CHESAPEAKE BAY TRUST

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

CONSULTANT SERVICES
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM GOALS AND OUTCOMES – HABITAT

Table of Contents

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to invite entities experienced in various aspects of fisheries, watershed science and policy, outreach and training, tidal wetlands, data review and development, tree canopy and forest buffers, and other watershed issues to submit proposals to the Chesapeake Bay Trust (the Trust). The Trust has been designated to receive federal funds from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as part of the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) Goal Implementation Team (GIT) Funding Program. The work to be supported will advance specific outcomes from the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement that have been identified as top priorities to address.

This RFP includes two "projects" that are described as Scopes of Work (Scope #8 and Scope #11). The Scope of Works are listed below, and scope details and qualifications of Offerors are described in more detail in the sections that follow. A maximum bid amount is listed for the Scope of Work. Cost will be a factor in evaluation of bids as described in Section IV. Offerors can bid on one or more of the individual scopes of work, with each scope of work addressed in a separate proposal.

The Trust has been designated to receive federal funds from the United States EPA as part of the GIT Funding Program to advance specific outcomes from the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. Awards under this RFP will be issued as "contracts." The Trust will establish and manage the contracts in compliance with Title 2 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 200 and the terms of the federal funding by the United States EPA, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) # 66.466, through the

Cooperative Agreement (Federal Award Identification Number) 96374201 dated 11/1/2021.

The source of the GIT Funding Program is federal funding. Therefore, awarded projects must adhere to federal requirements regarding contracting, including contracts with consultants and the purchase of supplies and equipment. For example, Contractors shall obtain multiple estimates or put the work out for competitive bid (e.g., in a RFP) for subcontracted services over $10,000 and use good-faith efforts to engage Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs), including Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs), Women Business Enterprises (WBEs), and Small Business Enterprises (SBEs).

1.2 Services/Scopes of Work and Offeror's Minimum Qualifications

A list of the Scopes of Work is provided below with details for each scope of work including the maximum bid and minimum qualifications provided in Appendix A.

Scopes of Work (SOW):

Scope of Work (SOW)*	FFY21 Scope Title	Maximum Bid Amount
SOW 8:	Facilitating Brook Trout Outcome Attainability through Coordination with CBP Jurisdictions and Partners	$80,000
SOW 11:	Understanding and Addressing the Impacts of Wetland Mowing to Facilitate Meeting the Chesapeake Bay Wetland Enhancement Goals	$75,000

**These scopes were originally advertised in March 2022 and are being readvertised in this RFP with adjusted scopes of work.*

1.3 Scope of Work 8: Facilitating Brook Trout Outcome Attainability through Coordination with CBP Jurisdictions and Partners

Goal Implementation Team (GIT): Habitat

Purpose and Outcomes: The Brook Trout Workgroup (BTWG) is requesting support to help *identify opportunities for cross-GIT and partner (as well as stakeholder) collaborations and improve the ability to track progress in achieving the CBP Brook Trout Outcome* (which includes an 8% increase in brook trout habitat: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/goals/vital_habitats#brook_trout). The contractor will assist the BTWG with improving communication and coordination with partners and stakeholders (e.g., non-governmental organization (NGO) conservation groups) to develop synergies relating to brook trout restoration and conservation goals across the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. Improved coordination will be measured by the extent of new partner/stakeholder data on brook trout conservation projects contributing to meeting the Brook Trout Outcome.

The BTWG is currently working with the CBP Data Center Team to develop a tracking/reporting application that will provide more comprehensive data and a completed database. For this project, ***the contractor will work with the Data Center Team, the BTWG, and the partner/stakeholder currently collecting these data to populate the database to better evaluate progress on the Brook Trout Outcome.*** An additional measurement of this project will be the increased focus and collaboration that will be brought to the outcomes in the other GITs and associated workgroups that support brook trout habitat, including the ***Project Outcomes*** described below.

1. *Building stronger ties to improve relationships both within the CBP and with external partners/stakeholders* by increasing coordination among the groups listed in bullets below. The success of these coordination efforts will be measured by documenting meetings held, points of contact (POCs) identified, identifying commonalities and overlaps across the groups, and recommendations on how to continue building on this effort as part of a final report. We expect that this project will help to align priority activities among the following workgroups:

    - The Habitat Goal Implementation Team's (GIT 2) Brook Trout Workgroup, Stream Health Workgroup, and Fish Passage Workgroup;
    - The Sustainable Fisheries Goal Implementation Team's (GIT 1) Fish Habitat Workgroup;
    - The Water Quality Goal Implementation Team's (GIT 3) Forestry Workgroup and Land Use Workgroup;
    - The Maintain Healthy Watersheds Goal Implementation Team (GIT4);
    - The Fostering Chesapeake Stewardship Goal Implementation Team's (GIT 5) Stewardship Workgroup;
    - Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG);
    - Relevant agencies in states with brook trout populations (New York, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia); and
    - Other partners/stakeholders (e.g., Trout Unlimited, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy)

2. *Developing appropriate reporting metrics and a reporting framework*, by compiling and analyzing existing data with conservation and reporting projects, that can be continued after this project ends. This will enable the BTWG to accurately assess progress toward the outcome and increase our understanding of the status in meeting the outcome, as this information is currently incomplete.

Project Steps and Timeline:

Step 1: 11/1/2022 – 12/15/2022

The contractor will meet in-person (or virtually if necessary due to Covid-19 conditions) with the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee for a project Kickoff meeting. The meeting will discuss the project goals/objectives; review the deliverables, timeline, the role and expectations of the contractor; and be used to collaboratively develop the project workplan. Following the Kickoff meeting, the contractor will continue to develop the workplan in collaboration with the Project Steering Committee. The GIT Lead will coordinate the Project Steering Committee and provide the contractor with contact information for the members of this group.

To better coordinate across CBP GITs/Workgroups, the draft workplan should include ideas for coordination with workgroups responsible for outcomes associated with climate monitoring and assessment, climate resiliency, fish passage, stream health, forest buffer, tree canopy, land use methods and metric development, and protected lands, including a list of potential questions for conversations with other GITs/ relevant external organizations. This list of questions will be determined by the contractor and the Project Steering Committee and will include general questions that will be consistent for all organizations plus some questions which may be unique (as needed) to a particular group. The draft workplan will be submitted to the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee for comments. A final workplan will be submitted reconciling any comments to the draft workplan.

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Kickoff meeting minutes including list of attendees (Word)
- Draft Workplan by 10/25/2022 (Word)
- Final Workplan (Word) 11/15/2022

Step 2: 12/15/2022 – 03/31/2023

The contractor will attend a check-in/teleconference with the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee at least every other week. The contractor will submit quarterly progress reports that should include a summary of activities, accomplishments, potential obstacles, and supplemental information. The contractor will work with Project Steering Committee to collate a list of relevant organizations (e.g., CBP teams, agencies, NGOs, etc.) and Points of Contact (POCs) that may possess data on completed and/or in-progress brook trout conservation and restoration projects across the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. After generating a list of an estimated 10 to 15 relevant organizations/POCs, the contractor will meet virtually (or in-person) with representatives from the various groups, relevant organizations and POCs to discuss the questions finalized in Step 1. After meeting with the identified organizations/POCs, the Contractor will submit a list of organizations contacted, the name/information for points of contact, as well as summaries of the answers to the questions developed in Step 1. The contractor will continually work with CBP Data Team and BTWG on the database including assisting with developing appropriate reporting metrics and the process for collecting data from organizations (the reporting framework).

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Quarterly Progress Report (Word)
- Spreadsheet of organizations contacted and summary of answers to questions (Excel)

Step 3: 04/01/2023 – 07/31/2023

The contractor will attend a check-in/teleconference with the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee at least every other week. Following the initial meetings with relevant organizations/POCs completed in Step 2, the Contractor will continue to lead the Workplan efforts of coordinating with organization POCs and CBP Data Team to collect relevant data on previously completed and in-progress brook trout conservation and restoration projects. The contractor will work with the CBP Data Team and BTWG to continue developing appropriate reporting metrics and the process for collecting data from organizations (the Draft Reporting Framework) that can be continued by the BTWG after the contract ends. The contractor will submit a Draft Reporting Framework to the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee for review and comment. During this timeframe, the Project Steering Committee will take the lead on creating materials and presenting them to CBP partners/stakeholders, with assistance from the contractor.

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Quarterly Progress Report (Word)
- Updated spreadsheet of organizations contacted and updates (Excel)
- Draft Reporting Framework (Word)

Step 4: 08/01/2023 – 11/30/2023

The contractor will attend a check-in/teleconference with the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee at least every other week. After receiving feedback from the Project Steering Committee on the Draft Reporting Framework submitted in Step 3, the contractor will finalize this material. The contractor will lead the efforts to coordinate testing of draft the database/reporting tool with partners/stakeholders /CBP Data Team, will collate and analyze feedback from testing, and will update the database/reporting tool as appropriate. Note that while the Contractor will be leading these efforts regarding the draft database, the CBP IT Team will lead construction of the database, with minimal assistance needed from the contractor. The contractor will continue to assist the Project Steering Committee and BTWG leads with their presentations to the CBP partners/stakeholders.

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Quarterly Progress Report (Word)
- Final Reporting Framework (Word)

Step 5: 12/1/2023 – 12/31/2023

The contractor will attend a check-in/teleconference with the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee at least every other week. The contractor will lead work efforts with organization POCs and CBP Data Team to collect current data and fully populate and implement database/reporting tool framework and results of analyses. The contractor will deliver a draft report on activities and results. This report will include a compilation of all activities to date (from previous progress reports) and a separate section with a recommended approach on how to maintain newly established lines of communication with other GITs/ partners/stakeholders for continued collaborative efforts and data-sharing moving forward. If appropriate, this recommendations section may be drafted separately from the report and submitted as a separate document.

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Draft Report on activities and results, including a separate recommended approach section to continue collaborative efforts with GITs/partners/stakeholders (Word)

Step 6: 1/1/2024 – 1/30/2024

The contractor will attend a check-in/teleconference with the GIT Technical Lead and the Project Steering Committee at least every other week. The contractor will revise the Draft Report based on reviews and feedback to create final version. A PowerPoint presentation of the Final Report will be created by the contractor, for use in assisting the Project Steering Committee with presentations to CBP partners/stakeholders. The contractor will present the final report on activities and results to the Brook Trout Workgroup and cross-GIT partners/stakeholders. Finally, the contractor will create a Factsheet summarizing the project (two pages).

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Final report on activities, results, and recommendations (Word)
- Presentation of the final report on activities, results, and recommendations (PowerPoint)
- Factsheet summarizing project (Word)

Partner/Stakeholder Participants and Technical Advisory Committee:

- Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture
- National Fish & Wildlife Foundation
- State & Natural Resource Agencies
- Relevant cross-GIT workgroups: GIT 1 (Fish Habitat Workgroup), GIT 2 (Stream Health and Fish Passage workgroups), GIT 3 (Forestry and Land Use Workgroups), GIT 4, GIT 5 (Stewardship Workgroup), and STAR (Climate Resiliency Workgroup)
- Trout Unlimited

Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) Requirement: No, *a QAPP will not be required.*

Qualifications of Applicant:

- Familiarity with the Chesapeake Bay Program
- Familiarity with Eastern Brook Trout (EBT)/other species conservation/restoration approaches
- Familiarity with database development/management
- Demonstrated experience coordinating partner/stakeholder collaborations, including facilitation, across a wide range of organizations (e.g., state/federal agencies, NGOs, CBP workgroups)

1.4 Scope of Work 11: Understanding and Addressing the Impacts of Wetland Mowing to Facilitate Meeting the Chesapeake Bay Wetland Enhancement Goals

Goal Implementation Team (GIT): Habitat

Purpose and Outcomes: The majority of tidal wetlands in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed are located on private property and are therefore managed by private landowners (including homeowners and residents). Consequently, how tidal wetlands are managed by private landowners has a tremendous influence on the suite of ecosystem services the wetlands can provide over space and time. Since the upper limits of tidal wetlands flood infrequently, these private landowners often have difficulty discerning the line between tidal wetlands and uplands, especially when the landscape is dominated by grasses. As a result, grass lawn mowing by landowners can often inadvertently extend into tidal wetland such as high marshes; neighbors often take cues of where to stop mowing from their adjacent landowners, which can further exacerbate tidal wetland mowing. These factors contribute to unintended, adverse impacts on tidal wetlands. Other landowners knowingly mow tidal wetlands for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to: a mowed path for access to piers/docks, personal aesthetics, to maintain a lawn-like landscape in order to prevent the growth of tall grasses which are considered by some as suitable and likely habitat for snakes and/or rats (as well as ticks, snakes, mosquitoes, etc.), and to expand upland land use and recreation area.

Wetland professionals acknowledge that wetland mowing is practiced throughout the Chesapeake Bay Watershed with unquantified impacts. Mowing wetland grasses and removing wetland shrubs can lead to multiple negative consequences, such as increased bank erosion, reduction in carbon sequestration, destruction of wildlife habitat, reduced water quality from nutrient runoff, decreased species diversity, the introduction of invasive and/or non-wetland plants, and improper land use. Based on decades spent walking tidal shorelines and observing, in some cases, commonplace mowing of the upper edge of tidal marshes, Wetland Workgroup members note that in some areas of the Watershed, this practice can be widespread. In several states (such as Virginia), mowing wetlands is tolerated and law enforcement policies vary (i.e., The City of Norfolk, VA, has treated unpermitted wetland mowing as a violation of State wetland regulations and conducts enforcement to stop the practice, while most other Virginia localities do not). Conflicting perspectives from federal, state, and local regulatory entities on whether wetland mowing is a regulated activity (and results in adverse impacts to wetlands) or whether wetland mowing constitutes a violation of law leads to confusion and lack of awareness among private landowners regarding the impacts associated with this behavior.

The scope of this project includes gathering data to inform an understanding of the potential impact and extent of tidal wetland mowing across the entire Chesapeake Bay Watershed. This project will focus on characterizing mowing prevalence and estimating the extent of the practice in the tidal areas of Maryland and Virginia to establish a baseline of the practice. Estimating the spatial extent of tidal wetland mowing will provide information necessary to quantify the impacts posed by wetland mowing and to assess if there is a benefit to engaging in behavior change initiatives with private landowners to reduce wetland mowing. At the completion of this project, the CBP will be able to provide qualified estimates of tidal wetland mowing to state and federal regulators to communicate the extent of this issue and ensure there is awareness related to existing mandates for wetland protection (and no net loss of wetlands) and for future wetland policy considerations. The findings will also help inform the next phase of this project; subsequent phases of this project would aim to reduce or eliminate this practice among private landowners through a social marketing strategy for the behavior change of this target audience, the development of communications materials, technical assistance, and/or enhancements to statutory and regulatory programs, local policies, and state laws regarding wetland mowing.

The goal of this project is to estimate the current amount and extent of wetland mowing in the tidal areas of MD and VA through stratified random sampling representative of the variable topographies and development patterns (i.e., urban and rural, inner and outer coastal plain), or aerial imagery or a similar scientifically valid approach from coastal MD and VA to set the baseline. ***Specific outcomes include:***

1. Determination of the present extent and location of wetland mowing to establish a baseline acreage from which to measure potential wetland enhancement acreage that would result from a future landowner behavior change project
2. Identification of possible geographies in MD and VA where it would be most beneficial to focus follow-up phases of this project based on the deliverables from this phase (maps and tables that show where this behavior is most prevalent)
3. Follow-up communication of the extent of wetland mowing to state and federal regulators in VA and MD

An identified end-user of the deliverables from this project will be the Project Steering Committee created as part of this project and the Wetland Workgroup members, who will use the information to inform the next phase of the project. Establishing a standardized method in this scope to develop an estimate of the current extent of tidal wetland mowing will establish a baseline. In the future, social marketing techniques to private landowners could then be employed. Using the same standardized method from the baseline study (following implementation of social marketing techniques), metrics could then be generated to quantify the effectiveness of the social marketing campaign and any behavior change that may occur after subsequent phases of this project. These metrics would be used to track progress toward the wetland enhancement goal. Another end user of the deliverables will be regulatory and non-regulatory agencies. The Wetland Workgroup will distribute the results of this project to these agencies for informational purposes.

This project is one phase of a larger effort that will ultimately inform a long-term, multi-phase effort to reduce the behavior and practice of tidal wetland mowing and make progress towards Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership wetland enhancement goals and outcomes. This project will also support progress toward meeting the Wetland Outcome under the Vital Habitats Goal in the Watershed Agreement (https://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/FINAL_Ches_Bay_Watershed_Agreement.withsignatures-HIres.pdf). For example, the reduction of wetland mowing would contribute toward the goal of enhancing the functionality of an additional 150,000 acres of degraded wetlands by 2025. This project will build upon previously completed social marketing research and initiatives through the Chesapeake Bay Program, such as behavior-change trainings and webinars, including the GIT-funded project "Behavior Change Training and Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Pilot Implementation" (completed in April 2021, https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/16765_Action-Research_Final-SAV-Report.pdf) and the GIT-funded projects "Shoreline Marketing to Improve Shoreline Management," (completed in January 2021, https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/16788_Action-Research_FInal-Shoreline_Implementation_Plan_Jan2021.pdf and https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/16788_Final-Survey-Results-%E2%80%93-Shoreline-Management-Barriers-and-Benefits.pdf) and "Developing Communications and Guidance on Shoreline Protection Options for Coastal Landowners" (completed in December 2021, https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Living-Shoreline-Outreach-Implementation-Plan.pdf). The overall goal (beyond this scope) of the phased larger effort will be to develop and implement a multi-phase project resulting in tool development (outreach materials, marketing products, model ordinances) to reduce or eliminate the practice of tidal wetland mowing.

Project Steps and Timeline:

Step 1: Complete QAPP and Hold Kick-Off Meeting (10/1/2022 – 12/1/2022)

Meet with the project team and convene the Project Steering Committee (invited by the project team and the Wetland Workgroup and identified by the GIT Technical Lead for this project) for a project kick-off meeting to discuss the full suite of project deliverables and timeline. The contents of the draft Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) will be discussed during the kick-off meeting. The contractor will be responsible for initiating contact and scheduling the kick-off meeting. Note that the "project team" refers to the GIT Technical Lead, the authors of this proposal, and the contractor team. The "Project Steering Committee" refers to an expanded group that includes the same members of the project team, plus representatives from the Wetland Workgroup, EPA CBP GIS team, and other individuals that the project team identifies.

Before any data collection begins, the contractor must develop and receive approval of a QAPP. All data-related tasks being carried out as a part of this project are covered by the EPA Region 3 QMP (Quality Management Plan). The contractor will submit a draft QAPP to the EPA. General guidance on QAPP's can be found on the EPA QAPP website: https://www.epa.gov/osa/elements-quality-assurance-project-plan-qapp-collecting-identifying-and-evaluating-existing. The contractor will receive comments from the EPA within 45 days and must resubmit a final QAPP with necessary signatures in place to the EPA to receive the approved QAPP. Once the EPA approves the final QAPP, the project can begin.
Deliverables for this Step include:

- Kick-off meeting notes and list of attendees (Word or PDF)
- Draft QAPP (Word) by 7/15/2022
- Final (signed) QAPP (PDF)

Step 2: Determination of Project Geography (Extent), Selection of Sample Locations, Development of Project Methodology, and Creation of a Mowing Index GIS Layer for Sample Area (12/1/2022 - 3/1/2023)

Task 1: The contractor will review relevant work to familiarize themselves with this topic, including federal, state and/or local laws and policies in Maryland and Virginia addressing wetland mowing. The contractor will work with the project team to define a target geography (or geographies) of shoreline communities in coastal Maryland and Virginia with low elevation landscapes and tidal marsh along the shoreline. A total of four locales or communities, 2 each in Virginia and Maryland, that preferably represent urban or suburban (high density development) and rural landscapes (low density development will be selected for analysis.

Task 2: The contractor will propose and present a method for determining the locations of tidal wetlands that are currently being mowed within the selected locales, and for determining the areal extent of mowed wetlands within the sample area in MD and VA to a joint virtual meeting of the Project Steering Committee and the Wetland Workgroup. The contractor will coordinate with the GIT Technical Lead to identify and select the most useful among existing data sources to be used for the analysis. The contractor will use GIS data layers of existing tidal wetlands in MD and VA. For example, the "1972 Tidal Maps in Maryland" exist through MERLIN (https://gisapps.dnr.state.md.us/MERLIN/index.html) and the "Tidal Marsh Inventory" in Virginia exists through AdaptVA (http://cmap2.vims.edu/AdaptVA/adaptVA_viewer.html).

Potential methods for determining the locations of tidal wetlands that are currently being mowed may include stratified random sampling that is representative of the variable topographies and development

patterns (i.e., urban and rural, inner and outer coastal plain), collection and interpretation of aerial imagery, or a similar scientifically valid approach. Mowed wetlands may be identified in remotely sensed imagery based on several factors which include, but are not limited to:

1. short wetland vegetation has a different "roughness" appearance from natural marshes particularly where mowing has suppressed the commonly occurring ecotone shrub species like *Baccharis* and *Iva*
2. mowed wetlands can differ in color signature from natural wetlands due to less healthy vegetation stressed by mowing and the color of the substrate (soil) becomes a part of the color signature for wetland plants mowed to the height of typical turf grasses; and/or
3. the occurrence of mowed wetlands flanked by unmowed wetlands (with similar elevation profiles).

The Project Steering Committee will provide feedback to the GIT Technical Lead for consideration. With the agreement of the GIT Technical Lead, the contractor will identify a final repeatable methodology to determine the prevalence and estimate extent of wetland mowing within the selected sample geographies. With the concurrence of the GIT Technical Lead, the contractor will implement an appropriate methodology to generate a "mowing index" GIS data layer. The mowing index will be used to indicate the presence of mowing occurring within the geographic sample area using a threshold and criteria agreed upon by the contractor and GIT Technical Lead.

Task 3: The contractor will develop draft report language detailing the data and methodology that was used to create the mowing index. The draft language will be provided to the Project Steering Committee and project team. The Project Steering Committee will have seven days to provide their feedback to the GIT Technical Lead, who will review all feedback and provide comments back to the contractor. The contractor will incorporate the feedback from the project team and submit the draft-final data and methodology text to describe the mowing index, which will be included as a chapter in the final report due at the end of the project.

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Draft data and methodology text to describe the mowing index (Word) by 2/1/2023
- A map showing the shoreline communities in coastal Maryland and Virginia with low elevation landscapes and tidal marsh along the shoreline and the areas selected for the sample analysis (shapefile and PDF of maps)
- A map showing the “mowing index” of the sample area as determined by the analysis (shapefile and PDF of map(s)) including calculations of areas affected by mowed wetlands)
- A zip file of the analysis including the project file, raw data, shapefiles, models, scripts, GIS layers, JPEGs, and any other data used to complete the analysis (if the file is too large to be transferred over email it can be provided on a USB)
- Draft-Final data and methodology text to describe the mowing index (PDF)
- Meeting minutes and list of attendees from Project Steering Committee meeting

Step 3: Verification of Sample Analysis (3/1/2023 – 5/1/2023)

The contractor will verify the analytical results of the sample analysis in Step 2 via a QA/QC process. Validation may involve ground-truthing via physical site visits, on the water observations, communications with wetlands regulators, coastal managers, or watershed organizations or a combination of methods. Validation may result in the development of confidence limits, model validation, etc. The contractor will develop draft report language detailing the verification process, if/how it effects the results, and how they will adjust the methods of the analysis if necessary. The contractor will provide this

draft report language to the project team. The project team will have one week from the date of delivery to provide their feedback to the GIT Technical Lead, who will review all feedback and provide comments back to the contractor. The contractor will incorporate the feedback from the GIT Technical Lead and provide draft-final language on the verification methods text, which will be included as a chapter in the final report due at the end of the project.

Deliverables for this Step include:

- Draft text detailing the verification process (Word) by 4/15/2023
- Draft-Final report text detailing the verification process (PDF)

Step 4: Extrapolation Analysis from Sample Area to Full Study Area (5/1/2023 – 7/1/2023)

Based on the information generated in Step 2 and the verification process in Step 3, the contractor will develop a method for extrapolating the analysis from the sample area (four selected localities) in Step 2 to all tidal wetlands on private landowner property in Maryland and Virginia. The contractor will meet with the project team for approval of this method and will then implement the analysis, resulting in the "mowing index" GIS data layer for the full study area. The mowing index will be used to indicate the presence of mowing occurring within all privately-owned tidal areas in MD and VA using a threshold and criteria agreed upon by the contractor and GIT Technical Lead.

The contractor will develop draft report language detailing the data and methodology that were used to extrapolate the analysis from the sample area to the full study area and provide it to the Project Steering Committee and project team. The Project Steering Committee will have seven days to provide their feedback to the GIT Technical Lead, who will review all feedback and provide comments back to the contractor. The contractor will present their extrapolation method to a joint virtual meeting with the Wetland Workgroup and the Project Steering Committee. The contractor will incorporate the feedback received on the draft report and during the presentation to the Wetland Workgroup and provide draft-final language to the project team and Project Steering Committee. The draft-final language will be added to the methods section, which will be included as a chapter in the final report due at the end of the project.

Deliverables for this Step include:

- A zip file of the analysis including the project file, raw data, shapefiles, models, scripts, GIS layers, JPEGs, and any other data used to complete the analysis (if the file is too large to be transferred over email it can be provided on a USB)
- A map showing the "mowing index" of the full study area as determined by the analysis (shapefile and PDF of map(s)) including a calculation of the area affected by mowed wetlands)
- Draft text detailing the data and methodology used to project the analysis from the sample area to the full study area (Word) by 6/1/2023
- Draft-Final report text detailing the data and methodology used to project the analysis from the sample area to the full study area (PDF)
- Meeting minutes and list of attendees from Project Steering Committee meeting

Step 5: Interpretation of Data to Inform Next Phase of Project (7/1/2023 – 9/1/2023)

Task 1: Using the mowing index for the full study area developed in Step 4, the contractor will create metrics to help determine the Bay-wide extent and location of wetland mowing (e.g., percentage of wetlands in the study area that are being mowed for instance by using random stratified surveys of aerial imagery to detail the area mowed vs not mowed, percentage of homeowners participating in this behavior, breakdown of data per state, etc.). The contractor will write a draft results section for the final report with this information and provide it to the Project Steering Committee and project team. They will have seven days from the date of delivery to provide their feedback to the GIT Technical Lead, who will

review all feedback and provide comments back to the contractor.

Task 2: The contractor will present the results of the analysis to the Project Steering Committee and project team in a virtual meeting. The contractor will provide recommendations for next steps based on these results, and the Project Steering Committee will discuss if the behavior is prevalent enough to pursue a behavior change campaign in follow-up phases (based upon the characterized severity). Recommendations from the contractor may include, but are not limited to, applications of project data to wetlands planning and decision-making (e.g.., communication and decision support tools) and opportunities for the CBP to apply information learned. The contractor will incorporate the feedback on the draft results from the GIT Technical Lead and add their recommendations for next steps to create the draft-final text of the results, which will be included as a chapter in the final report due at the end of the project.

Deliverables for this Step include:
- Draft results of the project including statistics that detail the extent and severity of wetland mowing (Word) by 8/1/2023
- A list of attendees and minutes from the Project Steering Committee meeting (PDF)
- Draft-Final results of the project including statistics that detail the extent and severity of wetland mowing, and the list of recommendations for next steps (PDF)

Step 6: Prepare Draft-Final Report (9/1/2023 – 11/1/2023)
The contractor will draft language for the "lessons learned" chapter and the "limitations/caveats on the final deliverables." Incorporating the previously drafted sections from Steps 2 through 5, the contractor will prepare a draft-final report with the following sections: 1. Cover; 2. Executive Summary; 3. Table of contents, list of figures, list of appendices; 4. Introduction and background sections; 5. Discussion of the data and methods used, including the verification process chapter; 6. Results of the analysis chapter; 7. Recommendation for next steps chapter; 8. Lessons learned chapter; 9. Description of any limitations/caveats on the final deliverables chapter; and 10. All maps and tables and a sampling of high resolution photographs created throughout the project. The draft-final report will be provided to the Project Steering Committee and the project team by 11/1/2023. They will have seven days from the date of delivery to provide their feedback to the GIT Technical Lead, who will review all feedback and provide one set of consolidated comments back to the contractor.
Deliverables for this Step include:
- Draft-final report (Word)

Step 7: Prepare Final Report, Create Final Project Package, and Present Final Products and Deliverables to Wetland Workgroup (11/1/2023 – 1/1/2024)
The contractor will address edits and comments received from the GIT Technical Lead on the draft-final report and create a final project package. The final project package will be delivered to the GIT Technical Lead and will include Word and PDF copies of all documents. The contractor will present the final results of the project and their recommendations for next steps to the Project Steering Committee and Wetland Workgroup (WWG) members at a Wetland Workgroup meeting. The GIT Technical Lead or another Project Steering Committee member will provide presentations and collaboration with other interested GITs and workgroups, as coordinated through the WWG, for input and feedback on project activity and output relative to other outcomes. Finally, the contractor will create a factsheet summarizing the project.
Deliverables for this Step include:
- The final project package, which includes the following:
  - Final report, with all components identified in Step 7 (Word and PDF)

- Editable electronic copy of the final presentation to the Wetland Workgroup will be submitted to the GIT Technical Lead at the time of the presentation (PowerPoint)
- Factsheet summarizing project (Word)

Stakeholder Participants:

- Project Steering Committee
- Wetland Workgroup
- Habitat Goal Team
- Fish GIT
- Water Quality GIT

Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) Requirement: Yes, a *QAPP will be required* for this Scope.

Qualifications of Applicant:

Required Qualifications:

- Extensive and proven knowledge of tidal wetlands and mowed tidal wetland conditions in the Chesapeake Bay watershed
- Expertise in geospatial analysis, particularly with wetland and land-use data and remote sensing and aerial photo interpretation

Preferred Qualifications for the Project Team includes:

- One certified professional wetland scientist and one professional geospatial analyst and;
- A diverse project team, which is defined as incorporating a HBCU and/or an MBE/DBE/WBE/SBE-certified firm as either the applicant or as the subcontractor(s). Expertise for all bullets above, including subcontracting steps of the project to present a collaborative approach for completing the project.

SECTION II – BUDGET AND ADDITIONAL SERVICES

2.1 **Amount Available.** It is anticipated that as a result of this procurement action, one contract will be awarded for each Scope. Each successful bidder for each Scope may be engaged in one additional phase of work through this procurement action. Awards will be managed as firm-fixed-price contracts.

2.2 **Additional Services.** The Contract Officer may request ancillary or additional services within the capacity of the Contractor as may be useful or necessary in the interests of the Trust and the Project for the above Scopes.

2.3 **Add/Deduct.** The Trust reserves the right to add or remove items from the base bid proposal during the contract and modify or adjust scope of work and payment as needed.

SECTION III - SUBMISSION INFORMATION

3.1 **Principal Solicitation Officer and Issuing Office:**

Contract Officer:	Sarah Koser
Telephone Number:	410-974-2941, ext. 106
E-Mail	skoser@cbtrust.org
Address:	Chesapeake Bay Trust 108 Severn Avenue

Annapolis, MD 21403

The sole point of contact for the purpose of this RFP is the Contract Officer.

3.2 **Prospective Offerors.** An "Offeror" is a person or entity that submits a proposal in response to this RFP**.**

3.3 **Cancellation; Discretion of Contract Officer.** This RFP may be canceled in whole or in part and any proposal may be rejected in whole or in part at the discretion of the Contract Officer. In addition, the Contract Officer has the right to negotiate separately with any Offeror in any manner which will best serve the interests of the Trust. The Contract Officer may waive any mandatory condition or minimum qualification if the Contract Officer determines that such action is in the best interest of the Trust.

3.4 **Submission Instructions/Proposal Closing Date.** Offerors must submit proposals using our Online Application System, located at: https://www.grantrequest.com/SID_1520?SA=SNA&FID=35071 no later than **4:00 p.m.** on **Thursday, August 25, 2022** (the "**Closing Date**"). Requests for extensions will not be granted, late applications will not be accepted, and the online funding opportunity will close promptly at 4:00 pm EDT. **Offerors are strongly encouraged to submit at least a few days prior to the deadline** given potential for high website traffic on the due date. The Trust cannot guarantee availability of Online Application System technical assistance on the deadline date. If email confirmation of submission is not received within two business days, please contact the Principal Solicitation Officer listed in Section 3.1.

Proposals are irrevocable for 90 days following the Closing Date.

3.5 **Professional Liability Insurance.** The Offeror shall agree to maintain in full force and effect during the term of the Contract usual and customary amounts of liability insurance coverage in connection with the performance or failure to perform services under the Contract.

3.6 **Eligible Organizations.** No entity may enter into a Contract with the Chesapeake Bay Trust under this funding opportunity if the entity is listed in www.sam.gov as debarred, suspended, or otherwise excluded. You will be required to submit your Unique Entity ID (UEI) number in the online application form. The federal government has transitioned from a DUNS (Dun & Bradstreet) number to a UEI. Entities and/or Contractors that developed or drafted the scope of work content or developed project specifications in this RFP are not eligible to bid on this opportunity to ensure adherence with Federal guidelines, including Title 2 CFR 200 and specifically §200.319 Competition.

3.7 **Subcontracting Opportunities and Procurement**. This solicitation will result in one "contract" per Scope of Work. The Offeror should specify the intent to procure subcontracting services and demonstrate compliance with federal procurement guidelines for all subcontracting services greater than $10,000 and less than $250,000, including:

a. Obtain three estimates for subcontracted work or
b. Obtain subcontracted services through a competitive bid process.

For all subcontracted work, the Offeror shall be able to demonstrate that Good Faith Efforts were used to engage minority/disadvantaged/women/small business enterprises

(MBE/DBE/WBE/SBE) by reaching out to MBE/DBE/WBE/SBE firms to obtain estimates or bids. The following websites may be helpful in identifying MBE/DBE/WBE/SBE firms in states/districts within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed:

DC	https://dslbd.secure.force.com/public/
DE	https://deldotcivilrights.dbesystem.com/FrontEnd/searchcertifieddirectory.asp
MD	https://marylandmdbe.mdbecert.com/
NY	https://ny.newnycontracts.com/frontend/searchcertifieddirectory.asp?
PA	http://www.dgs.internet.state.pa.us/suppliersearch
VA	https://www.sbsd.virginia.gov/directory/
WV	http://apps.sos.wv.gov/business/corporations/searchadvanced.aspx

All subcontractors must be verified by checking at https://sam.gov/content/home to ensure that they have not been suspended, debarred, excluded, or disqualified to do work with federal government resources.

SECTION IV - EVALUATION PROCEDURE

4.1 **Qualifying Proposals.** The Contract Officer will review each proposal for compliance with the minimum qualifications set forth in "Offeror's Minimum Qualifications."

4.2 **Deviations and Negotiation**. The Contract Officer shall have the sole right to determine whether any deviation from the requirements of this RFP is substantial in nature, and the Contract Officer may reject non-conforming proposals. In addition, the Contract Officer may waive minor irregularities in proposals, allow an Offeror to correct minor irregularities, and negotiate with responsible Offerors in any manner deemed necessary or desirable to serve the best interests of the Project.

4.3 **Evaluation.** Proposals shall be evaluated by a review committee composed of technical experts and facilitated by the Contract Officer. Evaluation will be made on the basis of the evaluation criteria discussed below and may include any oral presentation that may be required by the Contract Officer, through a recommendation by the technical review committee, at his or her discretion. The Contract Officer reserves the right to recommend an Offeror for contract award based upon the Offeror's proposal without oral presentations or further discussion. However, the Contract Officer may engage in further discussion if he or she determines that it might be beneficial. In such case, the Contract Officer will notify those responsible Offerors with whom further discussion is desired. In addition, the Contract Officer may permit qualified Offerors to revise their proposals by submitting "best and final" offers.

4.4 **Evaluation Considerations.** Proposals by Offerors who meet the minimum qualifications set forth in Appendix A will be evaluated by the technical review committee on the basis of the following factors:

a. Proposed Approach. Evaluation of the work to be performed to accomplish the goals outlined in the Scopes of Work in Appendix A.
b. Proposed Team (Specific Individual(s) Responsible for Performance of Contract). Evaluation of the qualifications, reputation, and compatibility with needs of the Trust and

the Project of the individual or individuals who will perform the Contract.

c. Experience of Offeror. Evaluation of the quality and quantity of the Offeror's (and subcontractor's) experience and expertise in the areas proposed, supported by references.
d. Capacity. Evaluation of the Offeror's ability and commitment to meet timeline for the Project.
e. Cost Effectiveness/Budget. Hourly rate, number of hours to be devoted to the project, and indirect rate. Budget line items and associated costs per line item must: a) support the scope of work and b) be appropriate and cost-effective. Ensure compliance with federal procurement guidelines (Federal funds will support this work), including Title 2 CFR 200. Cash and in-kind match are not required but leveraging funds to make a project more robust is encouraged.

SECTION V: OTHER INFORMATION

5.1 **Disclosure.** Proposals submitted in response to this RFP may be provided to government agencies and be subject to disclosure pursuant to the provisions of the Access to Public Records Act of the State Government Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland (the "Public Information Act") or equivalent for your area. Offerors must specifically identify those portions of their proposals, if any, which they deem to contain confidential or proprietary information and must provide justification why such materials should not, upon request, be disclosed by the State under the Public Information Act.

5.2 **Quality Assurance Project Plan.** Several of the scopes of work listed in Appendix A will require a Quality Assurance Project Plan ("QAPP"). General guidance on QAPP's can be found on the EPA QAPP website: https://www.epa.gov/osa/elements-quality-assurance-project-plan-qapp-collecting-identifying-and-evaluating-existing. If data originates from sources other than federal reports and peer reviewed journals, a statement on data quality suitability will be required in the final report. When submitting a proposal for a scope of work that requires a QAPP, the Offeror should understand and account for any costs associated with completing this component of the work.

5.3 **Expenses.** The Trust and the Contract Officer are not responsible for any direct or indirect expenses that an Offeror may incur in preparing and submitting a proposal, participating in the evaluation process, or in consequence of this solicitation process for any reason.

5.4 **Acceptance of Terms and Conditions.** By submitting a proposal in response to this RFP:

a. the Offeror accepts all of the terms and conditions set forth in this RFP;
b. the Offeror, if selected for award, agrees that it will comply with all federal, State, and local laws applicable to its activities and obligations under the Contract;
c. the Offeror shall be deemed to represent that it is not in arrears in the payment of any obligation due and owing the United States Government or the State or any department or unit thereof, including, without limitation, the payment of taxes and employee benefits, and, if selected for award, that it shall not become so in arrears during the term of the Contract; and
d. the Offeror, acknowledges that they are compliant with federal employment and non-discrimination laws and have not been debarred, convicted, charged or had civil judgment rendered against them for fraud or related offense by any government agency (federal, State,

or local) or been terminated for cause or default by any government agency (federal, State, or local).

5.5 **Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) Program, the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program, Women Business Enterprise (WBE), and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program Participation**: This RFP encourages the participation of MBE/DBE/WBE/SBE firms (members of a group as defined in the State Finance and Procurement Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland (the "Procurement Article"), Section 14-301(f)(i)(ii)). The Trust encourages MBE/DBE/WBE/SBE firms who meet the minimum qualifications to respond to this RFP.

5.6 **Parties to the Contract**: The contract to be entered into as a result of this RFP (the "Contract") shall be between the successful Offeror (the "Contractor") and the Trust and may be subject to EPA approval prior to Contract award.

5.7 **Contract Documents**. The Contract shall include the following documents: this RFP, the Contractor's Proposal (to the extent not inconsistent with the RFP or the Contract), and the Contract. In the event of an inconsistency, the Contract shall have priority over the other documents and specific conditions of the Contract shall have priority over General Conditions.

5.8 **Contract Term**. The Contract term shall commence as of a date to be specified in the Contract and, unless sooner terminated in accordance with the Contract, shall end when all work authorized under the Contract has been successfully completed by the project end date, unless the Contract is renewed or extended at the sole option of the Contract Officer.

5.9 **Billing Procedures and Compensation**.

a. Method: The Contracts to be entered into as a result of this RFP will not exceed the small procurement threshold fixed at 41 U.S.C. 403 (11) (currently $150,000). The Contractor(s) must comply with billing procedures as may be required by the Contract Officer and US EPA. These may entail monthly reporting of time and eligible expenses or may be based upon satisfactory completion of benchmark tasks.
b. Records: The Contractor(s) shall submit invoices in a form acceptable to the Contract Officer and maintain records relating to the costs and expenses incurred by the Contractor(s) in the performance of the Contracts for a period of three years from the date of final Project payment under the Contracts.

5.10 **Certification.** The Offeror shall certify that, to the best of its knowledge, the price information submitted is accurate, complete, and correct as of the Closing Date, and if negotiations are conducted as of the date of "best and final offer."

5.11 **Branding.** All products (outreach materials, events) will be branded with the United States EPA and Chesapeake Bay Trust logos.

SECTION VI: PROPOSAL FORMAT

6.1 **Proposal Format.** A project narrative and a project budget are required, as described below.

a. Project Narrative. You will be asked to submit a project narrative. Answer the project narrative questions below and upload the MS Word or PDF file. The project narrative should not exceed five (5) pages of text. You may add photos/graphs, resumes, Letter(s) of Commitment, and other materials to support your project proposal in addition to the project narrative questions and submitted as one file (i.e., combine the project narrative answers with additional materials excluding the budget for submission). There is a file attachment limit of 1 gig for the entire application. Each proposal (i.e., a submission in response to each Scope of Work) must include responses to items 1 through 7 in a concise description. Organize your Project Narrative as follows:

1. Scope Number and Title: List the scope number and title of your application.

2. Requesting Organization and Individuals Providing the Services:
   i. Describe your organization and experience.
   ii. Provide the names of individuals providing the services and number of years of experience in such areas.

3. Proposed Approach. Your proposal for how to accomplish the goals and outcomes/deliverables for the Scope(s) of Work (Appendix A).

4. Deliverables. Provide a deliverables schedule using the table format below, including details for each deliverable format (e.g., excel spreadsheet). A template is provided for the first two deliverables. Add rows for additional deliverables and include total cost in the last row. **Awards will be managed as firm-fixed-price contracts.**

Table X. Project deliverables and timeline.			
Report # and Reporting Period	**Project Deliverables**	**Date of Delivery**	**Amount**
Report #1: X/X/20XX to X/X/20XX	The deliverables include: • (add name of deliverables here, along with format of each deliverable)	X/X/20XX	$
Report #1: X/X/20XX to X/X/20XX	The deliverables include: • (add name of deliverables here, along with format of each deliverable)	X/X/20XX	$

5. Will a subcontractor be used in this Project: Yes or No? If Yes, describe the subcontracting process. If a subcontractor is proposed for services over $10,000, describe how you will or have met the criteria for subcontractual work as described in items "5i" or "5ii" below (whichever is appropriate for your project, and is consistent with Section 3.7 above):
   i. If the subcontractor has already been identified by attaining at least three estimates or through a competitive bid process and using good faith efforts to reach MBE/WBE/DBE firms, describe the process and results, e.g., describe the bid process used to obtain bids, including length of time the bid was open for responses, a description of the selection process/criteria used to select the winning bidder (e.g., low bidder, qualifications, criteria, etc.), and reason(s) for selection of the winning subcontractor (lowest qualified bid, etc.).
   ii. If the subcontractor has not already been identified describe the process you will

take to secure the subcontractor, e.g., describe the bid process to be used to obtain bids, including length of time the bid was open for responses, a description of the selection process/criteria used to select the winning bidder (e.g., low bidder, qualifications, criteria, etc.), and reason(s) for selection of the winning subcontractor (lowest qualified bid, etc.).

6. Qualifications: Respond to the qualifications section in the Scope of Work. Resumes of key personnel should be included in the application package but will not be considered in the Project Narrative's five-page limit.

7. References: Names, phone numbers, and email addresses of three references.

8. Additional information: Any other information which the Offeror considers relevant to a fair evaluation of its experience and capabilities.

b. Project Budget: You will be asked to upload your budget using the "Application Budget" worksheet of the Chesapeake Bay Trust's Financial Management Spreadsheet (FMS), an excel file template. The template is available in the online application and can be found by visiting www.cbtrust.org/forms where you can also watch a video with instructions on how to complete the FMS. The budget is a spreadsheet that is uploaded separately into the online application. For your budget request:

1. The resources requested in your budget should be able to be accomplish the body of work described in your proposal; be as detailed as possible.

2. The Offeror shall submit a budget including total number of hours and hourly rate of compensation for the services to be performed during the term of the contract broken down by direct rate, benefit rate, indirect rate, profit, and direct expenses; any additional costs required to complete the project; and total compensation. Under this program, food and beverage costs will not be supported.

3. **If your proposed indirect rate is higher than 10% of the direct costs, please provide the Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA) documentation in your proposal**.

4. Matching/leveraged resources are encouraged but not required. Indicate whether each match entry is applied for, pledged, or in-hand. Indicate in the narrative whether your organization has requested financial support from any other sources for the project not listed as match in the budget submitted.

5. Use the "Additional Budget Justification" section in the online application to justify and explain costs. Budgets that are detailed, justified, and itemized are ideal.

6. The proposed rates of compensation will be irrevocable for a period of 90 days from the Closing Date, or if modified during negotiations, for a period of 90 days from the date such modified rates are proposed by the Offeror.

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF THE SCOPE OF WORK SECTIONS

Goal Implementation Team (GIT)	This section indicates the Goal Implementation Team **(**GIT) that is presenting the scope of work for the RFP.
Purpose and Outcomes	This section provides the purpose of the work and the expected outcomes of the work as well as the background information and context for applicants.
Maximum Request	This section identifies the maximum request amount allowed for the scope of work.
Project Steps and Timeline	This section outlines the specific steps and proposed timeline of work that should be accounted for by the applicant. The applicant should also account for and provide detail regarding any additional steps or work that may be undertaken to deliver the final products as listed in the "Deliverables" section of the table for that scope of work. Additional project steps and extended timelines may be added throughout the project as agreed upon by the chosen Contractor, the GIT team, the Chesapeake Bay Program (CPB), and the Chesapeake Bay Trust (Trust).
Stakeholder Participants	This section lists the project participants that the Applicant will need to engage throughout the project to meet the deliverables of that scope of work.
Deliverables	This section outlines the specific final products that will need to be submitted and approved by the GIT and Trust teams in order to successfully meet the terms of the contract. Additional deliverables may be added throughout the project as agreed upon by the Awardee, the GIT team, the CPB, and the Trust.
QAPP (Quality Assurance Project Plan) Requirement	This section identifies if there is a need for a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). General guidance on QAPP's can be found on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) QAPP website: https://www.epa.gov/osa/elements-quality-assurance-project-plan-qapp-collecting-identifying-and-evaluating-existing. If data originates from sources other than federal reports and peer reviewed journals, a statement on data quality suitability will be required in the final report. When submitting a proposal for a scope of work that requires a QAPP, the applicant should understand and account for any costs associated with completing this component of the work. Additional information about QAPP's can be found in the following documents: 1. *EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans,* QA/R-5, March 2001 *2. Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans,* QA/G-5, December 2002 (https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-06/documents/g5-final.pdf) In some cases when secondary data is used, a QAPP is required. Guidance for developing a QAPP for secondary data can be found at https://www.epa.gov/quality/epa-region-3-quality-assurance-project-plans. If data originates from sources other than federal reports and peer reviewed journals, a statement on data quality suitability will be required in the final report.
Qualifications of Applicant	This section outlines the experience required by the Applicant's personnel assigned to perform under the Award.