

FY 2011 Natural Resources SCC Guidance

Table of Contents

A. Summary of “Important Things to Know”	2
B. General Instructions	5
C. Funding Source Guidance	9
<i>NPS Funding Sources:</i>	
Air Quality - Ecological Effects	10
Natural Sounds Program (Air Tour Management Plans/Acoustic Monitoring)	11
Biological Resource Management Division - Competitive	13
Environmental Quality Division - Environmental Impact Analysis	14
Natural Resource Preservation Program (NRPP)	16
NRPP - Disturbed Land Restoration	17
NRPP - Natural Resource Management	18
NRPP - Regional Program Block Allocation	19
NRPP - Regional Small Park Block Allocation	20
NRPP - Threatened and Endangered Species	21
Natural Resource Protection Projects	22
<i>Non-NPS Funding Sources:</i>	
USFS Forest Health Management – Insect and Disease Suppression	23
USGS Biological Resources Discipline – Park Oriented Biological Support	25
USGS Biological Resources Discipline – Research (NRPP)	26
USGS Biological Resources Discipline – Status and Trends of Biological Resources Program	27
USGS Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Program	29
APPENDICES:	
A. Natural Resource Project Ranking Criteria	31
B. Guidance for Interpretive Component	35
C. Project Funding Details in PMIS	37
D. The Recreation Fee Program Funding of Natural Resource Projects	38

A. Important “Things to Know” for the FY 2011 SCC

A five-year budget plan for the NPS is required by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The five-year Natural Resource Project Plan is necessary to support the continuing appropriation of funds for these projects. Establishing five-year plans is also a vital part of the park/unit budgeting process, and can be accomplished through the entry of project needs in PMIS. When a park/unit documents all its anticipated needs in PMIS for a five-year period, the needs can then be vetted through the regional and WASO review process. This process is designed to prioritize these requests relative to other park and Servicewide needs in conjunction with anticipated future funding levels.

Five-year planning also contributes to:

- Justifying requested funding levels and requests for Servicewide program increases
- Development of annual work plans
- Maintenance of historical data critical to Servicewide program reporting
- Program accountability, and
- Illustration of total financial resources available to the NPS

Parks are strongly encouraged to enter all natural resource funding needs for the five-year period covered by this SCC (FY11 – FY15).

- 1) This guidance to the regions on the FY 2011 Servicewide Comprehensive Call (SCC) addresses the Servicewide National Park Service (NPS) funding sources available to support natural resource projects.
 - a. Regionally prioritized proposals for each funding source for either FY 2010 and/or FY 2011 must be finalized in PMIS by March 31, 2009. These are full proposals that will be competing for funding and then selected for funding in those years. Regions must insure that the “Unit Priority at Formulation” and the “Regional Priority” section in PMIS are complete.
 - b. Potential proposals for FY 2012 – FY 2015 should be entered into PMIS, but do not need detailed project information and do not need to address ranking criteria. Regions do not need to prioritize these projects.
- 2) Submission of detailed implementation plans for approved projects to assigned project coordinators for approval:
 - a. FY 2010 new starts - May 31, 2009
 - b. FY 2011 new starts - May 31, 2010
- 3) WASO Funding Source Program Managers will review each proposal to assess eligibility and completeness prior to the proposal being forwarded to the panel. Projects that are ineligible or incomplete may not be considered for funding.
- 4) A list of all projects identified for funding in both current and future fiscal years is posted to the following website: <http://inside.nps.gov/waso/waso.cfm?prg=4&lv=1>
- 5) The Natural Resource portion of the SCC has reduced the number of special or unique procedures for entering Natural Resource proposals into PMIS. This has resulted in a significant change: The Natural Resource Project Ranking Criteria (see Appendix A) **must be** addressed in the “Additional Criteria” field in PMIS. **Responses to each criterion are limited to no more than 200 words and submissions that exceed this limit may receive lower ratings by the review panel.** Please contact the Fund Source Program Manager for assistance if needed.
- 6) **CHANGE – PLEASE READ!**
 - a. **No Submission of Regionally Prioritized Excel Table** – A standardized Microsoft Excel Regional Submission Table is no longer required. Lists of regionally prioritized proposals for each funding source and annual lists of potential projects to support the development and review of budget requests will be selected exclusively from PMIS.
 - b. **USGS-Biological Resources Discipline – Status and Trends of Biological Resources Program** New funding source for collaborative projects between USGS Status and Trends and NPS Inventory & Monitoring, analyzing and synthesizing NPS vital signs monitoring and core resource inventory data to address park management, planning, or interpretation.
 - i. Funding source will be accepting proposals for FY2010 and FY2011
 - ii. Only current I&M Networks are eligible for this funding source
 - c. **Ranking Criteria #1 has been modified** to request information on the priority of the project relative to other natural resource projects in the park.
 - d. **Regional funding quotas have been raised** for the Natural Resource Preservation Program – Natural Resource Management (NRPP-NRM) funding source in an effort to increase the number of project submissions.

Funding Source	Proposals Accepted for FY 2010	Proposals Accepted for FY 2011	Project Funding	Project Duration	# of Proposals per year	Rating Criteria	Required Interpretive Component	Detailed Implementation Plan
Air Quality-Ecological Effects Ellen Porter 303-969-2617	No	Yes	Minimum: \$40,000 Maximum: \$100,000 (per project)	1-3 Years	2 proposals per Region	Required	Not required, but encouraged	Yes
Natural Sounds Program (ATMP Acoustic Monitoring) Karen Trevino 970-225-3563	Yes, and for FY2009	Yes	Minimum: 20,000 Maximum: \$100,00 (per project)	1-3 Years	AKR - 0 IMR - 4 MWR - 2 NCR - 2 NER - 3 PWR - 4 SER - 2	Required	Not required, but encouraged	Yes
BRMD-Competitive Jerry Mitchell 970-225-3521	No	Yes	Minimum: none Maximum: \$50,000 (per project)	1-3 Years	AKR - 2 IMR - 3 MWR - 2 NCR - 1 NER - 2 PWR - 3 SER - 2	Required	No	Yes
EQD-Environmental Impact Analysis Tammy Whittington 303-969-2973	No	Yes	Minimum: \$30,000 Maximum: \$500,000 (per FY)	2-5 Years	No Limits	No	No	Yes
NRPP-Disturbed Land Restoration Dave Steensen 303-969-2014	No	Yes	Minimum: \$10,000 Maximum: \$250,000 (per project)	1-3 Years	AKR - 2 IMR - 5 MWR - 2 NCR - 2 NER - 3 PWR - 5 SER - 3	Required	Only for projects >=\$100,000	Yes
NRPP- Natural Resource Management George Dickison 970-225-3557	No	Yes	Minimum: \$50,000 Maximum: \$900,000 (per project submitted)	1-3 Years	AKR-\$480,000 IMR-\$1,380,000 MWR-\$900,000 NCR-\$240,000 NER-\$720,000 PWR-\$1,320,000 SER-\$960,000	Required	Only for projects >= \$100,000	Yes
NRPP-Regional Program Block Allocation Joe Chambers 970-267-2151	Yes	Yes	Maximum: Not to exceed \$25,000 per project; regions can set lower maximums.	See Regional Guidance	\$186,000 per Region	No	No	No, unless required by the Region
NRPP-Regional Small Park Block Allocation Joe Chambers 970-267-2151	Yes	Yes	Established regionally	See Regional Guidance	AKR-\$19,000 IMR-\$246,000 MWR-173,000 NCR-\$19,000 NER-118,000 PWR-164,000 SER-209,000	No	No	No, unless required by the Region
NRPP-Threatened and Endangered Species Peter Dratch 970-225-3596	No	Yes	Minimum: \$10,000 Maximum: \$150,000 (per project)	1-3 Years	AKR - 2 IMR - 3 MWR - 2 NCR - 2 NER - 2 PWR - 3 SER - 3	Required	Only for projects >= \$100,000	Yes

Funding Source	Proposals Accepted for FY 2010	Proposals Accepted for FY 2011	Project Funding	Project Duration	# of Proposals per year	Rating Criteria	Required Interpretive Component	Detailed Implementation Plan
Natural Resource Protection Karl Brown 970-225-3591	No	Yes	Minimum: \$10,000 Maximum: \$150,000 (per project)	1-3 years	4 proposals or maximum of \$150,000 per Region	Required	Yes	Yes
USFS Forest Health – Insect and Disease Suppression Carol DiSalvo 202-513-7183	Yes	No	Minimum: \$1,000 Maximum: \$200,000 (per project)	1 Year; with extensions	10 proposals per region	No	No	No
USGS BRD- Park Oriented Biological Support John Dennis 202-513-7174	Yes	Yes	Minimum: none Maximum: \$75,000 (per project)	1-3 Years	See detailed USGS-BRD guidance	See detailed USGS-BRD guidance	No	No
USGS BRD- Research (NRPP) John Dennis 202-513-7174	Yes Subject to availability of fund	Yes Subject to availability of fund	See detailed guidance	1-3 Years	See detailed NPS regional guidance	See detailed NPS regional guidance	No	No
USGS- Biological Resources Discipline – Status and Trends of Biological Resources Program Tom Philippi 970-225-3586	Yes Subject to availability of funds	Yes Subject to availability of funds	See detailed guidance	1-5 years	No Limit	See detailed USGS-BRD guidance	No	No
USGS Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Program Barry Long 970-225-3519 Gary Rosenlieb 970-225-3518	Yes	No	See detailed guidance	1-3 Years	See detailed guidance	Required	No	No

B. Natural Resource Project Proposal Guidance

1. General Instructions

These general instructions for the FY 2011 Servicewide Comprehensive Call (SCC) apply to all natural resource project proposals requesting funding from either Servicewide funding sources or designated non-NPS federal and non-federal (i.e., USFS Forest Health Management) funding sources for new project starts in FY 2010 or FY 2011. Additional guidance for non-NPS funding sources will be provided by those Fund Source Program Managers.

Detailed information on each of the Servicewide funding sources for natural resources projects is contained in succeeding sections of this guidance. Requirements or criteria that must be addressed in project proposals specific to each funding source are identified. Servicewide requirements for project proposals submitted through the two sources of NRPP funds block-allocated to regional offices are also detailed. Regions may establish their own requirements or criteria in addition to the Servicewide requirements and are responsible for conveying this information in conjunction with the SCC natural resource guidance to regional offices and parks.

2. Required Submissions

a. **Potential Future Proposals.** For out year planning parks should enter FY2012 projects into PMIS at a minimum. It is requested that projects for FY 2013 - FY 2015 be entered in PMIS. Potential future proposals will not be reviewed, paneled, or considered for funding, they will be used to create a series of annual lists of potential projects for FY 2012 - 2015 (i.e., "list," Table 1 below).

b. When fully implemented, the proposal process will follow the decision progressions found in Table 1 below. Please develop and fashion your proposals with these progressions in mind.

Table 1. Relationship of the annual Servicewide Comprehensive Call and the year of actual funding. The year a project is selected for funding (Approved) is shown in yellow. Projects typically have a one year wait for project preparation between selection and funding (Proj Prep). The year a project is first funded (Fund) is shown in green. Potential projects in out years (List) are shown in blue.

	FUNDING YEAR									
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
SCC										
2006	Approved									
2007	Proj Prep	Approved								
2008	Fund	Proj Prep	Approved	List	List	List				
2009		Fund	Proj Prep	Approved	List	List	List			
2010			Fund	Proj Prep	Approved	List	List	List		
2011				Fund	Proj Prep	Approved	List	List	List	
2012					Fund	Proj Prep	Approved	List	List	List
2013						Fund	Proj Prep	Approved	List	List
2014							Fund	Proj Prep	Approved	List
2015								Fund	Proj Prep	Approved

3. Minimum Proposal Requirements to Determine Project Funding in FY 2010 and FY 2011

a. **Scope.** The current natural resource SCC guidance solicits proposals for some project funding in FY 2010 and/or FY 2011 new starts. For some funding sources, there may also be a small amount of uncommitted funds available for FY 2009. In these instances, some projects identified for a start date in FY 2010 or FY 2011 may be offered the opportunity to begin in FY 2009. Contact the designated Funding Source Program Manager for additional information.

b. **Number of Projects Eligible for Submission.** For competitive project funding involving Servicewide funding programs, the NR-MAP workload analysis is generally used to determine either how many projects or the total cost of projects that may be submitted by each region. Some funding sources may use different criteria to limit submissions (e.g., the NRPP-Threatened and Endangered Species program uses the number of listed species found in each region). However, proposals for competitive sources that involve multiple regions (at least three regions) are not counted against a region's monetary or numeric cap. Once again, contact the designated Funding Source Program Manager for additional clarification.

c. Subject of Natural Resource Projects. In general, natural resource management projects include:

1. Projects dealing with natural resource components including those of historic scenes or cultural resources if their purposes focus specifically on the natural resource,
2. Social science projects if they relate to a need to protect or interpret natural resources. The NPS Social Science Program can provide limited technical assistance in developing project proposals and/or can help locate social scientists that can provide needed expertise.
3. Sound monitoring that is for a specific resource management action.

Specific funding sources may have restrictions on certain types of funding (e.g., exclude research or only consider certain types of species). Please consult the individual funding source guidelines or contact the Funding Source Program Manager for further information.

d. Exclusions. NPS natural resources project funds may not be used for:

1. Salaries of permanent NPS employees; however, a permanent, subject-to-furlough position can be brought out of furlough and be funded with project money. The **scheduled** work time is reflected in the Financial Plan and is therefore paid with ONPS funds, the **non-scheduled** time would not be programmed into the Financial Plan, and therefore, the work performed during the non-scheduled time could be paid with "soft money."
2. Maintenance of existing structures, or
3. Construction or rehabilitation of structures that are not directly related to preservation or restoration of natural resources.

e. Project Duration. To be eligible for natural resources funding, projects must:

1. Be non-recurring and non-cyclic,
2. Be funded and completed within the specified time limit for the funding source, and
3. Provide useful results even if no follow-up work is undertaken.

In unusual circumstances and with approval of the WASO Funding Source Program Manager, project duration may be extended an additional year where necessary for such things as completion of reports. However, no additional funding will be provided. A proposal to extend the duration of a project must be provided to the WASO Funding Source Program Manager in writing and must justify schedules exceeding three years. Proposals for continuation of previously funded projects that require additional funding for completion must be submitted as new projects, and must contain adequate justification.

f. Project Management Information System (PMIS) requirement. All project proposals requesting funding in response to the FY 2011 SCC must be entered into PMIS. The date by which PMIS entries must be complete, marked "Region-reviewed," and provided regional priorities in PMIS is March 31, 2009.

To obtain assistance on how to use PMIS, please:

1. Contact your PMIS administrator;
2. Complete the PMIS E-course available through DOI Learn; or
3. Visit the PMIS help resources on the SCC website.

g. Resource Management Plan (RMP) requirement. The requirement for a current, approved RMP is suspended for project funding requests submitted in response to the FY 2011 SCC.

h. Projects with Interpretive Components. Project proposals submitted to any Servicewide natural resource funding source requesting funding for \$100,000, or greater, must include a clearly distinguished Interpretive Component within the "Justification" section of the project proposal in PMIS. (Although not required, projects under \$100,000 are strongly encouraged to also include an Interpretive Component where appropriate). In addition, all Natural Resource Protection projects require an interpretive component. See the "Guidance for Interpretive Component" in [Appendix B](#) for additional information.

i. Multi-park Projects. Proposals may be submitted that include two or more parks within a single region. The proposal's project statement must contain the following information:

1. The park or support office assuming lead responsibility for the proposal,
2. The proportion of the total project funding attributable to each park, where project proposals are given a funding cap for the funding source,
3. The parks involved in the project, and
4. A brief justification for, and benefits of, the multi-park approach.

j. Multi-regional Projects. Proposals may be submitted that include parks in more than one region. The proposal's project statement must contain the following information:

1. The region assuming lead responsibility for the proposal,
2. The parks included in the multi-region project supported by documentation, and
3. Funding information:
 - (a) Proposals involving two regions: The region against whose maximum number of projects or dollar amount ceiling the project will be attributed (where such limits affect the regions) or the proportions of total project funding attributable to each region.
 - (b) Proposals involving three or more regions: If the proposal involves three or more regions, the proposal does not count towards any of the regional limitations or restrictions.
4. A brief justification for, and benefits of, the multi-region approach. Multi-region proposals should show benefits above and beyond the simple bundling of like projects. For example, in FY 2002, four regions proposed joint training for natural resource protection. By undertaking a coordinated training effort, the end product was a more consistent, nation-wide approach. In contrast, a proposal consisting of three parks from three regions, each wanting to restore unrelated streams may not have a strong justification for a multi-regional project.

k. Natural Resources Project Ranking Criteria. A standard set of criteria and response format are used to evaluate project proposals requesting funding from specific NPS Servicewide or USGS sources, and may be required for regional funding sources. These criteria received limited revision in FY 2007 and previous entries in PMIS should be carefully reviewed for consistency with the current criteria. This procedure is designed to facilitate fair and objective comparisons among competing projects. Project statements must still stand on their own technical merit and therefore, should be clear and concise. Guidance specific to the natural resource funding sources where the project ranking criteria are required is provided below in the individual funding source information.

l. Review, Selection, and Approval Process.

1. Project proposals submitted to most of the NPS Servicewide natural resource funding sources are rated and ranked competitively by panels using established evaluation criteria and procedures. In general, the process is as follows:
 - (a) Proposals are finalized in PMIS by March 31, 2009.
 - (b) All submissions are reviewed by the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for eligibility and completeness.
 - (c) Proposals determined to be ineligible or incomplete will not be considered for funding.
 - (d) Proposals are rated and ranked by panels. Panel recommendations are then provided to the Associate Director, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science, for the final decisions on project approvals.
 - (e) Approved project lists are usually available 90 days after the WASO due date for regional submissions. These results are provided to the regional directors and posted on the NPS Intranet. The results will also identify individual WASO-level project coordinators.
 - (f) All subsequent changes to the status of a project or funding levels for projects are communicated to the regional director and the region's contact for the affected funding source. The region is responsible for notifying parks.
2. Proposals submitted to either of the two regional block-allocation funding sources are reviewed and selected through region-specific procedures. Regions are responsible for announcing projects selected for funding through these funding sources.
3. Projects submitted to non-NPS funding sources are subject to the review and selection procedures of the respective agency or organization. These entities are responsible for announcing selection or rejection of NPS proposals.

m. Procedures for changing annual funding allocations, delaying projects, or extending projects.

1. If a park is unable to initiate a project as outlined in the proposal or is unable to fully expend funds, the park must request a modification to the funding schedule. The request can be submitted via email, but must come from the park, through the region, to the WASO Funding Source Program Manager. Any changes must be

identified in an Addendum to the Implementation Plan or Project Agreement and approved by the Funding Source Program Manager.

2. If funds become available during the fiscal year as a result of project delays or cancellations, the WASO Funding Source Program Manager will use the following system to offer or reallocate funds to other projects:
 - (a) First to projects funded in the current fiscal year and from the same region.
 - (b) Second to projects funded in the current fiscal year and in rank order (not from the same region).
 - (c) Third to projects proposed for funding in the next fiscal year and in rank order (not necessarily from the same region).

n. Detailed Implementation Plans. Parks are responsible for preparation of a detailed implementation plan for each project approved for funding through any of the following natural resource funding sources:

1. Air Quality - Ecological Effects
2. Natural Sounds Program (Air Tour Management Plans/Acoustic Monitoring)
3. Biological Resource Management Division - Competitive
4. Environmental Quality Division – Environmental Impact Analysis (The Project Agreement suffices for the Implementation Plan.) See EQD Funding Source for additional information.
5. NRPP - Disturbed Land Restoration
6. NRPP - Natural Resource Management
7. NRPP - Threatened and Endangered Species

Detailed implementation plans for approved FY 2009 projects must be submitted no later than May 31, 2008, with final approval no later than December 31, 2008. Funding for FY 2009 projects without approved detailed implementation plans on December 31, 2008 may be reallocated to other projects. A discussion of requirements for detailed implementation plans can be found on the NPS intranet at (<http://www1.nrintra.nps.gov/scc/guidance/templates.cfm>).

o. Reporting Requirements. Several types of reports are required for projects funded by any of the natural resource funding sources addressed by this SCC guidance. Three of these reports are submitted using PMIS and the fourth type is submitted directly to the NRPC project coordinator. A detailed discussion of requirements for these reports is found on the NPS intranet at (<http://www1.nrintra.nps.gov/scc/guidance/templates.cfm>).

1. Status Report – Minimum of one status report in PMIS for each funded project Funding Component. Due in PMIS no later than October 30th (30-days after the close of the fiscal year in which the Funding Component received funds).
2. Annual Accomplishment Report – Minimum of one Annual Accomplishment Report in PMIS for each funded project Funding Component. Due in PMIS no later than October 30th (30-days after the close of the fiscal year in which the Funding Component received funds).
3. Final Accomplishment Report (equivalent to the final PMIS funding component completion report in PMIS) – A variation of the Annual Accomplishment Report in PMIS for the final fiscal year a project receives funding. Due no later than October 30th (30-days after the close of the fiscal year the final Funding Component received funds).
4. Final Completion Report – A detailed MSWord document report (this report is not put into PMIS) required by October 30th (one fiscal year after the final fiscal year the project received funding). Submit report to NRPC project coordinator via email or NPS Focus (if large file size). NOTE: Unless a regional requirement, this reporting requirement does not extend to projects funded solely through NRPP-Regional Program Block Allocation or NRPP-Regional Small Park Block Allocation funding sources.

p. In situations when the participation of regional or WASO subject matter specialists is critical to the success of a project, parks are encouraged to include travel funds in their proposals for these specialists. Recent travel restrictions may otherwise limit participation of these specialists in park projects.

q. For questions and comments on the SCC please contact George Dickison, Director, Natural Resource Program Center (970-225-3557).

C. Funding Source Guidance

Each funding source is described in the following pages. Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information.

Funding Source: Air Quality - Ecological Effects

Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009 for FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Ellen Porter – 303-969-2617.

Documentation: Completed in PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Minimum \$40,000 and maximum \$100,000 per project. Approximately \$130,000 is available for new projects in FY 2011.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years.

Number of Projects per Region: A maximum of 2 projects may be submitted per region.

Subject of Projects: Projects must address and assess the effects of atmospheric pollutants (e.g., ozone, acid deposition, fertilization, persistent organic compounds, and heavy metals) on biological and/or ecological resources. Proposals that assess specific linkages between current or historical air pollution concentrations and ecological effects of these pollutants are generally of greatest interest. Proposals should fall into one of the following categories:

1. Studies that evaluate the effects of air pollution on soils, surface waters, plants or animals (field-based or laboratory), or help determine ecological thresholds or critical loads for changes induced by air pollutants.
2. Ecological models that (a) assess the effects of a given amount of air pollution on a biological or ecological resource, or (b) help determine the critical loads of pollution above which adverse resource impacts could occur.

Exclusions: Ecological effects funds may not be used for long-term ecological monitoring, routine air quality monitoring (e.g. visibility, ozone, wet/dry deposition), or atmospheric modeling (unless specifically linked to ecological effects).

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: Requirements for proposals to the NPS national program office are presented in section II, General Instructions.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "Air Quality – Ecological Effects" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: Not required, but encouraged.

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: Guidance is available from the NPS - Air Resources Division in evaluating and revising project proposals. To obtain assistance or information please contact via electronic mail or telephone Tamara Blett at 303-969-2011 or Ellen Porter at 303-969-2617.

Funding Source: Natural Sounds Program (Air Tour Management Plans/Acoustic Monitoring)

Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009 for FY 2009 through FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Karen Trevino – 970-225-3563

Documentation: Completed in PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Minimum \$20,000 and maximum \$100,000. Approximately \$300,000 per year is available for new projects.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years.

Number of Projects per Region: Regions are allowed to submit the following number of proposals based on the number of Air Tour Management Plan parks within a region:

REGION	PROPOSALS Per Year
Alaska	0
Intermountain	4
Midwest	2
National Capital	2
Northeast	3
Pacific West	4
Southeast	2

Subject of Projects: Projects must address and/or assess the noise impacts of air tours on biological, cultural resources, or visitor enjoyment. Proposals that assess potential linkages between noise from air tours to overall ecosystem health, species specific or cultural resource impacts or overall visitor enjoyment are of greatest interest. Proposals should fall into one of the following categories:

1. Acoustic monitoring to establish ambient baseline information
2. Cultural assessments, biological assessment, visitor use surveys
3. Assistance with development of Air Tour Management Plans including the development of soundscape indicators and standards
4. On site listening exercises
5. GIS or other mapping work relative to park resources potentially impacted by air tours
6. Air tour noise modeling
7. Acoustic data analysis and reporting (must satisfy specific requirements)
8. Procurement of compatible acoustic monitoring equipment
9. Costs associated with the development of an Aviation Rulemaking Committee or other expedited ATMP process

Exclusions: long-term acoustic monitoring, purchase of incompatible acoustic equipment, work in non-ATMP parks, any projects proposals not following NPS acoustic protocols or ATMP proposals not following the FAA/NPS ATMP Implementation plan.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: Requirements for proposals to the NPS national program office are presented in section II, General Instructions.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of Natural Sounds Program in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: Encouraged but not required

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: Guidance is available from the NPS – Natural Sounds Program in evaluating and revising project proposals. To obtain assistance or information please contact Kurt Frstrup via electronic mail or telephone at 970-267-2102.

Funding Source: Biological Resource Management Division – Competitive
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009, for new FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Jerry Mitchell - 970-225-3521

Documentation: Completed in PMIS by March 31, 2009

Funding Amount: Minimum none and maximum of \$50,000 per project. Approximately \$200,000 is available for new projects in FY 2011.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years.

Number of Projects per Region: Regions are allowed to submit the following number of proposals:

REGION	PROPOSALS Per Year
Alaska	2
Intermountain	3
Midwest	2
National Capital	1
Northeast	2
Pacific West	3
Southeast	2

Subject of Projects: BRMD – Competitive source will fund actions that help NPS achieve its overall performance management goals with respect to biological goals on:

1. Wildlife Management and Health
2. Endangered, Threatened or species of Management Concern
3. Ecosystem Restoration
4. Invasive/Exotic Animal or Plant Species
5. Integrated Pest Management
6. Human Dimensions of Biological Resource Management

Proposals must explain how the project will result in improved on-the-ground conditions for biological resources and how the action will contribute to meeting performance goals. Projects must be completed as a final product in no more than three years. Recurring actions like long-term monitoring and maintenance are not eligible for funding. The preparation of compliance documents is not allowed, unless it is associated with an approved BRMD-Competitive project.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: See General Instructions.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of “Biological Resource Management Division – Competitive” in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance or information please contact via electronic mail or telephone the Jerry Mitchell at 970-225-3521 or Debi Reep at 970-225-3592.

Funding Source: Environmental Quality Division - Environmental Impact Analysis
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009, for FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Tammy Whittington -303-969-2973.

Documentation: In PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Minimum \$30,000 and maximum \$500,000 (per FY). Approximately \$3,600,000 is available for new and continuing projects for FY2011.

Project Duration: Projects typically range in completion from 2 to 5 years. However, projects should be completed within five years.

Number of Projects Per Region: No restrictions.

Subject of Projects: The purpose of this fund source is to allow the NPS to conduct NEPA planning and develop legally defensible environmental impact analyses on difficult NEPA issues. The fund source pays for plans when conducted in a planning process that integrates the plan and NEPA analysis in one document. Projects funded by this fund source are undertaken cooperatively by a team composed of EQD, park, and regional office staff. Impact analysis and document preparation are contracted out, and EQD staff serve as COR and project manager. Exceptions to this can be made but must be stated so in the PMIS request, and be approved by the EQD Chief, or the Deputy Chief. In those situations, EQD will still provide technical oversight by reviewing scopes of work and providing internal technical/policy review of draft contractor work products including, but not limited to, internal scoping reports, draft EIS, final EIS, environmental assessments, findings of no significant impact, and records of decisions.

In most cases this fund source does not pay for travel by park staff, equipment, or park staff salaries. If the Park intends to pay for these items through this fund source, this must be stated in the PMIS project proposal, and this must be clearly stated in the Project Agreement approved by the Project Team, and must also be approved by the EQD Chief, or the Deputy Chief.

Parks needing assistance in estimating the cost and timing of their proposed project should contact Tammy Whittington (303-969-2073). Multi-park projects, including those with parks in more than one region, may be submitted where appropriate to avoid redundant efforts (e.g. South Florida & Caribbean Parks Exotic Plant Management Plan/EIS).

Environmental impact analysis (environmental assessments and environmental impact statements) projects that qualify according to the following selection criteria will be accepted for potential funding through this fund source:

Projects descriptions must show:

1. Preparation of environmental impact analysis is subject to a court order or likely to be litigated; or
2. Park specific issues or problems having precedent setting implications; or
3. Significant or long standing resource issues that require decisions; and
4. Background studies and reasonably foreseeable information needs are complete; and
5. Other funding sources are unavailable.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: See General Instructions. Note, however that the 8 Servicewide Natural Resource Ranking Criteria are not used for this fund source, rather parks should address under the "Additional Criteria" section how their project meets either number one, two, or three of the five selection criteria listed above as well as how it meets criterion numbers four and five. These five criteria are not weighted but are used by the EQD, along with national and on-going priorities, to select projects for funding. Projects that do not meet the selection criteria will not be considered.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "Environmental Quality Division - Environmental Impact Analysis" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: A Detailed Implementation Plan is not required; however a Project Agreement signed by the park, region and EQD must be submitted within 30 days receipt of funds or after initial internal scoping. The Project Agreement will be developed by EQD, the affected park and region and must include, at a minimum, project description, roles and responsibilities of key players, and a set of key indicators/milestones/timelines for the project. In addition, a Status Report in PMIS, an Annual Accomplishment Report in PMIS, and a Project Completion Report signed by the project Team are required for all projects. Modifications via Addendums can be made to the Project Agreement, especially the milestones, as approved by the Project Team.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance or information please contact, by e-mail or telephone, Tammy Whittington (303-969-2073).

Natural Resource Preservation Program (NRPP)

NRPP provides annual funds for a diverse range of natural resource projects. NRPP funding is divided into a series of discrete funding sources:

1. NRPP - Disturbed Land Restoration (FY 2011 new projects)
2. NRPP - Natural Resource Management (FY 2011 new projects)
3. NRPP - Regional Program Block Allocation (FY 2010 and FY 2011 new projects)
4. NRPP - Regional Small Park Block Allocation (FY 2010 and FY 2011 new projects)
5. NRPP - Threatened and Endangered Species (FY 2011 new projects)

Subject of Projects: Projects must focus on Natural Resource issues. Non-biological research is eligible for funding and may be combined with follow-up management or mitigation actions. Also eligible are pilot field-testing and methodology refinement. Tactical biological studies may be submitted to the NRPP-Natural Resource Management funding source. A tactical biological study is a short-term project that applies existing scientific theory and methods to obtain additional information about a particular natural resource problem at a specific site or sites.

Ineligible Actions:

1. Those activities properly funded through other Servicewide natural resource programs,
2. Water as a commodity (e.g., determining the location and amount of water available for human consumption is not eligible),
3. Basic biological research (e.g., development of new biological theory, broad management approaches, or widely applicable protocols), except as discussed below.
4. Biological research is not eligible. Projects involving biological research may be funded through non-NPS funds such as the USGS-Biological Resource Discipline Research (NRPP).
5. Recurring maintenance or monitoring actions.

The submission procedures vary somewhat among these funding sources. Documentation and submission information is provided in the accompanying guidance specific to each NRPP funding source.

Funding Source: NRPP - Disturbed Land Restoration

Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009, for new FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Dave Steensen – 303-969-2014.

Documentation: Completed in PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Minimum \$10,000 and maximum \$250,000 total project cost. Approximately \$400,000 is available for new projects in FY 2011.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years.

Number of Projects per Region: Based on NR-MAP estimates, Regions may submit the following number of projects:

REGION	2011 PROPOSALS
Alaska	2
Intermountain	5
Midwest	2
National Capital	2
Northeast	3
Pacific West	5
Southeast	3

Subject of Projects: Disturbed land restoration projects involve actions to correct damage to the physical structure and function of a site resulting from human developments and land uses. Developments and land uses include abandoned mines, roads, dams, canals, campgrounds, lands under agricultural production, or other similar disturbances or infrastructure that have diminished the ecological integrity of areas managed for natural conditions (e.g., uplands, streams, riparian areas, wetlands, shorelines, or marine areas). Proposals must demonstrate the need, and the appropriate activities, to correct existing geomorphic problems.

Eligible Projects: Projects correct human-altered soil-geomorphic attributes of landscapes by reestablishing naturally functioning conditions. Appropriate activities may include reestablishing approximate original contours, natural hydrologic patterns, and native vegetation; mitigating impaired soil conditions; and reestablishing critical physical habitat elements. Proposals should identify site preparation, earthmoving, vegetation establishment, and maintenance activities as necessary. Projects may include exotic plant management activities, but these activities must be directly tied to the project’s overall physical (geomorphological) objectives. Activities connected to site restoration, such as characterization, compliance, design, etc. are eligible as long as the primary project purpose is the mitigation of impacts caused by human development.

Ineligible Projects: Projects ineligible include those that do not plan to return a site to naturally functioning conditions and processes, mitigate prior human disturbances, or do not demonstrate an existing geomorphic problem. Examples of ineligible activities include interim control measures (e.g., fences, barriers, or other cyclic activities), engineered structures designed only to control naturally or artificially functioning processes (e.g., stream bank riprap, gabions, buttresses), exotic plant management or revegetation activities that are not directly linked to the restoration of the physical disturbance, or prescribed fire and fire rehabilitation. Certain capital expenditures (e.g., construction or maintenance of facilities, purchase of vehicles, etc.) are likewise ineligible (contact the fund source manager for information). Also ineligible are activities that manipulate areas disturbed by natural phenomena, such as landslides, earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and fires.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: Requirements for proposals to the NPS national program office are presented in section II, General Instructions.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of “NRPP - Disturbed Land Restoration” in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: [Yes, for projects \\$100,000 or greater.](#)

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance or information please contact Dave Steensen via electronic mail or telephone at 303-969-2014.

Funding Source: NRPP - Natural Resource Management
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009, for new FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: George Dickison – 970-225-3557.

Documentation: Completed in PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Minimum \$50,000 and maximum of \$900,000 per project submitted. Total amount of projects submitted can not exceed amount indicated below. Approximately \$1,300,000 is available for new projects in FY 2011.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years.

Number of Projects Per Region: Regions may submit proposals with total NRPP-NRM project cost (over all years) not to exceed the dollar amount specified below:

REGION	Total For FY 2011
Alaska	\$480,000
Intermountain	\$1,380,000
Midwest	\$900,000
National Capital	\$240,000
Northeast	\$720,000
Pacific West	\$1,320,000
Southeast	\$960,000

Subject of Projects: This funding source is available to assist parks with natural resource management issues.

Eligible Project: Projects may be submitted for assistance in general natural resource management; control of invasive species; assess impacts on a T&E species; restore plants, animals, or ecosystems; address problems related to soundscapes; follow-up on resource management or mitigation issues; conduct tactical biological studies; non-biological research; and many other subject areas.

Ineligible Projects: Projects that have been submitted to other Servicewide natural resource fund programs may not be submitted to this funding source. Projects pertaining to water as a commodity, basic biological research, and recurring maintenance or monitoring are not eligible for this funding source.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: Requirements for proposals to the NPS national program office are presented in section II, General Instructions.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "NRPP - Natural Resource Management" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: [Yes, for projects \\$100,000 or greater.](#)

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance or information please contact via electronic mail or telephone George Dickison at 970-225-3557.

Funding Source: NRPP - Regional Program Block Allocation
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009, for new FY 2010 and FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Joe Chambers - Program Analyst – 970-267-2151.

Documentation: In PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Subject to regional guidance. Regions are encouraged to limit funding to individual projects to a maximum of \$25,000 (some regions have even lower maximum limits); although multi-park projects may exceed this total provided funding to any one park does not exceed the individual project maximum.

Project Duration: Subject to regional guidance.

Number of Projects per Region: Each Region is allocated approximately \$186,000 per year.

Subject of Projects: Projects must address improvement of natural resource knowledge and condition, including projects such as specialized inventories (those currently outside the scope of the Servicewide I&M Program's twelve datasets) and mitigation actions (i.e., fossil inventories and exotic plant or animal control, respectively).

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: See General Instructions. Regional guidance will also be issued in connection with program proposals prepared and submitted to this funding source.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "NRPP - Regional Program Block Allocation" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds. Detailed Implementation Plans are not required; unless, required by the Region.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance and information please contact Joe Chambers via electronic mail or phone at 970-267-2151.

Funding Source: NRPP - Regional Small Park Block Allocation
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2008, for new FY 2009 and FY 2010 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Joe Chambers - Program Analyst – 970-267-2151.

Documentation: In PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Subject to regional guidance.

Project Duration: Subject to regional guidance.

Number of Projects per Region: In FY 2010 and FY 2011, \$948,000 in Servicewide NRPP funding will be allocated among the regions for projects in small parks subject to established procedures. As a general rule, parks under 10,000 acres are considered small parks for purposes of this funding, but regions may modify this criterion as appropriate to their region. The regional allocations of funds from this funding source are as follows:

REGION	2011 PROPOSALS
Alaska	\$19,000
Intermountain	\$246,000
Midwest	\$173,000
National Capital	\$19,000
Northeast	\$118,000
Pacific West	\$164,000
Southeast	\$209,000

Subject of Projects: Subject to regional guidance.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: Requirements for proposals to the NPS national program office are located in General Instructions. Regional guidance will also be issued in connection with project proposals prepared and submitted to this funding source.

Proposal Submissions: See General Instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of “NRPP - Regional Small Park Block Allocation” in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds. Detailed Implementation Plans are not required; unless, required by the Region.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance and information please contact Joe Chambers via electronic mail or phone at 970-267-2151.

Funding Source: NRPP - Threatened and Endangered Species
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information.

Due Date: March 31, 2009, for new FY 2011 projects

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Peter Dratch – 970-225-3596.

Documentation: Documentation in PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Minimum \$10,000 and maximum \$150,000 total project cost. Total amount of projects submitted can not exceed amount indicated below. Approximately \$100,000 is available for new projects in FY 2011.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years.

Number of Projects per Region: Based on the number of current park populations of ESA listed species in the regions. Regions may submit the following number of projects:

REGION	2011 PROPOSALS
Alaska	2
Intermountain	3
Midwest	2
National Capital	2
Northeast	2
Pacific West	3
Southeast	3

Subject of Projects: Project funding is available to assist parks with protecting and conserving federally listed endangered or threatened species. Projects must promote or plan for on-the-ground conservation actions and may address any federally listed endangered or threatened species. (Projects addressing delisted species are eligible for 5 years after delisting if a final U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/National Marine Fisheries Service monitoring plan has been approved). This funding source is not for species monitoring, but they can be used for inventories where the reported ESA Database trend is unknown. Funds can not be used for the preparation of environmental compliance documents; however, if a project requires environmental compliance, that compliance can be part of the park's "In-kind" contributions.

1. Priority for funding will be directed towards projects that:
 - a. Prevent the extirpation of a species from a park,
 - b. Move a species from a declining or unknown status to a stable or improving status,
 - c. Restore one or more species into a park,
 - d. Restore a species in more than one park.

2. Project proposals must:
 - a. Identify the species, its listing status and its current trend in the park.
 - b. Describe the action that will be implemented,
 - c. Predict the anticipated change in species trend, and
 - d. Include a discussion of why the action will promote the change in species trend.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: Requirements for proposals to the NPS national program office are presented in section II, General Instructions.

Proposal Submissions: See general instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "NRPP - Threatened and Endangered Species" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: [Yes, for projects \\$100,000, or greater.](#)

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance and information, please contact Peter Dratch via electronic mail or telephone at 970-225-3596.

Funding Source: Natural Resource Protection Projects

Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: March 31, 2009, for new FY 2011 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Karl Brown – 970-225-3591.

Documentation: Completed in PMIS by March 31, 2009.

Funding Amount: Minimum of \$10,000 and maximum of \$150,000 per project. Approximately \$175,000 is available for new projects in FY 2011.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years.

Number of Projects per Region: Each region may submit up to four projects and the total dollar amount for all submissions from a region may not exceed \$150,000.

Subject of Projects: Proposals must provide parks with a mechanism to develop strategic approaches for the use of law enforcement to protect natural resources, or assist parks in applying innovative investigative techniques to protect park natural resources. We encourage proposals that focus resources most at risk and identify the categories of risk. Proposed projects can also support training between disciplines and related tools for the prevention and prosecution of poaching, vandalism and other resource crimes. Projects must be genuinely interdisciplinary, with meaningful involvement by ranger activities and natural resource personnel. Those personnel can include protection rangers, special agents, interpreters, resources managers, scientists, and also stakeholders and cooperators from outside agencies. No matter how serious the resource threat, projects that do not demonstrate this interdisciplinary approach, will not be considered.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: See general Instructions.

Proposal Submissions: See general instructions.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of “Natural Resource Protection Projects” in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: [Yes](#)

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain assistance and information, please contact Karl Brown via electronic mail or telephone at 970-225-3591.

Funding Source: USFS Forest Health Management – Insect and Disease Suppression

Please see the WASO Funding source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: September 1, 2009, for new FY 2010 projects. **Note:** *Additional new project proposals for FY 2010 may be added between September 1st, 2009 and October 30, 2009 based on new partnership opportunities developing after the SCC, provided they are finalized in PMIS by September 1, 2009.*

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Carol DiSalvo – 202-513-7183.

Documentation: Each proposal submitted to the Washington Office must include three elements:

1. A one-page Forest Service Form (FSM 3450),
2. A brief narrative description of the proposed work, (this may be a separate document or it may be incorporated into the FSM 3450) and
3. A biological evaluation prepared by the US Forest Service (this was formally submitted through the US Forest Service channels. If a copy is not available to the park, include a brief note explaining its status). Economic analyses, which were required in past years, are no longer required.

Funding Amount: Minimum of \$1,000 and maximum of \$200,000. This funding source involves non-NPS funds. It is anticipated that approximately \$500,000 - \$800,000 is available for projects in FY 2011.

Project Duration: Projects may be single or multi-year in duration. However, projects are initially approved for only one year with no guarantee of subsequent funding.

Number of Projects per Region: A maximum of ten projects may be submitted from each region.

Subject of Projects: This program is targeted at the suppression of populations of insects and disease organisms that adversely affect trees and forests in natural, cultural, or developed settings. Projects aimed at inventory or long-term monitoring are approved only in rare instances. However, monitoring that is an integral part of population suppression is allowed. For example, a monitoring crew could be fielded to identify trees or stands that will be treated within the same year or the subsequent year. These funds may not be used for the suppression of weeds.

Parks are encouraged to join with other agencies to contract for treatments such as aerial application of insecticides. However, such arrangements may not result in expenditure of these funds on other agencies' lands.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: The WASO Funding Source Program Manager screens proposals for consistency with NPS policies, proposal adequacy, and project eligibility and forwards them to the U.S. Forest Service which approves proposals on a project-by-project basis. Parks typically are notified in December of approval or disapproval, and funds are distributed in April. However, in recent years, uncertainty about the budget has delayed the notification and fund distribution by several months. The discrepancy between the fiscal year and the field season has been a challenge for the Forest Health Management Program. Technically, these funds are no-year funds, but the Forest Services reserves the right to re-approve every dollar every year. At the end of each fiscal year, the WASO Budget Shop automatically pulls all funds back from the field. However, the biology of certain organisms requires that work be done in the fall, after the close of the fiscal year. Special budgeting and reporting procedures are available to accommodate this circumstance. Parks in this situation should call Carol DiSalvo at 202-513-7183 for advice on these procedures.

Proposal Submissions: The three documents described above must be submitted to Carol DiSalvo, Integrated Pest Management Coordinator, Biological Resource Management Division, National Park Service, 1201 I Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "USFS Forest Health Management – Insect and Disease Suppression" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: By September 1st of each year, parks must submit a completed Accomplishments and Expenditures Report to Carol DiSalvo. This is a half-page, fill-in-the-blank form that can be obtained by contacting Carol DiSalvo at the above address.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: Parks should request assistance from the U.S. Forest Service in evaluating problems and identifying solutions. Forest Service entomologists or forest pathologists will visit parks and write biological evaluations at no cost to the parks. In addition, the following assistance is available from Carol DiSalvo at 202-513-7183:

1. Assistance with identifying and contacting Forest Service experts,
2. Advice on Integrated Pest Management strategies and quarantines,
3. Advice on the eligibility of projects for this funding,
4. Blank proposal forms and accomplishments forms,
5. Advice on how to report and budget work done after the end of the fiscal year (September 30th), and a brief (2-week) extension of the September 1st deadline. Extensions will be granted only to give parks time to complete late-summer population monitoring.

Funding Source: USGS-Biological Resources Discipline – Park-Oriented Biological Support

Please contact the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: To be set in the USGS call for proposals.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: John Dennis - 202-513-7174

Documentation: In PMIS subject to pending USGS-BRD guidance issued with each USGS-BRD call for proposals.

Funding Amount: No minimum and a maximum of \$75,000 per project with no more than \$45,000 in any single year. The next USGS call for proposals expected late spring in 2009 may change these limits.

Project Duration: Projects must be completed within three years. Projects may receive funding in no more than 2 years.

Number of Projects Per Region: No specific number of projects per NPS or USGS region. Competition among proposals occurs at the national level.

Subject of Projects: Project proposals must clearly demonstrate the benefit of the proposed activity to the participating parks or NPS offices. All proposals must demonstrate cooperation and coordination with NPS natural resource managers or other technical specialists who are permanent employees. All proposals must include a letter of support from the managers of the relevant parks or NPS offices at the time the USGS scientists submit the proposals to USGS-BRD. This letter of support must show NPS support for the project, document the ability and willingness of NPS staff to apply the results of the work quickly and effectively, and describe any personnel, logistics, or other contributions the NPS partner will make. Proposals will be accepted for the following types of projects:

1. **Technical Assistance:** Projects focus on data gathering, data analysis, and technical support. These projects must produce a tangible product to the park (e.g., a paper, mathematical model, report, or other product presenting or describing the results of a project). Park technical assistance proposals must address a recognized, high-priority management need of one or more parks as described in park Resource Management Plans, NPS overview documents describing such needs, or through any processes sponsored by USGS for NPS to identify park information needs.
2. **Exploratory Research:** Projects provide a cornerstone for new research on emerging issues that may become significant to the park. These projects involve studies of a pilot or short-term nature and must produce products useful to the park. This type of research focuses on short-term goals and is typically “tactical,” in that the results might quickly solve a particular problem. The products may identify a need or possible direction for future, long-term strategic research. Strategic research proposals resulting from Park-Oriented Biological Support projects may be candidates for funding from other NPS or USGS programs. Exploratory research proposals do not need to be based on issues already identified in NPS documents, since these proposals are addressing emerging issues that are unlikely to have been identified in advance. Exploratory research proposals do need to have strong support from the parks in which the research is proposed to be conducted.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: The USGS-BRD will identify selection criteria in their call for proposals (outside the SCC). USGS/BRD and NPS together evaluate the project proposals submitted and recommend a list of projects to receive the services of USGS-BRD scientists. USGS/BRD solicits detailed work plans and schedules the work with the parks following USGS/BRD procedures.

Proposal Submissions: Proposals must be submitted by USGS scientists according to the USGS/BRD call for proposals.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: These projects must have a formulated fund source of “USGS-Biological Resources Discipline – Park-Oriented Biological Support” in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds. Detailed Implementation Plans are not required.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain information or guidance please contact John Dennis via electronic mail or call 202-513-7174.

Funding Source: USGS-Biological Resource Discipline Research (NRPP)
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: Subject to NPS regional instructions

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: John Dennis – 202-513-7174.

Documentation: In PMIS subject to NPS regional and USGS guidance.

Funding Amount: This funding source involves non-NPS funds which are subject to NPS regional and USGS guidance.

Project Duration: Subject to NPS regional and USGS guidance.

Number of Projects Per Region: Subject to NPS regional and USGS guidance.

Subject of Projects: Biological research.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: For this partnership program, NPS or NPS-USGS work groups evaluate the project statements developed by the NPS and submitted to NPS regional offices or consortia of offices. The work groups develop a list of priority projects.

Proposal Submissions: Proposals must be submitted as follows:

Receipt of project proposals, review, and rating of proposals, and transmittal to USGS-BRD of approved proposals for biological research funded through this funding source will be made by each collaborative group of NPS regions working in partnership with a USGS-BRD region. Each collaborative group of NPS regions will announce its own specific requirements as regional guidance in conjunction with the FY 2011 SCC. Parks should contact their NPS regional science advisor for information concerning their region's specific requirements for USGS-BRD biological research proposal submission, evaluation, and reporting processes.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "USGS-Biological Resource Discipline Research (NRPP)" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain information or guidance please contact your regional science advisor or John Dennis via electronic mail or call 202-513-7174.

**Funding Source: USGS Biological Resources Discipline -
Status and Trends of Biological Resources Program**

Please contact the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: To be set in the USGS call for proposals; (July or August)

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Tom Philippi (970) 225-3586

Documentation: In PMIS subject to pending USGS guidance issued with each annual USGS call for proposals. See <http://www.fort.usgs.gov/brdscience/NationalParkMonitoringProject.aspx>

Funding Amount: No minimum or maximum amount. However, projects requesting more than \$100K in a fiscal year must be divided into separate subtasks of \$75K or less each, which are evaluated separately. Anticipate about \$900K will be available each year for new and continuing projects.

Project Duration: Research tasks may run for 1- 5 years. They will be funded on an annual basis, with continuing funding contingent on annual progress reports and statements of work.

Number of Projects Per Region: No specific number of projects per NPS or USGS region. Competition among proposals occurs at the national level.

Subject of Projects: These funds are available to support the USGS component of USGS S&T - NPS I&M collaborative research in support of NPS I&M needs on themes set jointly by the NPS I&M and the USGS S&T Programs. The funding theme anticipated through FY2010 is "Integrated analysis, modeling, and synthesis of NPS Inventory and Monitoring data to inform condition-based management". NPS I&M networks are developing tools for reporting individual vital signs in both annual summaries and less frequent but more detailed trend reports. This theme targets the need for broader, more complex syntheses or integration of several vital signs and inventory data sets into information relevant to planners, managers, and the general public. The primary goal is to produce syntheses and models relevant to management, planning, or interpretation at the individual park level, based on extant data from one or more I&M network. The secondary goal is to produce toolkits and otherwise enhance the capabilities of NPS I&M to perform similar syntheses in other networks and for similar topics. Potential types of projects fundable under this theme include:

- tools for integrated reporting of clusters of related vital signs (e.g., water chemistry, stream invertebrates, and fish) and inventories,
- development or refinement of methods required for syntheses, with case studies based on I&M data
- predictive models transforming vital signs data into management projections or scenarios
- broader syntheses across multiple abiotic and biotic vital signs or integrated assessments
- science behind "compelling stories" that place the vital signs and parks in the context of the surrounding region or ecosystem.

The primary foci are vital signs monitoring data and the 12 core resource inventories, but other relevant park data may be included, especially to put vital signs data into context. Fieldwork for collection of new data will not be funded. Pass-through funding is not allowed, but cooperators from other organizations are acceptable if USGS does not have the required expertise. Proposals may involve more than one I&M network. Proposals must clearly state the involvement of NPS I&M network investigators, list anticipated products, address the benefits to park management, planning, or interpretation, and specify the enhancements to NPS I&M capabilities for analysis, modeling, and synthesis.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: The USGS will identify selection criteria in their call for proposals (outside the SCC). USGS S&T and NPS I&M together evaluate the project proposals submitted and recommend a list of proposals to receive the services of USGS scientists.

Proposal Submissions: Proposals must be submitted by USGS-BRD scientists according to the USGS call for proposals. Proposals must include the substantial participation of at least one principal investigator from USGS-BRD and at least one from NPS I&M networks. Additional investigators (with any affiliation) are allowed, and USGS scientists from other divisions may be funded as long as one lead PI is from USGS-BRD.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: These projects must have a formulated fund source of "USGS-Biological Resources Discipline – Status and Trends of Biological Resources Program" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required for all projects funded with these funds. Detailed Implementation Plans are not required.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: To obtain information or guidance please contact Tom Philippi via electronic mail or call (970) 225-3586.

Funding Source: USGS Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Program
Please see the WASO Funding Source Program Manager for additional information

Due Date: February 28, 2009, for new FY 2010 projects.

WASO Fund Source Program Manager: Barry Long - 970-225-3519 and Gary Rosenlieb – 970-225-3518.

Documentation: In PMIS by February 28, 2009. Parks must submit a MS Word version of their USGS technical proposal, including author identification, PMIS #, and contact information, in order to submit FY 2010 projects to USGS.

Funding Amount: Approximately \$500,000 is available for new projects in FY 2010. There is no minimum funding level. However, the four types of projects addressed by this funding source have the following maximum funding levels:

1. Intensive Studies: \$100,000/project/year.
2. Synoptic Studies: \$50,000/project/year.
3. Fixed-Station Monitoring Studies: \$50,000/project/year.
4. Technical Assistance Requests: \$20,000/request.

Project Duration: Not to exceed three years.

Number of Projects per Region: The number of submissions is intended to allow funding for approximately 40% of projects. The region may not adjust the submissions among categories or exceed the total project number.

Region	Total # Project Proposals	Category Distribution		
		Intensive or Synoptic studies	Fixed- Station Monitoring Studies	USGS Technical Assistance
Alaska	3	1	1	1
Intermountain	5	3	1	1
Midwest	3	1	1	1
National Capital	3	1	1	1
Northeast	3	1	1	1
Pacific West	5	3	1	1
Southeast	3	1	1	1
TOTALS	25	11	7	7

Subject of Projects: Projects will be accepted in the four categories below. Researchers are encouraged to include a data analysis and interpretation component by USGS to make the information immediately applicable by NPS resource managers, and also make specific provisions for park interpreters and the USGS to present the information to the public.

1. Intensive Studies: Relatively large projects that require in-depth study of park water quality. Designed to characterize known or suspected water quality problems, these projects will also focus on understanding causes of contamination and the implications of water quality impairment to aquatic biota. Most intensive studies are strongly issue-driven and oriented towards priority water quality issues confronting the NPS.
2. Synoptic Studies: Short-term investigations of water quality from several sites during selected seasonal periods or hydrologic conditions. These projects are designed to focus on park-specific issues that may have broader regional implications. Synoptic studies are intended to provide a quick assessment of aquatic conditions at selected locations and to evaluate the spatial relationships or contributions to those conditions, or to provide baseline data and information where little exists.
3. Fixed-Station Monitoring: Monitoring that documents long-term trends in water quality and determines if management actions are achieving water quality objectives. Fixed-station monitoring will be designed to enable park managers to know the health of nationally significant NPS water bodies, know the effects of remediation actions, and document whether external activities adversely affect park water quality. Generally, fixed-station monitoring will be implemented using a "site rotation" concept.
4. Technical Assistance: Short-term assistance provided to the park for purposes of installation of instrumentation, training, scoping water quality issues, or providing technical representation at meetings requiring water quality expertise.

USGS Coordination: Early in the process of assembling project proposals for submission, parks must contact local USGS offices to inform them of park needs, discuss strategies, and receive assistance in writing or revising project statements and addressing the ranking criteria. One or more USGS professionals normally collaborate with the benefiting park and prepare an original technical proposal for the project. The local USGS Water Science Center Chief should certify each submission with an approval letter, indicating that the work is feasible and the schedule and costs are appropriate. In addition, the local NPS Park Superintendent should certify each submission with an approval letter, indicating that the park approves the project work and is committed to being involved in the project during its implementation.

Criteria, Selection and Approval Process and Schedule: An NPS-USGS work group will evaluate the project proposals submitted to the national office. The NPS-USGS work group will develop a list of priority projects for each funding source. The NPS Water Resources Division will participate on the work group and will provide assistance to parks during all stages of the process. NPS Regions that screen project proposals for this partnership program must include at minimum one local USGS scientist (chosen by USGS) on their screening panels. USGS scientists participating on NPS Regional screening panels will be allowed to formally rank and vote on partnership projects. Selected USGS representatives will communicate with NPS Regional Water Resource Coordinators as their point of contact. Project funds will not be transferred to participating parks. Instead, parks will collaborate with the USGS Water Science Center Offices that will conduct the water quality assessments and monitoring studies necessary to satisfy park needs.

Proposal Submissions: Regional offices are responsible for providing the following two documents by email to Barry Long no later than February 28, 2009: 1) The USGS Technical Proposal and 2) Responses to all nine natural resource ranking criteria and approval letters. NOTE: In case of Barry Long's absence, please send the package to Gary Rosenlieb.

PMIS Funding Source Identification for regions: All proposals must have a formulated fund source of "USGS Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Program" in PMIS.

Required Interpretive Component: No

Implementation Plan and Reporting Requirements: Detailed Implementation Plans, Annual Accomplishment Reports, Final Accomplishment Report, and Final Completion Report are required from USGS for all projects funded with these funds. Detailed Implementation Plans are not required from parks.

Proposal Preparation/Technical Assistance: Guidance is available from the NPS-WRD and the USGS-WRD in selecting project statements for submission, preparing the overall project proposal submissions, and facilitating coordination with USGS. To obtain assistance or information (including USGS District personnel who can assist your park), please contact Barry Long, NPS-Water Resource Division, via electronic mail or telephone at 970-225-3519, Gary Rosenlieb, NPS-WRD, via electronic mail or telephone at 970-225-3518, or Mark Nilles, USGS-WRD, via electronic mail (manilles@usgs.gov) or telephone at 303-236-1878.

Appendix A. Natural Resource Project Ranking Criteria

Responses to project ranking criteria are required for all project proposals. These responses are to be put in PMIS under "Additional Criteria" and minimally must address eight and, in some instances, all nine of the following criteria. Information on the type of documentation and whether the response must include the ninth criterion are contained in the funding source-specific guidance. **Responses to each criterion are limited to no more than 200 words and submissions that exceed this limit may receive lower ratings by the review panel.**

The project ranking criteria include:

1. Significance of the resource or issue to the park: Describe why this is an important issue or resource to the park involved. There should also be direct discussion about how important the resource/issue is to the park relative to other resources/issues, marked in the High band, and list the priority rating in reference to all other natural resource issues. For example: "This project is park priority 30, but is priority 2 for park natural resource projects. Also, what was the process that identified this as a priority?"
2. Severity of resource threat, problem, or need(s): Is there a time-critical or urgent aspect to this project? What causes this to be an urgent need? How imminent is the threat, and what is its extent? What are the consequences of not doing the project now?
3. Problem definition and information base: What exactly is the problem? Why is this project needed? What information do you have that's relevant to the problem? If this is an information-gathering project, what is the information being gathered and what will you be able to do as a result?
4. Problem resolution: Describe how the proposed project will resolve the problem, as defined in the proposal. Will the project contribute directly to decisions or actions that will meaningfully resolve a management issue?
5. Technical soundness: What methods will be used to achieve the project objectives? What is the timeframe of the project and its components? What is the status of compliance requirements for the project? Who are key staff and what are their qualifications?
6. Transferability: How widely will the results or new protocols, or new information be used by others? What are you going to do to get this information to others who can use it? (Multi-park and multi-region projects are addressed in this criterion)
7. Cost-effectiveness: Given the problem statement and proposed methodology, are cost estimates realistic?
8. Project support: A detailed description of total project costs, including contributions, is required using the table on page 34. Do not include management oversight, supervision, administrative support, and other routine costs that will occur regardless of whether this project is funded. Do not include the cost of NEPA compliance required for this project when calculating the percent matching contributions. Funds that are excluded from matching include any Natural Resource WASO-level base or project dollars including those associated with the NRPP funding call. ([List of Funding Sources found on page 7](#))
9. Scientific merit: This criterion applies only to the USGS Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Program.

The project ranking criteria responses are evaluated by a panel convened to review the project proposals submitted by all the regions to a funding source. Panel members may, for each criterion, score projects from the 0 to 5 level. Qualifications for scores of 1, 3, or 5 points for each criterion are listed below. Criterion 8 includes qualifications for scoring at the 1 to 5-point levels.

Detailed Discussion of Criteria:

1. Significance of the Resource or Issue to the Park: Weighting Factor = 3x

5 points: High significance - Resource or issue is: One of the most significant in the park, defined as unique, unparalleled, unprecedented, unequalled, matchless, singular. The only one of its kind (State the source of this determination, and define the scale, such as whether it is unique in the park, region, or nation), project is in the "High" band in PMIS, the subject of the enabling legislation, fundamental to this park's ecosystem and purpose (as opposed to basic resources such as air and water that are fundamental to all parks), on federal or state lists as endangered or threatened; and/or, required by statute. To earn a "5" requires that at least four of these criteria be met and the project is the top natural resource priority in the park.

3 points: Moderate significance - Resource or issue is important, but not singularly so for that park and project is in the "Medium" band in PMIS. Project is not the top natural resource priority in the park.

1 point: Resource or issue is only peripherally related to park's purposes, uses, or long-term condition and project is in the "Low" band in PMIS.

2. Severity of Resource Threat, Problem, or Need(s): Weighting Factor = 3x

5 points: Delaying the project will result in resource damage that is extensive; or persistent; or immediate; or complex; or likely irreversible. Doing the project now will prevent significantly worse problems later and loss of an important opportunity for partnership and significant cost-sharing or delaying the project will result in a significant hazard to human health or safety .

3 points: Resource threat, problem, or need is urgent. Delay of the project will result in, or continue, resource degradation. A potential public health or safety threat exists.

1 point: Resource threat, problem, or need is potential; or minor; or infrequent; and/or temporary. Immediate action is not necessary to protect resources. Delaying the project will result in, or continue, the potential for resource degradation. Public health/safety is not an issue.

3. Problem Definition and Information Base: Weighting Factor = 2x

5 points: The proposal clearly defines the problem that will be addressed by this project. For a management problem, the information base regarding the problem is well-described and provides a sound foundation for problem resolution. For a problem involving lack of information, project statement clearly documents why existing information is not adequate and how the information obtained through this project will provide a sound foundation for problem resolution.

3 points: The proposal describes the problem in general terms. For a management problem, the proposal provides some details about the information base, but there is not enough information available to resolve the problem. The project does not clearly focus on what the real problem is. For a problem involving lack of information, the proposal describes only moderately well what information is needed and how it will be used.

1 point: The problem is poorly defined and/or availability, applicability, or adequacy of the information is poorly addressed.

4. Problem Resolution: Weighting Factor = 3x

5 points: The proposed project implements specific management prescriptions that will result in the final resolution of a natural resource issue or threat; or the project develops the information necessary for implementing management actions that will resolve the issue or threat. For a management problem, no additional actions other than follow-up monitoring are anticipated; or for projects involving lack of information, no additional information is needed or required and the park has specific plans to take action as a result of having this information.

3 points: The proposed project will contribute to resolution of the problem, but will not fully resolve it or the proposed project will contribute to the future resolution of the problem, such as by clarifying management issues, articulating techniques or procedures, or supporting an interagency or regional strategy. Information gained through this project will help in future resolution of the problem, but the park does not currently have concrete plans to take action. Additional studies, management actions, and/or planning will be necessary to completely resolve the stated problem.

1 point: The proposed project is only generally related to the development of management actions to resolve a specific problem. The proposed project will contribute basic information about park natural resources.

5. Technical Soundness: Weighting Factor = 3x

5 points: Objectives and expected outcomes/products are clearly stated and related to the technical approach; and methodologies, procedures, and proposed actions are technically sound; and their applicability is well demonstrated; and description and status of environmental planning documents/ requirements is clearly stated; and time frame is reasonable for using the planned approach to accomplish project objectives. Key individuals working on the project have a high level of expertise directly relevant to their roles in the project.

3 points: Objectives and expected outcomes/products appear related to the technical approach; or methodologies, procedures, and proposed actions have some technical inadequacies; or their applicability is not well demonstrated; or description and status of environmental planning documents/requirements is only generally discussed; or project objectives may not be accomplished within planned timeframe using the proposed approach. Key individuals working on the project have expertise that is generally relevant to their roles in the project.

1 point: Objectives are not clearly stated; or methodologies, procedures, and proposed actions are not technically sound; or their applicability has not been demonstrated; or description and status of environmental planning documents/requirements is inadequately discussed; or project cannot be accomplished within proposed time frames. Key individuals working on the project do not clearly have relevant expertise that is necessary to the success of the project.

6. Transferability: Weighting Factor = 1x

5 points: The proposal clearly demonstrates, through specific examples, how protocols or results of the project will contribute to tangible needs at the national level (NPS or other organization); and there are expressions of interest in this work by others across the country; and the project approach includes specific measures to make project information and results widely available.

3 points: The protocols or results of the project can contribute to tangible needs at several parks or other organizations within a geographic region; and others have expressed interest in this project; and the project approach includes the intent and ability to make project information, and results available to other units or organizations.

1 point: The project's tangible benefits are limited to the park or the proposal provides no clear plan to actively inform others about project information or results. For example, information may be made available through publications or a website, where others may or may not see it.

7. Cost-Effectiveness: Weighting Factor = 2x

5 points: Alternative ways of doing this project have been researched, and this is the most cost-effective way of achieving the project benefits. (Describe the alternatives that have been considered.) The benefit to the resource, in relation to the cost, is very high. Costs are realistic, well-researched, clearly spelled out in a detailed budget, apportioned for each deliverable/product or result, and supported by examples.

3 points: Costs appear reasonable to achieve the stated objectives, procedures, deliverables, products or results. If costs are high, they are justified by the proportionate value of benefits to be achieved or proposal only generally describes how costs were determined and provides only general supportive data.

1 point: Costs appear disproportionately high or low in relation to the stated project objectives, procedures, deliverables/products, or results or proposal provides inadequate evidence that costs have been accurately evaluated.

8. Project Support: Weighting Factor = 2x

A detailed description of total project costs, including contributions, is required using the table on page 34. Do not include management oversight, supervision, administrative support, and other routine costs that will occur regardless of whether this project is funded. Do not include the cost of NEPA compliance required for this project when calculating the percent matching contributions.

5 points: 70% or more of the project costs are covered by other funding sources, the Region, or partners.

4 points: 51-69% of project costs are covered by other funding sources, the Region, or partners.

3 points: 39-50% of project costs are covered by other funding sources, the Region, or partners.

2 points: 10-38% of project costs are covered by other funding sources, the Region, or partners.

1 point: Less than 10% of project costs are covered by other funding sources, the Region, or partners.

Table: Example of a required Project Support Cost Estimate

Project Support Cost Estimates			
Estimated By: URPark		Date of Estimate: 09/20/08	
Item	Description	Percent of Total Project Cost	Item Cost
Park In-kind Support	1 each GS-401-9 Seasonal Biologist for 14 pay periods = \$21,480 3 each GS-401/486-5 Seasonal Biological/Wildlife Technicians for 12 pay periods = \$12,120	14%	\$33,600.00
Donated Supplies Costs	5 each Insulated chest waders = \$220 400' Goldline rope = \$310 6 each 100' Drift nets = \$1,200 Lab supplies = \$210 Misc. field supplies = \$460	2%	\$2,400.00
Donated Equipment Costs	2 each Backpack electroshock units = \$6,200 2 each MCT dataloggers = \$1,000 3 each portable radios = \$2,600 1 each AED unit = \$2,200	5%	\$12,000.00
Federal Non-NRPP Contributions	NOAA – National Marine Sanctuaries (grant)	2%	\$2,400.00
Volunteer Services and Non-federal Contributions	Diving Equipment and Marketing Association (cash)	1%	\$1,200.00
	California Department of Fish and Game (cash)	1%	\$1,200.00
Other Contributions	None		\$.00
Project Support Cost Estimate Totals		25%	\$52,800.00

9. Scientific Merit: Weighting Factor = 3x

This criterion applies only to the USGS Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Program.

5 points: The proposed project exhibits superior scientific merit by applying existing or new techniques to study unique and/or complex park problems and provides high-quality information to managers and the public in useful and original products.

3 points: The proposed project exhibits scientific merit by applying existing techniques to address park problems and provides quality information to park managers and the public.

1 point: The proposed project does not exhibit scientific merit, but will provide basic water resource information to park managers and the public.

Appendix B: Guidelines for Interpretive Component

For advice and assistance with your proposal contact the [NRPC Office of Education & Outreach](#); we specialize in interpretive media development for natural resources.

The purpose of the interpretive component is to enhance the effectiveness of our resource stewardship efforts by addressing the human dimension inherent in most natural resource issues. A good Interpretive Component should use the following format:

- 1. Human Dimensions of the Issue: Clearly identify the natural resource issue that you're addressing, and describe its human dimension. What role do people have in contributing to, and in resolving, the issue?**
 - The interpretive component should reflect the proposal's statements about the significance of the resource, severity of resource threat, and/or problem resolution, and then should discuss the direct or indirect link between humans and the resource issue.
- 2. Message: Articulate the messages that need to be conveyed through outreach products or programs. What is the interpretive intent?**
 - What is the most desired message that needs to be conveyed, and what is its purpose? Is it to gain support? To change behavior? To simply inform? To instill appreciation? Different issues require different levels of acceptance, understanding, or response from the public for resolution.
- 3. Target Audience: Identify the most important target audiences for the message.**
 - The interpretive presentation should be designed to connect with the needs and interests of the most appropriate target audience (the audience that needs to be reached to resolve the resource issue).
 - Often the best approach in dealing with critical resource issues is to use a variety of interpretive techniques that reach various audiences at different levels.
 - Programs may need to reach both supporters and nonsupporters, including internal NPS staff, external park communities, park partners, schools, local businesses, traditional visitors, park neighbors, tribal members, ranchers, in-holders, commercial fisherman, hikers, pet owners, urban populations, or concessioners. In seeking real solutions, the most appropriate target audience should not be missed by unwittingly delivering the message to a more convenient or traditional audience or using a "one size fits all" approach for everyone.
- 4. Media and Method: Identify the specific media and methods that will be effective to communicate the message.**
 - Studies in the U.S. and Canada have shown that -- regardless of the content, accuracy, or depth of knowledge presented while interpreting critical natural resource issues -- the success of a program depends entirely on its understanding *and retention* by the audience.
 - Consider a variety of techniques, and determine which ones will best reach your target audiences needs and interests. Possible techniques include brochures, maps, signs, displays at trailheads, posters, personnel at school programs, hosting public meetings, slide shows, agency periodicals, guidebooks and identification checklists, commercial and agency radio, TV and/or periodicals, movies or short film segments, and bookmarks.

Media can also be distributed in a variety of locations including: visitor centers, campgrounds, schools, trailheads, agency offices, and backcountry areas. A multilayered approach often brings the best results in resolving critical resource issues

Provide budget details itemizing the total interpretive component cost and identifying the amount requested from NRPP and amounts available from other funding sources. Funding needs should be detailed in the PMIS Component budget section. Funding to complete the Interpretive Component should not come at the expense of other funding needed for the project; rather it is an addition to the project budget that is specifically allocated to interpretation.

Other useful factors to include:

- Providing **budget** details itemizing the total interpretive component cost and identifying NRPP requested amount and other funding source contributions (if applicable). Requested funding should be recognized in the Cost Component Estimate. Funding to complete the Interpretive Component should not come at the expense of research or management dollars; rather it is an addition to the budget specifically allocated to communication. Further, many natural resource interpretation projects qualify for funding from other sources. Details about all costs and contributions are required in the Interpretive Component, however only the portion of costs being requested from NRPP should be included in the overall cost estimate of the proposal.

- Identify interpretive specialist(s) from the park, regional office, national office, and/or partner organizations who will **collaborate** on the Interpretive Component.
- Include **evaluation** criteria that may be used to measure the success of this communication effort in the Measurable Results section of the PMIS.

Interpretive components that have carefully considered all factors will not only make highly competitive proposals, but will support other efforts to provide long-term solutions to resolving natural resource issues. [Sample Interpretive Components](#) (doc)

The WASO Natural Resource Program Center, Office of Education & Outreach is available to help with this process. For further information, contact Sara Melena at (970) 225-3525 (Sara_Melena@partner.nps.gov), Mike Whatley at (970) 225-3541 (Mike_Whatley@nps.gov) or Lynne Murdock at (202) 513-7195 (Lynne_Murdock@nps.gov).

Appendix C: Project Funding Details in PMIS

Project Cost Information: Each natural resource project proposal submitted through PMIS in response to the FY 2011 SCC must provide cost information in a standardized format regardless of the funding amount requested. These six cost elements include:

- Personnel Services Costs (for seasonal/temporary park staff employees specifically to implement project)
- Travel and Transportation Costs
- Supplies Costs
- Equipment Costs
- Contractor and Cooperator Costs (including identity of cooperator, if known at time of project submission)
- Other Costs (including overhead costs) not encompassed by the above.

Component cost estimate information is entered for each Funding Component of a project proposal in PMIS. Each of the above cost elements constitutes one "Item" in the component cost estimate for a Funding Component within the "Project Funding Component Cost Estimate Information" module. Each Funding Component would contain an entry for each of the six cost elements (including cost elements with a zero cost). After FY 2007 projects no longer receive additional funding to cover regional contingency assessments. These project costs should be included in the proposed budgets. Projects will receive the full amount that was approved and should not expect supplemental funding to cover regional contingency assessments.

These cost elements must appear as separate "Items" within each project Funding Component (e.g., a proposal with one Funding Component would contain six items with one corresponding to each of the six cost elements, a proposal with three Funding Components would have six items with one corresponding to each of the six cost elements in each of the three funding components). **Note:** Specific natural resource funding sources may require additional project cost information beyond that in this standardized format. Such funding source-specific information would be provided in the "Additional Criteria" section.

Table: Example of a completed component cost estimate for a single funding component in PMIS.

Component Cost Estimates					
Estimated By: URPark		Date of Estimate: 09/20/08			
Estimate Good Until: 09/30/2011		Class of Estimate: C			
Item	Description	Qty	Unit	Unit Cost	Item Cost (System Calculated)
Personnel Services Costs	1 each GS-401-9 Seasonal Biologist for 14 pay periods = \$21,420 3 each GS-401/486-5 Seasonal Biological/Wildlife Technicians for 12 pay periods = \$12,120	1	Each	\$33,540.00	\$33,540.00
Travel and Transportation Costs	GSA Rental Vehicle Mileage = \$2,425 Lodging = \$21,600 M&IE = \$8,160	1	Each	\$32,185.00	\$32,185.00
Supplies Costs	5 each Insulated chest waders = \$220 400' Goldline rope = \$310 6 each 100' Drift nets = \$1,200 Lab supplies = \$250 Misc. field supplies = \$460	1	Each	\$2,440.00	\$2,440.00
Equipment Costs	2 each Backpack electroshock units = \$6,200 2 each MCT dataloggers = \$1,850 3 each portable radios = \$2,600 1 each AED unit = \$2,200	1	Each	\$12,850.00	\$12,850.00
Contractor And Cooperator Costs	CESU support (Central University coop. agree. mod.) for aging 600 fish scales to assess brook trout population age structure and prepare report = \$2,400	1	Each	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00
Other Costs (incl. Overhead Costs)	Varies. Ex. CESU support (Central University coop. agree. mod.) overhead (17.5%) = \$360	1	Each	\$360.00	\$360.00
Component Funding Estimate					\$83,775.00
Component Funding Requested (Rounded)					\$84,000.00

Appendix D: The Recreation Fee Program Funding of Natural Resource Projects

The Recreation Fee Demonstration Program began in 1997 and was replaced in the FY2005 Appropriations Act with the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA). The top priorities for all recreation fee funds are to meet NPS mission and performance goals in four areas: 1) Deferred maintenance obligation targets; 2) Overall condition of the NPS constructed asset inventory, as measured by the Facility Condition Index (FCI); 3) Cost of collection (COC); and 4) Critical needs in other allowable areas.

The following guidance is a result of a combined Servicewide effort between the Recreation Fee and Natural Resource programs to clarify the FLREA Fee criteria for funding natural resource work and to provide clear and consistent direction to the field.

The FLREA Expenditure Categories most applicable to natural resource project needs include:

- Repair, maintenance, and facility enhancement related directly to visitor enjoyment, visitor access, and health and safety;
- Interpretation, visitor information, visitor service, visitor needs assessments, and signs;
- Habitat restoration directly related to wildlife-dependent recreation that is limited to hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, or photography;
- Law enforcement related to public use and recreation
- The Secretary may not use any recreation fees for biological monitoring on Federal recreational lands and waters under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 for listed or candidate species. See Paragraph titled Threatened and Endangered Species Exemption

Even with the limitations associated with FLREA there remains a wide range of potential projects that would address natural resource stewardship needs, including work associated with assets, interpretation/education, habitat restoration, and resource protection.

Direct Visitor Connection

Foremost for any Fee Program proposal is the requirement that it clearly articulates a direct visitor connection in the title, project description and justification fields in PMIS. The direct visitor connection should be quantified as much as possible.

For example, the project will result in “XXX more visitors a year being contacted”, or “the project will increase the number of visitors able to view species X in its habitat”. A direct visitor connection means the project will enhance visitor experiences by addressing a visitor need or providing an interpretive opportunity.

The quality of the visitor connection is important as well as the quantity of visitors affected. Since many park visitors may have only limited knowledge about an authentic park experience, it's essential to connect visitors to the park visual landscape and ecology and to interpret the significance of restoring impacted natural resources to a pristine condition.

Facility (Asset-related) Projects

While more familiar to park facility management personnel, the NPS is actively engaged in asset management. (See definition in RM 80, p. 41 at: <http://classicinside.nps.gov/documents/DO%2380%20Reference%20Manual%2011-20-06.pdf>).

Work suitable for funding using Fee revenues include assets whose purpose is specifically to accomplish a natural resource objective (e.g., a fence to exclude non-native livestock or exotic animals, air quality monitoring instrument shelter), as well as natural resource aspects of assets serving other purposes (e.g., invasive exotic plant management within the maintained landscape of a campground or along a road or trail; demolition, removal and associated habitat restoration of abandoned dams, roads, mine openings, cabins or other human-made structures etc).

A number of asset-related projects addressing natural resource needs may also constitute Deferred Maintenance (DM), which is currently receiving particular management attention (for definition of Deferred Maintenance see p. 10 at: http://classicinside.nps.gov/documents/glossary_fmp_080324.pdf).

Asset-related (facility) DM projects eligible for Fee funding include but are not limited to:

- 1) Removal and restoration of man-made structures such as abandoned or unneeded dams;
- 2) Replacement of exterior facility lighting to save energy and restore/protect night sky resources;
- 3) Restoration of abandoned mines, road or utility corridors, and ski areas; and
- 4) Maintenance of boundary fencing to exclude exotic animals or trespass livestock.

Asset-related proposals incorporating pertinent visitor health and safety issues (e.g., closure of mine openings to protect visitors while permitting continued bat passage, facility modifications to exclude native or exotic pest entry) simultaneously meet health and safety and natural resource needs.

Park natural resource and park facility management staffs will need to work together to ensure that asset-related project proposals for potential Fee funding follow the FMSS/PMIS Guidance distributed in December 2004. It is essential that the FMSS parent order number has a complete accurate parent to children work order relationship in FMSS with correct Sub-work type mapping and the correct Work Breakdown Structure to report Critical System Deferred Maintenance. In PMIS, the single parent work order needs to be added, the park needs to accurately complete the DOI category percentages with supporting documentation in the narrative fields and choose a single primary asset type.

Interpretation

Interpretation projects to inform visitors about the natural resources of the park and/or influence visitor behavior to protect those resources are eligible for Fee funding. Projects that translate science information into material that will be used by interpreters in presentations to visitors, school groups and others, or inclusion of this information in printed or web based materials may be eligible for funding.

Habitat Restoration

Habitat restoration work is appropriate if there is a direct visitor connection related to a wildlife-dependent recreational activity (hunting, fishing, wildlife observation or photography). For NPS purposes "wildlife" is consistent with the NPS Organic Act's use of "wild life" which includes all living resources in the parks. For the purposes of project proposals eligible for Fee funding a clear beginning and end to each project is essential within the near term (e.g., 3 to 5 years). While from the standpoint of ecological objectives most habitat restoration projects require a number of years or even decades for natural processes to fully complete the restoration, projects proposed for Fee funding need to focus on the near term specifications the project itself will achieve (e.g., restoration plan or contract specifications). These projects should set the stage for natural processes to assume the role of eventually meeting ecological health objectives.

In most cases, habitat restoration will provide quick results that are obvious to visitors. In other instances, it may be critical for the project to include an effective interpretive component that enhances the visitor experience immediately by explaining the restoration effort including its significance to the park's mission and future visitor benefits. This interpretive component must be significant (e.g. including new wayside exhibits, enhancements to the park website and expanded interpretive programs that connect the habitat restoration effort, the park's mission and the park's effort to restore an authentic visual and ecological experience to visitors).

In addition, each funding component of a habitat restoration project needs to articulate specific accomplishments to be achieved for that year of project funding. For example, Year 1: 30 acres of exotic vegetation will be removed; Year 2: 60 acres will be re-contoured to reflect natural slopes and provided erosion control cover; Year 3: XXXX native plant transplants will be planted or XX acres will be reseeded with native vegetation.

Law Enforcement

The poaching of cacti, reptiles, or fossils can deprive park visitors from fully experiencing key park resources, and law enforcement efforts to deter these illegal activities may significantly enhance their visit. However, such efforts are ineligible for Fee funding since they are operational in nature. Short-term law enforcement required to redirect visitor flow during a specific activity of a natural resource project, to ensure that visitors do not enter a closed area during critical recovery activities or to protect nesting areas of sensitive species may be eligible for Fee funding. (Note that such law enforcement services would need to be provided by seasonal or term commissioned personnel since Fee funds can not be used for permanent salaries.)

Project Merit

To be eligible for funding under the Fee Program, the proposed projects must be based on proven and effective methodologies resulting in a reasonable expectation that the proposed actions will produce tangible results for the visitor that can be touched, felt, seen, heard, understood or experienced.

Fee projects must address compelling needs to enable visitors to see their fees are being used to preserve and protect park natural resources and maintain or enhance their visitor experience. It is imperative that Fee project proposals effectively convey why they are compelling projects relative to the FLREA requirements, and how they meet the park's mission so they can be given a relatively high park priority reflective of their importance.

Project proposals advanced for potential Fee funding must include clear, concise responses to each of the following four factors. These responses are to aid in the evaluation of natural resource project proposals submitted to this funding source. The responses need to be included in the Justification field entry in PMIS. The four factors include:

- (1) The benefit to park visitors if action is or is not taken;
- (2) The significance of the natural resources at risk;

- (3) The level of threat to park natural resources and need for urgent action; and
- (4) The prospects that this proposal will resolve the problem.

These four factors and other required information should be addressed early and succinctly in the appropriate sections of each PMIS project proposal (Description, Justification, and Measurable Results fields) to make this information readily available to Fee Program managers and reviewers.

Projects that would implement an action previously approved in the park's GMP, DCP or CIP, or one of its' implementation plans (e.g., Vegetation Management Plan, Deer Management Plan, etc.) should cite this information in the PMIS project justification section.

Meeting the eligibility qualifications and policy guidance for Fee funding (i.e. there is a direct visitor connection, the project qualifies under the FLREA Expenditure Categories and the project is within policy on staffing and types of expenditures) does not ensure a project will be selected for funding. The four factors outlined above together with the context of NPS mission and performance goals, and the park's available Fee revenue will assist those charged with selection and prioritization of the eligible projects to fund. The Regional Fee Program Managers review the projects selected for funding to ensure the eligibility qualifications and policy guidance for Fee funding have been met. Then they review and approve each park's Recreation Fee Comprehensive Plan (RFCP) for project expenditures. WASO Fee Program Management approves each park's RFCP to certify that each park is within policy and the Servicewide goals of the program are met. While a project may have merit and meet eligibility qualifications, the park's total package of projects determines whether they are meeting the Servicewide goals of the Fee Program.

Other Types of Project Work Fundable Through Fee Revenues

- Social science study projects designed to better understand visitor use patterns and needs are eligible for Fee funding.
- Planning components integral to natural resource asset-related or habitat restoration efforts (e.g., IPM plan for maintained landscape, Bear Management Plan, Ubehebe Mine Restoration Plan, etc. [including associated environmental compliance]) are eligible for Fee funding, but only if they are part of a broader, comprehensive project proposal that includes substantive funding of on-the-ground implementation actions (e.g., installation of a new type of bear proof garbage container in campgrounds per Bear Management Plan, gating of mine adit and shaft entrances and restoration of disturbed mine land pursuant to Ubehebe Mine Restoration Plan). Science study projects designed to better understand visitor use patterns and needs are eligible for Fee funding.
- Projects involving the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) of fee facilities (as defined in FLREA) can include line items for natural resources needs (e.g., water quality testing of beaches, restoring vegetation in campgrounds, removal of hazard trees for visitor safety, management of human-wildlife interactions in fee facilities.)

Tactical Studies

Biological and physical science tactical studies are not generally eligible for Fee Program funding, except where they constitute an essential and limited aspect of a broader project proposal whose effective implementation is contingent on their information. The eligibility of such studies for Fee funds will be gauged on both the proportion of the monetary investment needed for a study relative to the on-the-ground actions the project would take, and, in particular, the merit of the project and its measurable results (as addressed above) relative to other unfunded priority proposals. For example, the specifications for a new bear-proof food container may need to be developed through a tactical study of several alternative container designs in order to procure and install the resulting containers in each site of a front country campground.

Required Information in All Fee Project Proposals

All projects proposed for Fee funding must include the following:

- Describe the direct visitor connection associated with the project (PMIS Description and Justification fields).
- Projects must have a clear beginning, and ending (on-going operations that should be base funded are not eligible, except O&M as previously noted).
- Defined outputs or outcomes (must be provided in the PMIS Measurable Results field).
 - Project outputs or outcomes need to be quantified (e.g. acres of habitat restored, miles of fence repaired, miles of abandoned roads restored).
 - Project outcomes also need to be quantified in terms of the numbers of visitors that are projected to see the results of the project and the number of visitors whose experience will be enhanced through interpretive messages regarding the project.

Additional Information

Fee Program Managers are actively trying to help parks describe their project needs in ways that meet FLREA expenditure guidelines, and will be as competitive and compelling as possible. Parks need to look at their overall project needs and, where the proposals are consistent with the requirements of FLREA and prioritized highly by the park, propose appropriate projects for potential Fee Program funding.

Project proposals previously submitted to a Servicewide natural resource funding source (e.g., NRPP, BRMD-Competitive) were undoubtedly prepared pursuant to Servicewide Comprehensive Call guidance issued by the Natural Resource Program. It is crucial to note that the nature and content of project proposals that may be submitted to the Fee Program are markedly different. Consequently, the Title, Description, Justification, and Measurable Results information necessary to compete for Fee funding will largely need to be revised. Please note that the frequently lengthy Justification field entry associated with natural resource funding source proposals could be left unedited in PMIS. The more concise, focused information for the Fee funding proposal can simply be inserted at the beginning of the Justification field and a clear delineation between the Fee funding and natural resource funding texts created made using several blank rows followed by several rows of hyphens or asterisks in the body of the text.

Several types of natural resource projects have previously been reviewed by the WASO Fee Program and have been determined to be eligible for Fee funding. These pre-approved eligible projects have been developed as templates to assist parks with their entry into PMIS and reduce the workload on park staffs to independently create their own proposals from scratch.

Currently the list of the Fee funding eligible project templates include:

- Assessment of Night Sky Resources, Outdoor Lighting, and Stewardship Technical Assistance - PMIS 127948
- Template: Enhance Recreational Fishing/Visitor Enjoyment by Restoring Native Fish and Habitat – PMIS 128973
- Remove Stream Obstructions to Enhance Recreational Fishing and Wildlife Viewing for Visitors TEMPLATE – PMIS 128979
- Prepare Park Resource Stewardship Strategy - PMIS 138283

It should be noted that while park Fee projects based on approved templates are automatically eligible for Fee funds, this does not guarantee that a project will be given a high priority by the park or region or ultimately funded. Funding will be based on competitiveness, demonstrable results and meeting FLREA expenditure criteria in addition to the items discussed above.

Threatened and Endangered Species Exemption

Definition: FLREA Section 8(b):

Limitation on Use of Fees: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires one-time actions termed survey, clearance, or inventory of the listed or candidate species as a part of the compliance process. These one-time actions are not considered monitoring as defined under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Under the ESA, “monitoring” is defined as a distinct action with an established frequency or repetition, and monitoring is associated with recovery activities for listed or candidate species. Resulting from the NEPA process, mitigation actions may be required to insure that a project does not jeopardize the continued existence of an endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

Policy: Section 8(b)

Each participating agency will ensure that no recreation fees are being expended for actions on biological monitoring under the Endangered Species Act for listed or candidate species. By policy, the excluded activities associated with listed or candidate species under the Endangered Species Act are expanded to include the writing of ESA-required recovery plans and mitigation that is generated by the implementation of a recovery plan. NEPA establishes a process that an agency must undertake prior to proceeding with certain visitor events or activities or with projects to enhance visitor facilities and services. In such cases, the definition and policy in this document allow for the use of recreation fees for surveys, inventories, and mitigation actions during an event, activity, or project execution that are required as a result of the NEPA process, even if the actions may be consistent with a recovery plan.

Exception to Policy on Recovery Plan Mitigation: Exceptions to the prohibition of using fees for ESA recovery plans include the use of the fees on expenditures specifically provided for under Section 8(a)(3). For example, recovery plans may include expenditures that also provide for "habitat restoration directly related to wildlife-dependent recreation that is limited to hunting, fishing, wildlife observation or photography," an expenditure explicitly authorized in Section 8(a)(3)(C). Where such overlap occurs, an explanation should be provided that identifies the expenditure provision in the Act that authorizes the activity and how the expenditure enhances the visitor experience.

Each agency will require the information used to determine the use of this policy exception is documented in the justification and determination of approval of the expenditure. The agency will maintain and have readily available the documentation supporting the approval of the expenditure as within the law and the policy.