproducible, and objective. The specific data used and the specific assumptions, analytic methods, and statistical procedures employed are clearly stated. It is developed and presented in an accurate, clear, complete, and unbiased manner. The underlying data are characterized by sound collection methodologies, data management systems to protect their integrity, and quality assurance procedures.
 - Baseline Data Available - Data are available to inform baseline condition or establish and track the status and trend of an environmental parameter of interest.
- 4) In collaboration with an agency working group:
 - Review existing nearshore related goals, objectives, beneficial uses and standards for multiple resource areas (e.g., standards for water quality and fisheries, and other beneficial uses).
 - Determine and document if there are gaps with existing standards to protect nearshore condition characterized by various related Pathway desired conditions or otherwise expressed values (such as beneficial uses).
 - Relate Desired Conditions and values to measurable chemical, physical, and biological objectives for nearshore conditions.
- 5) Evaluate available indicator data to determine reference conditions related to the different nearshore dimensions of interest. Use reference conditions as a scientific basis or starting point to establish new nearshore condition standards.
- 6) Prepare a nearshore indicator status and trend monitoring and evaluation plan and conduct a pilot test of protocols identified in the plan. Make adjustments to the plan and associated protocols as appropriate based on pilot test. Vet results of pilot test with agency workgroup and scientific colleagues. Draft final monitoring and evaluation plan.
- 7) Complete analyses to assess how the proposed new indicators compare to existing nearshore associated indicators. A technical justification is desired to support recommendations for new or modified standards, as well as the background or reference conditions for such standards.
- 8) Conduct a public workshop to disclose the project findings and draft recommendations with the public and broader agency representatives before developing final recommendations regarding indicator selection, nearshore condition standards and a monitoring plan.

E. Proposal Format and Content Requirements

The required format for all proposals is described in the table below. Project proponents should strictly follow these requirements in developing their proposal. Deviations from the required format may exclude your proposal from further consideration. Applicants should identify portions of their proposal that contain confidential or proprietary information that they do not

want made public. Applicants are advised to use the proposal template, which is available at the grants.gov website.

The proposal must address these important issues:

- Strategy for review and synthesis of existing knowledge
- Plans for working with agency work group to formulate and carry out the scope of work
- Development of products that address agency needs
- Plans for review, revision, and communication of products and findings

Required Format: All pages must have a **minimum of 10 point font size and 1” margins.**

Item and Content	Length/format
I. Title page	1 page
a. Project Title (the title of each proposal received will be published)	
b. Primary theme & sub-theme targeted by the proposal (choose only 1 primary subtheme , although proposals may address other subthemes)	
c. Principal Investigator(s) and Institution(s): name and institution (to which the awards or any subcontracts will be made), address, phone, fax, and email.	
d. Grants contact person: name, phone, fax, and email	
e. Funding requested and cost share per institution with which an agreement would be made	
II. Proposal narrative	This section
a. Project abstract (1 paragraph summary)	has a
b. Justification statement: explain the relationship between the proposal and the subtheme description	maximum of
c. Concise background and problem statement	7 pages,
d. Goals and objectives	single-spaced
e. Approach, methodology and location of research	(longer
f. Relationship of the research to previous relevant research, monitoring, and/or environmental improvement efforts. Explain the qualifications of the investigators based upon their expertise and experience with the particular issues being addressed in the proposal.	proposals
g. Strategy for working with agency workgroup	will not be
h. Description of deliverables/products and plan for how data and products will be reviewed and made available to end users	reviewed)
III. Schedule of major milestones/deliverables in a table with estimated start and end dates (note that progress reports are required each quarter)	1 page
IV. Literature cited	Up to 2 pages
V. Figures (optional) for locations, schematics, sample outputs, etc. (Figures do not count toward page limits unless they are embedded in the narrative).	Up to 6 figures
VI. Budget (Requested and contributed funds) Separate budgets can be submitted for each institution in a multi-institution proposal	Provide
a. Personnel: salaries/wages and time allocations for PI(s), associates, students, technicians, etc.	overall budget
b. Fringe Benefits	with cost
c. Travel (domestic and international travel must be listed separately)	breakdowns
d. Equipment (purchase of nonexpendable equipment above \$5,000 is discouraged; leasing can be considered for equipment over \$5,000)	for each
e. Supplies (provide itemized list)	project year,
f. Contractual	detailed
	budgets for all
	subawards or
	contracts, and

h. Other	narrative justification as needed to explain all project costs.
i. Total Direct Costs	
j. Indirect Costs (Facilities and Administration, see below. Indirect costs must be shown as a separate line item.	
k. Total Budget Requested and Contributed (a minimum 20% of costs of each project/subproject must be provided as match by the receiving institution)	
VII. Abbreviated CV(s) for investigator(s) (summarizing qualifications that are most relevant to the research proposal); include CVs for all investigators receiving at least 10% of the total personnel costs.	Up to 2 pages each

Quarterly Reporting. To comply with the requirements of the SNPLMA program, all funded projects are required to submit updates on a **quarterly basis, by the 1st of July, October, January, and April.** Proposals should account for these quarterly reports in their budgets and timelines.

Budgets and Indirect Costs (Facilities and Administrative Costs). Budgets **must** conform to the format of Standard Form 424 (see http://www.grants.gov/agencies/approved_standard_forms.jsp). **Detailed budgets must also be included for any subcontracts.** The budget categories on the SF-424 form must be used; for example, costs associated with personnel, including overhead, must be separated among salary/wages, fringe benefits, and indirect costs. The budget should display time allocations for key personnel for whom funding is requested. We discourage requests for purchases of equipment, which defined as non-expendable, tangible personal property with a unit cost of \$5,000 or more and has a useful life of more than one year. Tangible property that does not meet the definition of Equipment may be included in Supplies.

PSW intends to provide for as much on-the-ground science as possible with the limited amount of dollars available. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to minimize indirect costs to the extent possible. All awardees and subawardees seeking reimbursement of indirect costs will be required to ensure that their budgets comply with a current indirect cost rate determination issued by the cognizant audit agency (i.e., Health and Human Services). Copies of those indirect cost rate determinations will have to be provided prior to approval of the award agreement.

For entities that do not have such determinations (e.g., for-profit companies), their budget must include details of proposed facilities and administrative or indirect costs, which must be reasonable (no more than 49% as an absolute maximum rate of modified total direct costs), allocable, and allowable. No profit or fee will be provided to a for-profit organization. Such entities will be also required to submit a written description of their policy for indirect costs (Facilities and Administrative Costs) and documentation of historical actual indirect cost rates, certified by an accountant, with their award application.

To determine allocable and allowable costs, consult the appropriate guidelines:

OMB Circular A-122, Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations

OMB Circular No. A-102 - Grants and Cooperative Agreements with State and Local Governments

OMB Circular No. A-21 -- Cost Principles for Educational Institutions

FAR Part 31—Contract Cost Principles and Procedures

Funding Instruments. Proponents are encouraged to submit an integrated proposal to address the entire subtheme, although more than one award may be made if the recommended proposal involves multiple institutions. Awards will be made through one or more cooperative agreement(s). Cooperative Agreements are a preferred option as they provide for substantial interaction between Forest Service personnel and researchers in refining study plans and developing products. A grant may be used if in the best interest of the Tahoe SNPLMA Science Program administered by PSW; however Forest Service policy requires use of a Cooperative Agreement for assistance awards that substantially involve Forest Service personnel after the award has been made. **Under the terms of a Cooperative Agreement, cooperators have to contribute a cost share amounting to a minimum of 20% total project costs; in addition, State Cooperative institutions cannot be reimbursed for tuition remission and indirect costs.** All cooperators can meet cost share by contributing direct cost, indirect cost, or a combination of both. Applicants who cannot meet these requirements may still apply, but they are advised that cost-effectiveness of proposals will be considered as part of the review process. In addition, PSW reserves the right to negotiate all budget elements and to refuse proposals if they are not in the best interest of the Tahoe SNPLMA Science Program administered by PSW.

Permits and Permissions. Where necessary or anticipated, applicants should provide documentation to demonstrate that they have or will be obtaining state and federal regulatory permits, and private-or public-landowner written approval to meet the needs of the proposal. More information about permitting and landowner permission requirements is available on the “Guidelines for Researchers” section of the PSW Tahoe Science website.

Proposal Submission. In all cases, the affiliation of the principal investigator(s) must match the institution through which project funding will be received. University researchers are advised to submit their proposals through their university’s sponsored projects office. Researchers should conform to the submission policies of their host institutions particularly with regard to obtaining institutional endorsements and requirements for original signed signature pages.

E. Option for Applying through Grants.gov

Requirements for Applying through Grants.gov Website. Applicants may file an electronic application at the www.grants.gov Website. If so, you must complete the steps below. Anyone who is awarded funding will eventually have to complete these steps (see Section G: Award Process); however, *you do not have to complete these steps now* if you apply directly through e-mail or mail.

- furnish a DUNS number obtained by contacting Dun and Bradstreet at 1-866-705-5711. A DUNS number will be provided quickly by telephone at no charge. A DUNS number can also be obtained on-line at www.dnb.com
- register in the Central Contractor Registry (CCR), by going to www.ccr.gov and following the instructions provided on line, or by calling the CCR Assistance Center at 1-888-227-2423
- submit an SF-424 (Application for Federal Assistance) package
- furnish a tax identification number
- designate a financial institution or an authorized payment agent through which a federal payment may be made in accordance with US Treasury Regulations, Money and Finance at 31 CFR 208

Instructions for Applying through Grants.gov website. Grants.gov contains full instructions on all required passwords, credentialing, and software. Follow the instructions at Grants.gov for registering and submitting an electronic application. If a system problem or technical difficulty occurs with an electronic application, please use the customer support resources available at the Grants.gov website.

First time Grants.gov users should go to the “Get Started” tab on the Grants.gov site and carefully read and follow the steps listed. These steps need to be initiated early in the application process to avoid delays in submitting your application online. Registering with the Central Contractor Registry (CCR), will take some time to complete, so keep that in mind when beginning the application process. In order to register with the CCR, your organization will need a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number. A DUNS number is a unique nine-character identification number provided by the commercial company, Dun and Bradstreet (D&B). To investigate if your organization already has a DUNS number or to obtain a DUNS number, contact Dun and Bradstreet at 1-866-705-5711. Be sure to complete the Marketing Partner ID (MPIN) and Electronic Business Primary Point of Contact fields during the CCR registration process. These are mandatory fields that are required when submitting grant applications through Grants.gov. Information about registering with CCR was published in the Federal Register on January 17, 2006 (see 71 FR 2549).

The Grants.gov Website includes a blank application package. To access the opportunity to compete for funding under this RFP, search for one or more of the following attributes:

Opportunity Number: USDA-FS-PSW-TAHOE-2010-NEARSHORE

Opportunity Title: Tahoe Research Supported by SNPLMA Round 10: Nearshore.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA): 10.652 (Forestry Research).

F. Review Process

A full description of the process that will be used to evaluate the proposals, including criteria to determine technical quality and relevancy, is available at the PSW website (www.fs.fed.us/psw/partnerships/tahoescience) and at the Tahoe Science Consortium website (http://www.tahoescience.org/peer_review/Default.aspx). A brief description of the major steps in the review process is provided below.

Compliance with RFP: One or more representative(s) from the Peer Review Committee will work with PSW Tahoe SNPLMA Science Program representatives to examine the submitted proposals to ensure they fulfill all requirements stated in the RFP. Only proposals fulfilling all RFP requirements will be distributed for external peer review.

Peer Review: Accepted proposals will be distributed to at least three independent scientists (not affiliated with the TSC or the project proponents) who will evaluate technical quality. **Note that you have an option of identifying reviewers who you do not wish to review your proposal.** If you wish to exercise that option, please contact the TSC Program Coordinator (Jill Falman, jcfalman@ucdavis.edu, (775) 881-7566) within 5 business days of submitting your proposal. Do NOT include that information with your proposal.

Relevancy Review: Agency representatives designated by the Tahoe Science Agency Coordination Committee will assess relevancy.

Synthesis: The Peer Review Committee will synthesize results of the technical reviews and agency reviews to provide their recommendation to the PSW regarding funding.

Notification: We anticipate notifying principal investigators about decisions regarding possible funding of their proposals by May 2010. Anonymous peer review comments and relevancy review results will be distributed to the Principal Investigators of all proposals.

G. Award Process

The PSW reserves the right to negotiate scopes of work, budget amounts and deliverables with proponents based upon feedback from the peer review process and to comply with Forest Service policies. Projects may be required to modify their proposed indirect cost rates and/or demonstrate cost share contributions.

Project Start Dates: Projects should expect to begin no earlier than June 1, 2010, although the actual start date could be delayed. Until the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management sends PSW notification that funding is approved and available, PSW cannot make awards. Project charges cannot be incurred prior to the award.

Project Execution. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to coordinate with appropriate agency representatives or partners and secure any permits, agreements, or approvals necessary prior to initiating research. If, for example, the research is proposed to be conducted on agency or private lands, the project proponent must secure all applicable approvals from the land manager/owner. If the research requires use of data collected by an agency, then the project proponent must secure approval to use this data. This prerequisite must be satisfied before receiving funding.

Project Award Requirements. Upon execution of a federal award, the recipient/cooperator will be requested to

- furnish a DUNS number obtained by contacting Dun and Bradstreet at 1-866-705-5711.

A DUNS number will be provided quickly by telephone at no charge. A DUNS number can also be obtained on-line at www.dnb.com

- register in the Central Contractor Registry (CCR), by going to www.ccr.gov and following the instructions provided on line, or by calling the CCR Assistance Center at 1-888-227-2423
- submit an SF-424 (Application for Federal Assistance) package
- furnish their tax identification number
- designate a financial institution or an authorized payment agent through which a federal payment may be made in accordance with US Treasury Regulations, Money and Finance at 31 CFR 208

Authorization of Awards. Funding for these projects is not guaranteed and is subject to the availability and authorization of funds through the SNPLMA program. PSW reserves the right to partially fund proposals/applications by funding discrete activities, portions, or phases of proposed projects. If PSW decides to partially fund a proposal/application, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the proposal/application, or portion thereof, was evaluated and selected for award, and that maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process. PSW reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement (after the original award selections are made) if additional funding becomes available. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than 6 months after the original selection decisions. The additional selections must be made in accordance with the terms of this announcement and PSW policy.