

# Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program

PUGET SOUND  
NEARSHORE  
PARTNERSHIP



## 2007 Request for Proposals April 23, 2007

---

### **SUMMARY**

The Washington State Legislature has appropriated \$13 million to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) for the 2007/09 biennium to fund nearshore protection and restoration projects through a competitive award process. The Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership (Nearshore Partnership) is issuing a Request for Proposals for this 2<sup>nd</sup> grant cycle. Guidance for preparing and submitting a proposal is provided below.

WDFW and the Nearshore Partnership are looking for exemplary projects of regional importance that restore nearshore ecosystem processes and functions. Project work need not result in construction under this award, but funding for feasibility or design should be anticipated to lead to protection or restoration actions. ESRP projects should exemplify best restoration practices and seek to maximize the efficiency and efficacy of ecosystem restoration. We encourage you to forward your best proposals, as we anticipate strong competition for funds.

Proposals must be received at the address indicated below by 5:00 PM, Monday May 21, 2007. Proposals received after this time or not in the described format will be considered “non-responsive” and will not be evaluated for funding.

### **ELIGIBILITY**

Eligible projects must be within Puget Sound and identified by a salmon recovery lead entity or marine resource committee and identified in a current salmon recovery, watershed, or nearshore habitat restoration and protection plan. Project proposals will be screened for eligibility based on the following criteria:

1. The primary purpose of the project must be to restore or protect Puget Sound Nearshore ecosystem processes or functions.
2. Funded projects require a non-state match or in-kind contribution. Individual projects require a minimum 33% cash or in-kind match.
3. Proposed funding will enable completion of the proposed action by June 30, 2009.
4. Projects with the primary objective of providing recreation, or remediating chemical contamination are not eligible as stand-alone projects; however these activities may be eligible components of larger projects.

## **REQUIRED PROJECT DOCUMENTATION**

Applicants are responsible for insuring that submitted application materials fully address the selection criteria provided. Project documentation should include the following as relevant to project activities. An optional project cover sheet and narrative template is attached at the end of this RFP. The following materials should be included in a project proposal packet

### **1. COVER SHEET / TITLE PAGE (1 PAGE)**

- a. Project name (For maximum staying power we suggest using a combination of a specific place name and description of work, i.e. “Deer Creek Mouth Fill Removal Design”).
- b. Nearshore Database Project number as found on your database printout
- c. Proponent contact information.
- d. Site access contact information that would enable ESRP staff to visit the site.
- e. Location (including street address and latitude/longitude).
- f. Driving directions from highway.
- g. Proposed start date and completion date for activities proposed for funding.
- h. Key personnel and their project role.

### **2. PROJECT NARRATIVE (no more than 6 PAGES of text)**

- a. The project narrative should be formatted to specifically and concisely respond to the ranking criteria as described on the project scoring sheet. The narrative may reference attached technical information as necessary. To facilitate review of your proposal, please address all ranking criteria in the order outlined in Table 1.
- b. In addition, where the actions proposed for funding are a portion of a whole project please use consistent language across the proposal to separate the whole project and the actions proposed for funding, and explain:
  - i. what specific actions will be completed under proposed funding,
  - ii. how the proposed actions to be completed are a complete and vital component of the whole project, and
  - iii. how proposed actions will result in clear advancement of the whole project in terms of the status categories in Table 2.

### **3. ATTACHMENTS**

- a. A budget table and narrative as described in the attached guidance.
- b. A resume or curriculum vitae for project lead(s).
- c. Evidence that the landowner is aware of the project and supportive of the application in cases where the landowner is not also the applicant.
- d. A list of the permits required and their status.
- e. A map or project site aerial photograph indicating the boundaries of proposed work. Please include Washington Department of Ecology oblique aerial photos if relevant.
- f. Design drawings useful for understanding project scope.
- g. Evidence of secured match and a description of the status of any pending match sources.

## **RANKING CRITERIA**

Projects will be awarded points based on their ability to satisfy the following five groups of criteria as further defined in the project scoring sheet (Table 1):

1. Ecological Importance (30 pts)
2. Technical Merit (30 pts)
3. Readiness (15 pts)
4. Cost Justification (15 pts)
5. Public Support (10 pts)

For criteria one, two, and five, scoring is generally based on an assessment of the whole project. For criteria three and four project ranking is generally based on an assessment of the actions proposed for funding.

## **SUBMITTAL FORMAT**

Project narratives are limited to six pages of text (12 point font). This limit does not include the budget table and narrative, a bibliography, or additional attachments useful for understanding the project.

Please provide the proposal in an electronic format. Due to short timelines and limited staff we ask you to deliver the cover page, narrative, budget table and budget narrative as a single MS Word™ or PDF document, and all other supporting materials as a second MS Word™ or PDF document, for a total of two electronic files per proposal. All files should be decipherable when printed on standard letter size paper. These two files can be delivered either as e-mail attachments of less than 10 megabytes per e-mail, or as files on a CD readable by a Windows™ operating systems. All submittals received via e-mail will be provided with confirmation of receipt. Questions regarding this process can be directed to [ESRP@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:ESRP@dfw.wa.gov). Where helpful to applicants-at-large, questions and answers will be posted to the ESRP website.

**Submittals on CD** can be mailed to:

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
ATTN: Paul Cereghino, Acting ESRP Program Manger – Director’s Office  
600 Capitol Way North  
Olympia, Washington 98501-1091

**Electronic submittals** should be e-mailed to (10 MB file attachment limit):

[ESRP@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:ESRP@dfw.wa.gov)

Proposals must be received at the address indicated by 5:00 PM, Monday May 21, 2007. Proposals received after this time or not in the described format will be considered “non-responsive” and will not be evaluated for funding.

## **RESOURCES**

The following websites may provide additional information that supports your application:

ESRP website	<a href="http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp.htm">http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp.htm</a>
Nearshore Partnership Publications	<a href="http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/publications.htm">http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/publications.htm</a>
PS Shared Strategy Regional Nearshore Chapter	<a href="http://www.psat.wa.gov/Programs/salmon_recovery/environments.htm">http://www.psat.wa.gov/Programs/salmon_recovery/environments.htm</a>
The Nature Conservancy Ecoregional Assessment	Contact Betsy Lyons (blyons@tnc.org) to obtain assessment on CD
Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound - Research Plan	<a href="http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/coastal_habitats.pdf">http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/coastal_habitats.pdf</a>
WA Dept of Ecology Oblique Aerial Photography	<a href="http://apps.ecy.wa.gov/shorephotos/index.html">http://apps.ecy.wa.gov/shorephotos/index.html</a>
WA Dept of Ecology Coastal Atlas	<a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/SMA/atlas_home.html">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/SMA/atlas_home.html</a>

**Table 1 – Review Criteria for 2007 ESRP Request for Proposals**

<b>Points</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>1</b>	<b><i>Ecological Importance</i></b>	<b><i>The Project targets recovery of ecosystem processes and functions</i></b>
<b>9</b>	<b>1a</b>	<b>Priority Habitats</b>	The project will protect or restore processes that are critical to the long term maintenance and development of priority habitat functions/systems. Site identified/prioritized as important and supported by PS Shared Strategy Regional Nearshore Chapter, The Nature Conservancy's ecoregional planning framework, and/or other nearshore assessment(s). (see links below)
<b>7</b>	<b>1b</b>	<b>Habitat Linkages</b>	The project is positioned in the landscape to maximize benefits of restoration or protection by restoring or maintaining linkages between ecosystems.
<b>8</b>	<b>1c</b>	<b>Self-sustaining processes</b>	The project is designed to minimize the need for ongoing maintenance or intervention to sustain nearshore functions.
<b>3</b>	<b>1d</b>	<b>At Risk Species</b>	Long term project benefits will be realized for populations currently managed as 'at risk' by state or federal authorities.
<b>3</b>	<b>1e</b>	<b>Information Gap</b>	The project design and subsequent evaluation of outcomes will fill an information gap critical to increase effectiveness and predictability of nearshore ecosystem restoration or protection. (e.g. CHIPS Research Plan link below)
<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>	<b><i>TECHNICAL MERIT</i></b>	<b><i>The project will result in the desired outcomes.</i></b>
<b>10</b>	<b>2a</b>	<b>Conceptual Model</b>	The project proponent will explain how the proposal will result in restoration or preservation of ecosystem processes, structures and functions.
<b>4</b>	<b>2b</b>	<b>Interdisciplinary Review</b>	The project design has received and incorporated interdisciplinary scientific review and input. (e.g. a Lead Entity Technical Committee)
<b>8</b>	<b>2c</b>	<b>Probability of success</b>	The stated project goals and objectives are likely to be achieved by the proposed action(s). The project design has addressed a wide range of factors that could affect the outcome.
<b>8</b>	<b>2d</b>	<b>Monitoring</b>	The project provides hypothesis-driven monitoring to demonstrate that goals and objectives will be met.
<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b><i>READINESS</i></b>	<b><i>The project will be implemented quickly and effectively</i></b>
<b>5</b>	<b>3a</b>	<b>Qualifications</b>	The proponent team has the demonstrated skills and capacity to complete the full project scope.
<b>5</b>	<b>3b</b>	<b>Record of Success</b>	The proponent team has successfully completed similar projects and is not currently delinquent on any other grant or contract.
<b>5</b>	<b>3c</b>	<b>Project Readiness</b>	Projects will be evaluated for readiness as defined within each of the status categories (see category definitions attached)
<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b><i>COST JUSTIFICATION</i></b>	<b><i>The project plan maximizes benefits</i></b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4a</b>	<b>Cost-effectiveness</b>	The relationship between expected outcomes and total project cost is appropriate for the project location.
<b>5</b>	<b>4b</b>	<b>Reasonable Budget</b>	The budget is complete and includes all elements required for successful implementation, including contingency planning, post construction data collection, and maintenance.
<b>5</b>	<b>4c</b>	<b>Match</b>	The project leverages other sources of funding to maximize protection and restoration benefits for requested funds.
<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b><i>PUBLIC SUPPORT</i></b>	<b><i>The project will build community support for protection and restoration</i></b>
<b>5</b>	<b>5a</b>	<b>Public Education</b>	The project has a high potential for public education and the proponent has an effective project communications plan.
<b>5</b>	<b>5b</b>	<b>Partnership</b>	The project actively engages a range of local and regional partners that will support education, technology transfer, and stakeholder participation.

**Table 2 – Status Categories for 2007 ESRP Request for Proposals**

<b>RESTORATION STATUS CATEGORIES</b>	
Feasibility Pending	A feasibility study for the project is planned and funded, or has been initiated. These studies often entail assessments of nearshore areas to document existing conditions including physical, chemical, and biological functions and generally utilize a “conditions analysis” to identify physical processes that are impaired and that result in habitat loss. Feasibility studies also develop recommendations for spatially explicit actions (e.g., acquisition, restoration, rehabilitation) to address impaired conditions.
Feasibility Complete	A feasibility study for the project has been completed. The results of the study are available to facilitate design development for the project elements. In this case site specific recommendations have been developed based on an assessment of a particular nearshore area. Degraded conditions such as historic habitat loss and constraints on physical processes have been identified in the target area and used to develop spatially explicit project recommendations. Specific design elements are conceptual at this stage and engineered plans have not been developed. Goals, objectives, and expected ecological benefits have been developed for the project. Project proponents (e.g., Lead Entities, Salmon Enhancement Groups) have engaged with local stakeholders (e.g., landowners and adjacent landowners) and interested parties (e.g., user groups) to develop community support of the project.
Design Complete	Project specific designs have been developed for the project and in most cases can be used to apply for regulatory permits. In some cases, particular design elements may need further refinement as the project plans may be at the 30% or 60% design stage. Specific cost estimates have been developed for individual project elements and an evaluation of constraints and uncertainties has been conducted. Information necessary to initiate environmental compliance activities has been obtained for the project. Many projects in this category are actively seeking funding to move forward with design refinement and application for regulatory permits.
Permits Complete	All necessary regulatory permits for project construction have been obtained. Projects often have at least partial funding to complete initial phase of project and are seeking matching funds to meet total project costs. At this stage projects have been comprehensively reviewed by numerous regulatory agency staff (e.g., WDFW, NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, Corps) and received approval to proceed with construction activities. Public review processes have been completed and comments have been incorporated into revised project plans as appropriate.
Monitoring / Adaptive Management	Restoration hypotheses and appropriate monitoring indicators about the intended direct and indirect effects of restoration management measures are chosen within the feasibility pending status category. Baseline data on pre-project conditions are collected within the feasibility pending category. Experimental and control treatments are set up within the feasibility complete status category, especially where such treatments would affect design. Initial construction and adaptive management contingencies are established and linked to results of monitoring data within the design complete status category. Data on post-project conditions are collected to ascertain compliance with design and effectiveness of management measures on ecosystem processes, structure and function, and adaptive management contingencies are implemented, if needed, within the permits complete status category. Post-project data are evaluated and lessons learned are used to modify conceptual models, restoration hypotheses, and design parameters of future projects, as appropriate.
<b>ACQUISITION STATUS CATEGORIES</b>	
Parcel(s) Identification Study	The project will lead to identification of specific parcels to be proposed for acquisition. This phase may include early landowner contact to determine landowner willingness to sell. If a site has not yet been identified, the framework that will be used to identify the site(s) as a priority should be described. Consistency with The Nature Conservancy's Ecoregional Assessment, Puget Sound Shared Strategy's Regional Nearshore Chapter or the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership's Coastal Habitat in Puget Sound should be stated. A site visit has been completed.
Priority Parcel(s)/ Willing Landowner	A specific parcel(s) and cooperative landowner has been identified. "Proof of listing", a "Letter of Intent" or a "notice of fair market value" acknowledged by the landowner should be provided.
Negotiation	Active negotiations with landowner(s) for properties that are for sale. A title report and appraisal (or formal opinion of value) has been secured. An environmental site assessment and any other necessary survey work is in-process or completed.
Closing	The project is in the closing phase with very little uncertainty about completion. An option or purchase and sale agreement has been obtained.

# ESRP Budget Table and Narrative Guidance

2007 Request for Proposals  
 April 23, 2007

PUGET SOUND  
 NEARSHORE  
 PARTNERSHIP



A budget proposal is central to evaluation of a project and is the starting point for agreement negotiations, so please use detailed and accurate information. A budget template is provided below that you can copy into a spreadsheet for easier manipulation. You may add columns, or attach additional spreadsheets if it helps clarify your funding scenario or simplifies preparation of your application, as long as it meets and aligns with the minimum budget analysis requested here.

If only a portion of a whole project will be completed under an ESRP agreement, it is important to separate the costs of those actions proposed for funding from the whole project costs. This budget and narrative is intended to describe the actions proposed for funding. Feel free to provide additional information, separate from this budget, to support claims about readiness or likelihood of future implementation. The degree to which you lump or split a suite of actions into a series of whole projects is your choice, but please make sure your description of the whole project, and the actions proposed for funding, are clear and consistent across your proposal

Funds already secured should be broken down into state and non-state funds. Secured funds are those resources for which you have the authority to spend on the specified phases of work at the time of application. Remaining need refers to all anticipated project costs for which you currently do not have a secured source of funds. These include pending grant applications or funding agreements. Total refers to the sum of the previous four columns, and should reflect the total cost of completing the actions proposed for funding. *Authorizing legislative language for the ESRP requires that projects have a minimum 33 percent cash or in-kind match.*

Please include at minimum the following matrix of costs:

Costs of actions to be completed under ESRP funding					
	ESRP Funds Requested	Non-state funds secured	State funds secured	Remaining need	Total
Personnel					
Fringe benefits					
Travel					
Equipment					
Supplies					
Contractual					
Construction					
Other					
<b>Subtotal</b>					
Indirect Costs					
<b>Total</b>					

## **GUIDANCE ON BUDGET NARRATIVE**

In addition to a budget table, please provide a narrative that directly references and justifies the costs described in the budget table cells.

**‘Personnel’** refers to wages and salaries for staff engaged in project implementation. Narrative should break down costs by staff and describe their contribution to project implementation. Identify key those project leads for whom a curriculum vitae or resume has been provided. Indicate the method of calculating costs. Only include support staff if their time is not being considered for calculation of indirect rate.

**‘Fringe Benefits’** are those costs employers incur for providing a package of benefits beyond salary or wages.

The description of **‘Travel’** should include the method used to calculate travel costs. (e.g. mileage rate; estimated miles traveled)

**‘Equipment’** includes all non-expendable property with a value in excess of \$5000 with a useful life expectancy of more than 5 years. All other items are considered supplies. Please provide an itemized list of equipment.

**‘Supplies’** are materials costs that are not equipment. Please describe supplies and the methods used to identify their cost.

**‘Contractual’** and **‘Construction’** costs may not be finalized at the time of application. Individual contracts should be itemized with a brief description of scope, the basis for the estimate (i.e. engineers estimate, firm fixed bid, etc.) and the status of the contract (bid documents prepared, RFP released, etc.) Where personnel costs are fixed and fully loaded (like a conservation corps crew day) they could be included as contractual costs.

**‘Other’** costs should be described by the nature of the expense and the method of estimation.

**‘Indirect’** costs include a proportion of those costs related to overhead or administration that an organization incurs over the period of project implementation. The method of calculation must be clearly described. Indirect costs may not be funded by ESRP but may be used as match. Where support staff are critical to project implementation they can be included as personnel and described in the Personnel narrative.

# ESRP Project Cover Template (Optional)

PUGET SOUND  
NEARSHORE  
PARTNERSHIP



## PROJECT NAME

For maximum staying power we suggest using a combination of a specific place name and description of work, i.e. "Deer Creek Mouth Fill Removal Design"

<b>NEARSHORE DATABASE PROJECT NUMBER:</b>		<b>XX-XXXX</b>	
<b>PROPONENT CONTACT INFO:</b>			
<b>SITE ACCESS CONTACT INFO:</b>			
<b>STREET ADDRESS</b>			
<b>LAT/LONG (decimal degrees):</b>		<b>44.4444 N, -108.3333 W</b>	
<b>DRIVING DIRECTIONS</b>			
<b>START DATE</b>		<b>END DATE</b>	
<b>KEY PERSONNEL and their project implementation role:</b>			

## ESRP Project Narrative Template (Optional)

### *1. ECOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE. The project targets recovery of ecosystem processes and functions.*

#### **1a. Priority Habitats: 9 pts. possible**

Describe how the project will protect or restore processes that are critical to the long term maintenance and development of priority habitat functions/systems. Document how site is identified/prioritized as important and supported by a salmon recovery, watershed, or nearshore habitat restoration and protection plan, and/or other nearshore assessment(s) such as PS Shared Strategy Regional Nearshore Chapter, and The Nature Conservancy's ecoregional assessment.

#### **1b. Habitat Linkages: 7 pts. possible**

Describe how the project is positioned in the landscape to maximize benefits of restoration or protection by restoring or maintaining linkages between ecosystems.

#### **1c. Self-sustaining processes: 8 pts. possible**

Describe how the project is designed to minimize the need for ongoing maintenance or interventions to sustain nearshore functions. Identify ecosystem processes anticipated to be restored by the project.

#### **1d. At Risk Species: 3 pts. possible**

Describe long term project benefits anticipated for populations currently managed as 'at risk' by state or federal authorities.

#### **1e. Information Gap: 3 pts. possible**

Describe how the project design and subsequent evaluation of outcomes will fill an information gap critical to increase effectiveness and predictability of nearshore ecosystem restoration or protection. What specific advances in understanding could be achieved by the project? (e.g. CHIPS Research Plan).

### *2. TECHNICAL MERIT: The project will result in the desired outcomes.*

#### **2a. Conceptual Model: 10 pts. possible**

Explain how the proposal will result in restoration or preservation of ecosystem processes, structures and functions. What is your conceptual model of relationship between proposed action(s) and desired ecosystem benefits?

#### **2b. Interdisciplinary Review: 4 pts. possible**

Describe how the project design has received and incorporated interdisciplinary scientific review and input. (e.g. a Lead Entity Technical Committee).

#### **2c. Probability of success: 8 pts. possible**

Identify specific project goals and objectives that are likely to be achieved by the proposed action(s). Describe how the project design has addressed factors that could affect the outcome.

**2d. Monitoring: 8 pts. possible**

Describe plans for implementing hypothesis-driven monitoring to demonstrate that goals and objectives will be met.

**3. READINESS** *The project will be implemented quickly and effectively.*

**3a. Qualifications: 5 pts. possible**

Demonstrate that your team has the skills and capacity to complete the full project scope.

**3b. Record of Success: 5 pts. possible**

Describe successfully completed similar projects. Verify that your organization is not currently delinquent on any other grant or contract.

**3c. Project Readiness: 5 pts. possible**

Using status category definition, describe the current status, and the anticipated status following completion of this specific proposal. Projects will be evaluated for readiness as defined within each of the status categories. (see Table 2 – Status Categories)

**4. COST JUSTIFICATION.** *The project plan maximizes benefits.*

Submit project budget information, using provided guidance. The review team will evaluate budget in the following areas:

**4a. Cost-effectiveness: 5 pts. possible**

the relationship between expected outcomes and total project cost is appropriate for the project location.

**4b. Reasonable Budget: 5 pts. possible**

the budget is complete and includes all elements required for successful implementation, including contingency planning, post construction data collection, and maintenance.

**4c. Match: 5 pts. possible**

the project leverages other sources of funding to maximize protection and restoration benefits for requested funds and meets the 33% cash or in-kind match minimum.

**5. PUBLIC SUPPORT.** *The project will build community support for protection and restoration*

**5a. Public Education: 5 pts. possible**

Describe the project communications plan and potential for public education.

**5b. Partnership: 5 pts. possible**

Describe how the project will actively engage a range of local and regional partners that will support education, technology transfer, and stakeholder participation.