

# Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act FY 2010 Request for Project Proposals

## 1) Funding Opportunity Description

The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) requests interested entities to submit proposals and regional projects for the restoration of Great Lakes fish and wildlife resources, as authorized under the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act (16 USC 941c). This request is being presented by the USFWS through the U.S. Government's Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA # 15.608) and via the U.S. Government's internet portal for federal funding opportunities at [Grants.gov](http://Grants.gov).

The purpose of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act (GLFWRA) is to provide assistance to States, Indian Tribes, and other interested entities to encourage cooperative conservation, restoration and management of the fish and wildlife resources and their habitats in the Great Lakes Basin.

Beginning in fiscal year 2010, for the first time applications will be received for regional projects in addition to restoration proposals. Regional projects are authorized activities of the USFWS related to fish and wildlife resource protection, restoration, maintenance, and enhancement impacting the resources of multiple States or Indian Tribes with fish and wildlife management authority in the Great Lakes Basin. The USFWS will be responsible for accomplishing regional projects on behalf of the State and/or Tribal agencies submitting the regional project request.

All proposals should focus on the restoration of fish and/or wildlife resources and their habitats in the Great Lakes Basin and should be consistent with the [goals of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 2006](#) and the recommendations of the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration's "[Strategy to Restore and Protect the Great Lakes](#)". Proposals should also be consistent with one or more of the following:

- a. The goals of the [Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement](#);
- b. The [Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act](#) as reauthorized by the National Invasive Species Act;
- c. The recommendations from the [Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study of 1995](#);
- d. The [fish community objectives](#) identified by the [lake committees](#) and the Council of Lake Committees;
- e. The [Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries](#);
- f. The [Joint Strategic Plan for Management of Great Lakes Fisheries](#); and
- g. The [Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture 2007 Implementation Plan](#).
- h. Additional step down plans that further specify the implementation of the goals and objectives of the above plans at the state, tribal, watershed or local level.

Proposals submitted are reviewed and recommended for funding by the GLFWRA Proposal Review Committee under the guidance of the USFWS. Since 1998, 87 restoration proposals totaling close to \$8.3 million, including \$5.0 million in federal funds, have been implemented. More than 60 organizations have contributed matching funds and expertise.

## **2) Award Information**

Supported in part by President Obama's Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, a total of \$8 million will be available to support projects this fiscal year. This represents the largest amount appropriated for this effort since the grants program in 1998. Available funding and project awards are subject to final Congressional appropriations for Fiscal Year 2010.

Up to 33% of the total Congressional appropriation to the GLFWRA is eligible to fund regional projects.

Successful restoration proposals have ranged from **\$12,000** to **\$223,000**, with the average proposal at **\$72,000**.

Accepted restoration proposals will be awarded funding for the duration of the project via a cooperative or grant agreement between the recipient and the USFWS. Funding will be made available once agreements are signed by each party. Continuation of projects funded in previous fiscal years is eligible but will be considered and reviewed as a new project.

Regional projects are subject to annual appropriations. Multiple year projects will be contingent on future appropriations.

## **3) Eligibility Information**

### **A) Eligible Applicants**

#### **Restoration Proposals**

States, Federally Recognized Indian Tribal Governments, and Native American Treaty Organizations within the Great Lakes Basin are eligible. Local governments, non-governmental organizations, universities, and conservation organizations (either within or outside of the basin) may receive funding if sponsored by an institution listed above. Proof of sponsorship is not required at the pre-proposal stage, but is required during the review of full proposals to receive funding.

#### **Regional Projects**

Proposals for regional project must be submitted by a State Director and/or Tribal Chair (or a joint submission from the supervisors of the agency's fish and wildlife programs on behalf of the Director or Tribal Chair). Regional projects should impact

multiple States and/or Tribes, consequently each proposal should provide documentation of all State Directors and Tribal Chairs who support the project (or a joint letter of support from the supervisors of the agency's fish and wildlife programs on behalf of the Director or Tribal Chair).

## B) Cost Sharing

### **Restoration Proposals**

All proposals **require a 25% non-federal match**. The required match is 25% of the **total project costs** (funding request + non-federal match). For example, if the funding request is for \$50,000 of federal funding, the minimum required non-federal match is \$16,666.66 ( $\$50,000 / 0.75 = \$66,666.66 - \$50,000.00 = \$16,666.66$ ).

### **Regional Projects**

Regional projects selected shall be exempt from cost sharing if the USFWS Director determines that the authorization for the project does not require a non-Federal cost-share.

## C) Timeliness

Any proposals received after the submission deadline (see below) will not be considered.

## **4) Application Submission Information**

### A) Application Process Overview

Two-page project pre-proposals are submitted to the USFWS. Pre-proposals are reviewed and ranked by the GLFWRA Proposal Review Committee. Successful applicants of restoration proposals will be invited to submit full proposals based on the review and merit of the pre-proposal. Based on available funding, final regional projects will be developed among the applicants submitting the project and the USFWS.

### B) Obtaining Application Materials

The Request for Project proposals and Project Pre-proposal form can be downloaded at the [Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act](#) internet site.

## C) Content and Form of Application

### **Pre-proposal**

Pre-proposals are limited to **two pages** and must include the following information: project title; project applicant(s); costs; project dates; rationale; objectives; methods; references; information on how each of the eight review criteria are addressed; and deliverables/products. Pre-proposals for restoration projects must also include separate one page curriculum vitae or resume for each project applicant.

### **Full proposal**

#### **Restoration Proposals**

Those applicants invited to submit full proposals will be required to submit the same information as included in the pre-proposals with more detail that may include providing a response to comments/suggestions from the Proposal Review Committee that will be provided via email. The following information must be included in detail: source of the non-federal match; budget (including direct and indirect costs); background and rationale; project objectives; methods; information on how each of the eight review criteria are addressed; deliverables; schedule for completion; past and current funding support; and references.

For restoration projects approved for funding, applicants may be required to provide further information as required by the USFWS to achieve compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4321-4347), Endangered Species Act (16 USC 1531-1544), or other requirements as referenced in part 6(b) below.

#### **Regional Projects**

Final USFWS work plans for regional projects recommended for funding by the Proposal Review Committee will be developed among the applicants submitting the project and the USFWS.

## D) Submission Date and Requirements

Pre-proposals are due on **January 22, 2010 by 11:00 PM EST**. An email will be sent to confirm receipt of pre-proposals. Pre-proposals received after this deadline will not be considered.

An electronic copy of the pre-proposal (**Microsoft Word format**) must be submitted to the USFWS via email to [Rick\\_Westerhof@fws.gov](mailto:Rick_Westerhof@fws.gov).

## E) Intergovernmental Review

This program is excluded from coverage under E.O. 12372.

## F) Funding Guidelines and Restrictions

The Proposal Review Committee has established the following guidelines and restrictions for funding provided through the Act.

- Construction and engineering costs are allowed for restoration projects that directly benefit fish and wildlife resources in the Great Lakes Basin.
- Equipment purchases are allowable for those items necessary to meet the stated project objectives.
- Strive to hold indirect costs to a maximum of 5% in order to put as much funding as possible into actual research or on the ground habitat restoration.
- Funding is not available for salaries of permanent or tenured staff.
- The development of management plans is not eligible for funding; however, gathering important information for the development of management plans and implementing actions listed in management plans are eligible for funding.
- Travel funding to attend and present results at conferences is limited to \$1,000 per person, up to a maximum of \$2,000 per award.
- Grant funds may be used for project activities that occur after the starting date and before the agreement is signed or during the pre-agreement period that begins upon the receipt of the full proposal, however, pre-agreement costs will NOT be reimbursed if the proposal is not approved for funding. Project activities that occur before the receipt of the full proposal are ineligible as a grant activity and will not be reimbursed with grant funds.
- Reimbursement payments on funded restoration proposals will not be released to the Recipient unless all required annual reports have been received. The USFWS will withhold payment of the final 20% of the total funds until all identified reports, products and other deliverables have been received and approved.

## 5) **Application Review Information**

### A) Criteria

Restoration proposals and regional projects will be reviewed and evaluated based on scores associated with the following eight criteria as described in Table 1:

#### **Management Significance and Relevancy to the Act**

- Importance of Problem or Opportunity
- Project Impact and Scale
- Target Species/Habitats
- Impacts both Fish and Wildlife

## **Project Characteristics**

- Objective and Methods
- Cost or Value
- Likelihood of Success
- Potential for Negative Impacts

All proposals should focus on the restoration of fish and/or wildlife resources in the Great Lakes Basin and should be consistent with the [goals of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 2006](#) and the recommendations of the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration's "[Strategy to Restore and Protect the Great Lakes](#)". When appropriate, all proposals should be consistent with:

- a. The goals of the [Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement](#);
- b. The [Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act](#) as reauthorized by the National Invasive Species Act;
- c. The recommendations from the [Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study of 1995](#);
- d. The [fish community objectives](#) identified by the [lake committees](#) and the Council of Lake Committees;
- e. The [Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries](#);
- f. The [Joint Strategic Plan for Management of Great Lakes Fisheries](#); and
- g. The [Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture 2007 Implementation Plan](#).
- h. Additional step down plans that further specify the implementation of the goals and objectives of the above plans at the state, tribal, watershed or local level.

Proposals **without a 25% non-federal match** will not be considered.

## **B) Review and Selection Process**

### **Restoration Proposals**

Pre-proposals are reviewed and ranked by the GLFWRA Proposal Review Committee. Successful applicants will be invited to submit full proposals based on the merit of the pre-proposal. Full proposals are subject to peer review. Upon further review of full proposals, the Proposal Review Committee recommends to the USFWS those proposals that should be funded given available funding.

### **Regional Projects**

The GLFWRA Proposal Review Committee will review all regional project pre-proposals and make recommendations to the USFWS Director on how much of the annual appropriations should be allocated to regional projects and which projects should be developed into final USFWS work plans for funding.

## 6) Award Announcement and Administration Information

### A) Award Notices

Depending on approval by the Director and available funding, successful restoration project applicants can anticipate receiving an official, signature-ready grant or cooperative agreement by August or September 2010. The agreement serves as the official notice of award to the recipient and provides information on requesting costs reimbursement. The USFWS will begin implementing regional projects as soon as the Director approves the recommendations of the Proposal Review Committee that should occur during January-February.

### B) Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Recipients of Federal funds are required to comply with all applicable Federal laws, regulations and guidelines. General information on grant requirements including cost principles, administrative requirements, and audit requirements can be found in the following Office of Management and Budget (OMB) circulars: for State and Local Governments: A-87, A-102, A-133; for Educational Institutions A-21, A-110, A-133; and for Non-Profit Organizations: A-122, A-110, A-133. These circulars are available on the [OMB website](#).

Additional U.S. Department of the Interior guidance can be found in [43 CFR 12](#). Information on specific non-discrimination, environmental, and historic and cultural preservation compliance requirements can be found in the [Federal Assistance Toolkit](#).

### C) Reports/Deliverables/Products

All projects and activities are monitored for progress and compliance with the agreed upon scope of work. Annual reports describing progress are due each year on or before the date the agreement was originally signed. Final reports, deliverables and other products are due on or before the project end date.

## 7) Agency Contact

Mr. Rick Westerhof  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Green Bay Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office  
6644 Turner Road  
Elmira, Michigan 49730  
Email: [Rick\\_Westerhof@fws.gov](mailto:Rick_Westerhof@fws.gov)  
Phone: 231-584-3553  
Fax: 231-584-2462

**Table 1. Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act Review Criteria**

Management Significance and Relevancy to the Act				Project Characteristics			
Important Problem or Opportunity	Project Impact and Scale	Target Species/Habitats	Affects both Fish & Wildlife	Objectives and Methods	Cost/Value	Likelihood of Success	Potential for Negative Impacts
4 - Project directly addresses a specific management objective or task identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan OR addresses a critically important emerging need as recognized by State, Tribal, or Federal Agencies.	4 - Project will result in large ecological benefits with broad regional/multistate or basin-wide implications.	4 - Project focuses on a Federal or State threatened or endangered species OR project focuses on rare occurring habitat or habitat critical to the life cycle/function of a species.	4 - Project provides clear benefits to both fish AND wildlife communities.	4 - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; methods are unique, innovative, and advance the state of knowledge in this area.	4 - Project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are below target level.)	4 - Proposed timeline is easily attainable and appropriate, applicants are very well qualified for proposed project and there are no anticipated impediments (e.g. permits, etc.) to implementation.	4 - There are no foreseeable negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, disease, contaminants, etc.) from this project.
3 - Project addresses a goal or general action(s) (i.e. a stated goal is to implement a type of action, without specific plans for specific projects) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan.	3 - Project will result in large ecological benefits with local (not larger than a single lake or state) scale implications only.	3 - Project focuses on a native species targeted for rehabilitation or a species of economic importance OR project focuses on habitat supporting the life cycle/function of a species.	3 - Project provides clear benefits to either fish OR wildlife communities.	3 - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; methods are consistent with known standards and techniques.	3 - Project costs provide very good value for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are below target level.)	3 - Proposed timeline is acceptable, applicants are qualified for proposed project, and there are no apparent impediments (e.g. permits, etc.) to implementation.	3 - The project clearly and adequately addresses all potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.).
2 - Project addresses the vision or a broad, far reaching action(s) (i.e. a stated goal is to restore a species or to restore watershed health) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan.	2 - Project will result in small-medium ecological benefits with broad regional/multistate or basin-wide implications.	2 - Project focuses on a native species not targeted by a specific rehabilitation plan or of economic importance OR project focuses on important (but not critical) habitat.	2 - Project provides clear benefits to specific fish AND wildlife populations	2 - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; however, the methods need minor improvement to be consistent with known standards and techniques.	2 - Project costs provide appropriate value for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are at target level.)	2 - Proposed timeline is reasonable, but there is a serious impediment (e.g. qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	2 - The project vaguely or not adequately addresses potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.).
1 - Project does not address an action(s) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan but has some value to resource managers.	1 - Project will result in small-medium ecological benefits with local (not larger than a single lake or state) scale implications only.	1- Project focuses on a non-native species or of economic importance OR project focuses on abundant, less important habitat.	1 - Project provides clear benefits to specific fish OR wildlife populations	1 - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; however, the methods are inconsistent with known standards and techniques.	1 - Project costs are more costly than average for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are above target level.)	1 - There are at least two barriers (e.g., time, qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	1 - The project does not address potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.).
0 - Project does not link to management plans or to any needs of resource managers.	0 - Project will result in minimal ecological benefits at any spatial level.	0- Project has no linkages to particular species or habitats of importance to resource managers.	0- Project has dubious value to any fish or wildlife species.	0 - Proposed objectives and methods are inappropriate to address the problem and are inconsistent with known standards and techniques.	0 - Project costs are excessive and not appropriate for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are well above target level.)	0 - Proposed timeline is not reasonable and there are one or more probable barriers (e.g. qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	0 - Potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.) clearly outweigh any positive benefits from this project.