

Request for Proposals B (RFP-B)
 FY 2011 Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry
 Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI)

Program Area	Approximate Funding	GLRI Area of Concern
4. Payments for Ecosystem Services - Incentivize measureable, robust voluntary actions that result in carbon storage, water, and/or biodiversity benefits and will, in turn, compensate private individuals and entities for exceptional land stewardship that provides public benefits.	\$220,000	Near shore health and nonpoint source pollution

Background

The FY 2011 Federal Budget provides a \$300 million earmark for an interagency Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) which will target the most significant Great Lakes environmental problems in the region in five main areas of concern: toxic substances; invasive species; near shore health and nonpoint source pollution; wildlife protection, habitat and restoration; and accountability, monitoring, evaluation, communication, and partnerships.

Purpose

The Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry (NA S&PF) unit of the USDA Forest Service has received \$3,605,000 of this GLRI funding to fund projects through grants or other agreements in Program Areas that target several of these main areas of concern. This RFP (B) relates to the Payments for Ecosystem Services Program Area; see RFP-A for the other Program Areas.

Eligibility

The RFP is open to all state forestry agencies, NGOs, municipalities, tribes, or other organizations located wholly or partially within the Great Lakes Watershed (GLW). Projects located in counties wholly within the GLW will receive priority; projects from counties partially within the GLW will be required to leverage matching funding for any and all program coverage that falls outside of the GLW region (see Appendix A). Proposals for Payments for Ecosystem Services funding may be submitted directly to the NA, without first being submitted through State Foresters (or Tribal Administrators).

Objectives

The PES program proposed should be developed to achieve the following objectives:

- Develop program and appropriate program infrastructure that will do all or most of the following:
 - Define and incentivize voluntary actions by private landowners and other entities (businesses, universities) that mitigate combined sewer overflow (CSO) discharge risks, or other non-point source pollution discharge through the use of *green infrastructure*¹;
 - Internalize carbon and/or water and/or biodiversity benefits within one simple, bundled payment (or rebate);

¹ Green infrastructure may include trees, tree boxes, reforestation, cisterns, rain barrels, downspout disconnection, green roofs, roof gardens, contained planters, vegetated swales, rain gardens/vegetated infiltration basins, flow-through planters, infiltration planters, and soakage trenches.

- Create a method for quantifying and distributing payments which is straightforward and metric-based;
- Define and achieve real, quantifiable, and measureable benefits from PES activities;
- Design or employ a pre-existing robust monitoring and verification system capable of certifying benefits on an aggregate scale;
- Be economically self-sustaining in the near-term (upon or before exhaustion of grant monies), by linking ratepayer sewage and/or storm water discharge (or other) fees to payments/rebates for ecosystem services (through voluntary creation and maintenance of green infrastructure).
- Be operational within two (2) years of award date.
- Exceed current regulatory requirements (create additionality);
- Be contained within a well-defined, spatially explicit, priority watershed of the Great Lakes region;
- Be scalable to larger regions or replicable in other well-defined priority watersheds to create similarly robust, measureable benefits;
- Be designed and deployed so as to be easily understood by participants, policymakers, and the public.

End Results

Expected results include:

- Reduced environmental stressors that impede watershed health resulting from payment for ecosystem services (PES) programs that encourage green infrastructure on private and non-federal lands.
- Reduced incidence of combined sewer overflow (CSO) discharge events and non-point source pollution discharge resulting from payment for ecosystem services (PES) programs that encourage urban green infrastructure on private and non-federal lands.
- Incentivization and greater awareness of land-use practices that ensure non-degradation and ecological restoration of watersheds (and provide carbon, water, and biodiversity benefits) among private and other non-federal landowners within the defined region.
- Models that can be applied more broadly within the Great Lakes Basin to encourage investment in restoration through market-based conservation incentives.

Requirements and Evaluation Criteria

Minimum Requirements

- 1) Proposals must address the GLRI Area of Concern (nearshore health & nonpoint source pollution).
- 2) Proposals should meet all Objectives and End Results (listed above).
- 3) All funds must be used directly for projects leading to the protection, maintenance or restoration of the chemical, biological or physical integrity of the Great Lakes watershed in the United States. The Great Lakes Watershed (GLW) is defined as those areas within the United States draining into either: Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake Erie, or Lake Ontario or draining into the St. Lawrence River west of where the International Boundary line leaves the river (see Appendix A).
- 4) Proposals must exhibit capacity to implement in the time proposed (two years from date of award), including a reasonable balance between administration, technical assistance, and on-site investments.

- 5) The planting of trees and other plant material must be based on a landscape plan that includes specifications for plant selection, planting and maintenance. Plant material must meet the American Standard for Nursery Stock (ANSI Z60.1). Tree planting and maintenance should also follow the standards described in “Principals and Practices for Planting Trees and Shrubs”, International Society of Arboriculture.
- 6) Proposals may occur on any combination of non-federal land ownerships.

Evaluation Criteria (Relative Weight)

- *Addresses priority landscapes or watersheds on an appropriate scale (40%)* – to include consideration of Statewide Forest Resource Assessments and Strategies² and other salient information regarding priority landscapes and watersheds; however, project proposals should clearly define their geographic boundary (that lies within a priority landscape) so that benefits and results will be tangible (as well as potentially scalable), considering the total amount of funding available/requested.
- *Scalable, Replicable, and Economically Sustainable (30%)* – program meets all listed objectives. In so doing, the project provides simple, straightforward criteria/metrics for quantifying/measuring ecosystem benefits, a strategy for local adoption, an economic approach that is self-sustaining price for these (potentially bundled) services, and a framework that can be exported to other well-defined geographies within the Great Lakes watershed.
- *Measurable results/outcomes expected (30%)* – while specific *outputs* (trees planted, other green infrastructure installed, number of landowners engaged, contiguous land area covered) is informative and should potentially be measured, we are looking for indicators of measurable *outcomes* that link directly to the end results: For example, measureable runoff reduction, increases in infiltration, or decreases in siltation, nutrient loads (e.g. nitrate, phosphate), fecal indicator bacteria (e.g. *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio*), heavy metals (e.g. Chromium, Copper, Lead, Zinc), and/or herbicides (Atrazine, Dicamba, Ghyphosate, 2,4-D) would imply reduced environmental stressors and better near-shore and watershed health. Relevant best management practices (BMPs) and guides should be consulted and referenced in performance measuring and monitoring. Please explicitly reference indicators to be measured and BMPs to be used.
- Although no match or leveraging is required, consideration will be given to the extent of leveraging commensurate with the extent and the quality of the outcome – i.e., leveraged projects may be able to produce larger and more quality outcomes, so such project proposals will receive priority consideration.
- The project application needs to clearly identify the requested funds and any associated cost-share contributions.

Grant Funding, Timeline and Submission Instructions

A total of \$220,000 in federal-share (S&PF) dollars is available. Proposals may be smaller than, but may not exceed \$220,000 (federal share).

Funds to be passed through to third party recipients must be clearly identified: name of organization, contact information and funding amount. The work responsibilities or sub-grant objectives of third party recipients must be clearly described in the project proposal.

²Statewide Forest Resource Assessments and Strategies can be found here:
http://www.stateforesters.org/issues_and_policy/forests_in_the_farm_bill

GLRI requirements will include quarterly reports due on March 31, June 30, September 30, and December 31 of each year with a final report due upon project completion. Awardees will be required to comply with all Federal laws and regulations related to the completion of projects as stated in the letter of award.

Application instructions are attached. Please submit your proposals to na_glri_rfp@fs.fed.us (na_glri_rfp@fs.fed.us) in electronic form, **no later than close of business on July 15, 2011**. Project proponents may expect to hear back within 60 days regarding the status of their proposal. If you have any questions, please contact Sarah Hines at (610) 557-4218 or shines@fs.fed.us.

Application Instructions

FY 2011 Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI)

- Project Applicant:** Identify the entity responsible for conducting the fiscal and performance accountability of the project. The project applicant in most cases will be the grant award recipient.
- Project Title:** Provide appropriate title for future reference to the project. This must be the same title used on the Application for Federal Financial Assistance.
- Project Location:** Proposals should identify the watershed(s), community (ies), counties, congressional districts or other appropriate geographic area(s) to which project activities will be targeted.
- Project Lead:** Provide the name(s) and contact information (address, phone, fax, email) of the grant administrator and the state staff member who will serve as principal contact(s) for the project.
- Funding requested:** Applicant must identify amount of federal funds being requested.
- Recipient of funds:** Identify recipient(s) of federal funds (name, address, phone, email, and fax). Third party pass through recipients, funding amount (best estimate) and mix of funds must be identified (Third Party need not be explicitly named if currently unknown).
- Project Duration:** Projected starting and ending dates, not to exceed two (2) years from date of award.
- Abstract:** A short (200-400 word) summary of the project that describes the project scope, expected accomplishments, and benefits.
- Scope of Work:** Provide a detailed narrative (3 pages maximum) that addresses each of the evaluation criteria.
- Partners:** List and/or describe any significant partners who will be involved and their level of commitment and the objectives/outcomes for which they will be responsible. Do not list partners who will not have a material involvement in the project. Enclose letters of support, as appropriate.
- Timeline:** Provide a brief, approximate schedule showing intermediate steps and major milestones. Please indicate if a specific start date is critical. Project time line is not to exceed two years from the date of award.
- Budget:** Provide a proposed budget using the template provided in the application. Show primary budgeted activities and matching funds (if any). Although no match or leveraging is required, consideration will be given to the extent of leveraging commensurate with the extent and the quality of the outcome – i.e., leveraged projects may be able to produce larger and more quality outcomes, so such project proposals will receive priority consideration. Leveraged non-federal contributions can funding, staff time, work performed, materials and services donated, etc. Recipients may choose to provide grant funds to other local groups /partners to assist in project accomplishment.

Application Form
FY 2011 Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI)

Project Applicant:

Project Title:

Project Location:

GLRI Program Area:

4. Payments for Ecosystem Services (GLRI Area of Concern – Near shore health and nonpoint source pollution)

Project Lead: Name:
 Address:
 Phone number:
 Fax number:
 E-mail address:

Federal funding requested: \$ _____

Recipient of funds: (If third party, be sure to provide name, address, phone number and funding amount for grant purposes); if multi-state project, be sure to identify each recipient as well as mix and amount of funding:

Name:
Address:
Phone number:
Fax number:
E-mail address:

Project Duration:

Abstract: Insert or Attach

Scope of Work: Insert or Attach

Partners: List and/or describe role of any significant partners or Third Parties. Enclose material letters as appropriate.

Timeline: Provide a brief, approximate schedule showing intermediate steps and major milestones. Please indicate if a specific start date is critical.

Budget: (Leverage is encouraged but not required)

Table I: In column II, be sure to include (sum total) of all non-federal cooperators.

Categories	I <i>FS Share</i>	II <i>Cooperator's Share</i>	III <i>Total</i>
1. Personnel			
2. Fringe benefits			
3. Travel			
4. Equipment			
5. Supplies/Materials			
6. Contractual			
7. Other (identify)			
8. Indirect Costs			
9. Total Costs			

Instructions for Table I:

Although no cooperator share (match) is required, projects should leverage State, local and private funding and other contributions (in-kind services) from both Federal and non-Federal entities.

1. Lines 1-7: Enter the dollar amount for each item.
2. Line 8: Identify charges. Additional lines can be added for budget items not listed.
3. Line 9: Charges not directly attributable to accomplishing the project such as overhead. You are encouraged to keep the Forest Service share of indirect charges to a minimum. Indirect rate must be approved by federal partner.
4. Line 10: Enter totals of lines 1-9.

Table II: Cooperator Contributions (if provided),

Cooperator		<i>Cash</i>	<i>Materials</i>	<i>In-Kind Services</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Total</i>					

Instructions for Table II:

Excluding USDA Forest Service contributions, identify the value of all non-federal cooperator contributions. Please value in-kind contributions and materials at reasonable and acceptable rates.

Submitter Signature: _____

Appendix A - Great Lakes Watershed Map
FY 2011 Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI)



Appendix B - Counties Wholly or Partially in Great Lakes Watershed (GLW)
 FY 2011 Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry
 Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI)

Counties Wholly in the Great Lakes Watershed

Indiana

DeKalb
 LaGrange
 Steuben

Michigan

Alcona	Clare	Iosco	Marquette	Oscoda
Alger	Clinton	Isabella	Mason	Otsego
Allegan	Crawford	Jackson	Mecosta	Ottawa
Alpena	Delta	Kalamazoo	Menominee	Presque Isle
Antrim	Dickinson	Kalkaska	Midland	Roscommon
Arenac	Eaton	Kent	Missaukee	Saginaw
Baraga	Emmet	Keweenaw	Monroe	St. Clair
Barry	Genesee	Lake	Montcalm	St. Joseph
Bay	Gladwin	Lapeer	Montmorency	Sanilac
Benzie	Grand Traverse	Leelanau	Muskegon	Schoolcraft
Branch	Gratiot	Lenawee	Newaygo	Shiawassee
Calhoun	Hillsdale	Livingston	Oakland	Tuscola
Cass	Houghton	Luce	Oceana	Van Buren
Charlevoix	Huron	Mackinac	Ogemaw	Washtenaw
Cheboygan	Ingham	Macomb	Ontonagon	Wayne
Chippewa	Ionia	Manistee	Osceola	Wexford

New York

Erie	Orleans
Genesee	Oswego
Jefferson	Seneca
Monroe	Wayne
Niagara	Wyoming

Ohio

Cuyahoga	Henry	Ottawa	Van Wert
Defiance	Huron	Paulding	Williams
Erie	Lake	Putnam	Wood
Fulton	Lorain	Sandusky	
Hancock	Lucas	Seneca	

Wisconsin

Brown	Florence	Marinette	Outagamie	Waupaca
Calumet	Kewaunee	Menominee	Ozaukee	Winnebago
Door	Manitowoc	Oconto	Sheboygan	

Counties Partially in the Great Lakes Watershed

Illinois

Cook
Lake

Indiana

Adams
Allen
Elkhart
Kosciusko
Lake
LaPorte
Noble
Porter
St. Joseph
Wells

Michigan

Berrien
Gogebic
Iron

Minnesota

Aitkin
Carlton
Cook
Itasca
Lake
Pine
St. Louis

New York

Allegany
Cattaraugus
Cayuga
Chautauqua
Chemung
Cortland
Essex
Franklin
Hamilton
Herkimer
Lewis
Livingston
Madison
Oneida
Onondaga
Ontario
Schuyler
St. Lawrence
Steuben
Tioga
Tompkins
Yates

Ohio

Allen
Ashland
Ashtabula
Auglaize
Crawford
Geauga
Hardin
Marion
Medina
Mercer
Portage
Richland
Shelby
Stark
Summit
Trumbull
Wyandot

Pennsylvania

Crawford
Erie
Potter

Wisconsin

Adams
Ashland
Bayfield
Columbia
Dodge
Douglas
Fond du Lac
Forest
Green Lake
Iron
Kenosha
Langlade
Marathon
Marquette
Milwaukee
Oneida
Portage
Racine
Shawano
Vilas
Washington
Waukesha
Waushara