

# **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

FROM THE

## **PIEDMONT WETLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAM**

### **RFP #07 – SMALL GRANT PROGRAM**

**A PROGRAM FUNDED BY WETLAND CREDIT SALES**

FROM

**NORTH FORK WETLANDS BANK**

**CEDAR RUN WETLANDS BANK**

**BULL RUN WETLANDS BANK**

ADMINISTERED BY

**WETLAND STUDIES AND SOLUTIONS, INC.**

FUNDING PAYMENTS FROM

**THE PETERSON FAMILY FOUNDATION**

**Proposal Application Due Date: March 31, 2010**

**WSSI #25000.01E7**

# CONTENTS

---

	PAGE
<b>I. Background</b> .....	4
<b>II. Research Topic</b> .....	5
A. Project Format .....	5
B. Suggested Topics .....	5
C. Flexibility and Intent .....	6
<b>III. Submission of Proposals</b> .....	6
A. Deadline and Delivery .....	6
B. Questions .....	7
C. Registration of Proposers .....	7
<b>IV. Program Funding</b> .....	8
<b>V. Proposal Review Process</b> .....	8
<b>VI. Subcontractors</b> .....	9
<b>VII. Review Criteria</b> .....	9
<b>VIII. Submission Requirements</b> .....	10
A. Solicitation Offer and Award Form .....	10
B. Table of Contents .....	10
C. Executive Summary .....	10
D. Project Team .....	10
E. Project Description .....	10
F. Scope of Work .....	11
G. Budget Narrative .....	11
H. Proprietary Information .....	12
I. Organizational Chart .....	12
J. Curriculum Vitae (CV) .....	12
K. Peer Review .....	12
L. Research Schedule .....	12
<b>IX. Payment and Reporting Requirements</b> .....	12
A. Reporting Requirements .....	12
B. Payment Requirements .....	13
<b>X. Budget Sheet</b> .....	13
<b>XI. Solicitation Offer and Award Form (SOAF)</b> .....	16

## **ATTACHMENTS**

---

**Solicitation Offer and Award Form**

**I. Background**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have worked with Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc. (WSSI) and their wetlands bank financial partner, The Peterson Companies and the Peterson Family Foundation (PFF), to establish a wetlands research funding mechanism from revenues resulting from certain credit sales in three mitigation banks (Bull Run, Cedar Run, and North Fork).

The general goal for all research projects funded by this program shall be to determine the overall effectiveness of compensatory mitigation efforts and specifically how design and construction practices should be modified to improve the performance, in terms of functions and values, of compensatory mitigation.

The mission of this program is to fund applied research that makes a real and measurable difference (in terms of how mitigation sites are designed and built) in wetland creation, restoration, and enhancement activities in the Virginia Piedmont.

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued to public and private universities in Virginia (see Section VI for Subcontractors’ policy), accredited by the Commonwealth of Virginia and with established programs related to the research topic. Its goal is to support research that will advance the science and engineering and provide state of the art practices for non-tidal wetlands creation, restoration, and enhancement, in the Piedmont Physiographic Province of Virginia. We also encourage responders to look at practices in nearby geographic areas to determine if they can be used to improve the state of the art in Virginia.

To date, we have funded four projects covered by three RFPs:

<b>RFP #</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Prime</b>	<b>Subcontractor</b>	<b>Amount</b>
1-A	Wetland Hydrology Monitoring	Virginia Tech	ODU	\$244,500.00
1-B	Wetland Hydrology Monitoring	Christopher Newport	—	\$ 29,967.00
2	Water Budget Modeling	Virginia Tech	ODU	\$594,875.00
3	Sustainable Created Forested Wetlands	VIMS	CNU	\$844,041.00

Three additional topics have been reserved to date:

<b>RFP #</b>	<b>Topic</b>
4	Growing Season
5	Dedicated Research Area
6	Soil Organic Matter Improvement Techniques

However, we have decided to keep these topics on hold due to other efforts initiated on these topics (#4<sup>1</sup> and #6<sup>2</sup>) and current economic conditions (#5).

## **II. Research Topic**

### **A. Project Format**

The concept of RFP #7 is to provide a lump sum<sup>3</sup> of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000.00) to a consortium of universities that will fund multiple research projects (one M.S. student could undertake two related projects) in the \$10,000 to \$35,000 range for undergraduate and/or masters' level students with no more than three projects in the \$65,000 to \$85,000 range. Our expectation is that these individual projects will be:

1. Short term (3 to 18 months);
2. Staggered over a 3-4 year period; and
3. Focused on applied research that could make a real and measurable difference (in terms of how mitigation sites are designed and built) in the Virginia Piedmont – either through technical improvements or, more likely, by determining “best practices” – design, implementation, maintenance, or regulatory oversight/permit conditions that can be implemented by industry and/or regulatory agencies.

### **B. Suggested Topics**

The following list is by no means inclusive – and is simply a starting point to show you our current perception of industry needs:

1. Recommended growing season dates for mitigation hydrology monitoring.
2. Recommendations for when, what, and how much soil organic matter amendments should be provided based upon literature review and/or ongoing projects.
3. Off-shoots from existing RFP work.
4. Comparison of mitigation success to Mitigation Banking Instrument (MBI) or permit conditions (i.e., New Jersey has very detailed requirements for construction inspection by designer, on OM%, on adjacent slopes, etc. – do they improve success?).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Norfolk COE requested information from consultants for a study being conducted by Ralph Tiner, USFWS.

<sup>2</sup> By Dr. Changwoo Ahn at Loudoun County Wetlands Bank Phase I where several OM amendment plots were disked into topsoil (wood chips, as well as composted leaf mulch).

<sup>3</sup> If requested in your response to this RFP, we will provide separate checks to each member of your consortium in the amount you specify such that the total is \$500,000.00.

5. Comparison of MBI or permit conditions between states/districts (i.e., compare Virginia to North Carolina). Does it improve success?
6. Evaluate designs and results to determine lessons for “best practices.”
7. Evaluate monitoring programs and results to determine lessons for “best practices.”
8. Evaluate maintenance practices and results to determine lessons for “best practices” (i.e., cattail spraying – good or bad?).
9. Design, construction, and regulatory process guidelines based upon results (to date) of previous RFPs, this RFP, and other sources.
10. Survey of agency and consultants to determine any consensus (if any) of what works/does not work in design, planting, soil preparation, construction, inspection, as-built surveys, monitoring, and maintenance.

### **C. Flexibility and Intent**

This RFP is specifically structured to be very flexible. When preparing your response, consider how its use will both create guidance useful to regulators and consulting practitioners, as well as provide a strong educational experience for student participants interested in becoming regulators or consultants and are thus interested in applied research versus basic research.

While not required, a thematic approach that connects the various proposed topics and/or a task that seeks to transfer the results of these projects to regulators and consulting practitioners will improve your score in Review Criterion #3 (see Section VII).

## **III. Submission of Proposals**

### **A. Deadline and Delivery**

The proposal application must be received by **5:00 PM on March 31, 2010**. Each proposal should be submitted as six (6) bound paper copies and an electronic copy in PDF format on a CD. Send proposal applications to the following address:

Michael S. Rolband, P.E., P.W.S., P.W.D.  
Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.  
5300 Wellington Branch Drive, Suite 100  
Gainesville, Virginia 20155  
Telephone: 703 679 5602  
E-mail: [mrolband@wetlandstudies.com](mailto:mrolband@wetlandstudies.com)

Please note that misdirected proposal applications will be deemed late and returned to the applicant. All proposal applications must be complete at the time of submission. Later changes or addendums will not be accepted.

**FAXED OR E-MAILED APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED**

**B. Questions**

Questions that arise during the proposal preparation should be directed by e-mail or U.S. Mail or overnight service<sup>4</sup> to:

Michael S. Rolband, P.E., P.W.S., P.W.D.  
Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.  
5300 Wellington Branch Drive, Suite 100  
Gainesville, Virginia 20155  
Telephone: 703 679 5602  
E-mail: mrolband@wetlandstudies.com

With a copy to:

Carol Novak  
Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.  
5300 Wellington Branch Drive, Suite 100  
Gainesville, Virginia 20155  
Telephone: 703 679 5607  
E-mail: cnovak@wetlandstudies.com

All responses and related responses shall be distributed to all registered proposers.

**C. Registration of Proposers**

If you desire to be informed of all questions and answers addressed during the proposal preparation process, as well as any RFP amendments, you must notify (via e-mail or U.S. mail) the following for registration:

Michael S. Rolband, P.E., P.W.S., P.W.D.  
Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.  
5300 Wellington Branch Drive, Suite 100  
Gainesville, Virginia 20155  
Telephone: 703 679 5602  
E-mail: mrolband@wetlandstudies.com

---

<sup>4</sup> Telephone calls are not preferred, as all registered proposers must be informed of all questions, answers, and clarifications.

With a copy to:

Carol Novak  
Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.  
5300 Wellington Branch Drive, Suite 100  
Gainesville, Virginia 20155  
Telephone: 703 679 5607  
E-mail: cnovak@wetlandstudies.com

#### **IV. Program Funding**

- A.** The PFF shall fund 100% of the award in one lump sum payment<sup>5</sup> in the amount of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000.00) to be made within 90 days of contract award.
- B.** Applicants are *not* expected to provide any cost-share towards the research budget, unless your institution requires such funding to offset the difference between the allowed Indirect Cost rate and your institution's Indirect Cost rate.
- C.** The Indirect Cost rate shall be limited to 35% of all Direct Costs. This is a maximum rate; proposers may offer a lower rate.
- D.** Tuition for graduate students *is allowable* as a Direct Cost on a proportionate basis to the percentage of their research time dedicated to the proposal work.

#### **V. Proposal Review Process**

- A.** Submission of Response to the Piedmont Wetlands Research Program in care of WSSI.
- B.** Based upon peer review recommendations in each proposal, as well as suggestions from WSSI staff and Mitigation Bank Review Team (MBRT) members, WSSI shall solicit peer review participants.
- C.** If there is sufficient interest, WSSI shall convene a peer review panel at its office for a one-day review meeting (MBRT members shall be invited to participate).
- D.** WSSI shall provide a recommendation to the MBRT for an award based upon its staff and peer review discussions (if they occur). WSSI staff, MBRT members, and external peer reviewers will not review proposals where a significant personal or organizational conflict of interest exists.

---

<sup>5</sup> If requested in your response to this RFP, we will provide separate checks to each member of your consortium in the amount you specify such that the total is \$500,000.00.



- E.** The MBRT Chair shall have ten (10) days to (based upon MBRT comments): (i) concur with the RFP Award Recommendation, (ii) select an alternative proposal, or (iii) reject all proposals. The MBRT Chair shall provide one (1) signed original “Solicitation Offer and Award” form confirming its decision to WSSI.
- F.** WSSI shall notify PFF of the decision and the research grant shall be awarded by PFF to the selected proposal (if any).
- G.** Timing: We expect the review process to take 30-60 days.

## **VI. Subcontractors**

One academic institution must be the prime research contractor and designate a Principal Investigator (PI) as both the point of contact and the party responsible for performing the work. Other entities may be subcontractors to the prime research contractor subject to the following conditions:

- A.** They are an academic institution or a federal government entity with research capabilities (such as USGS), and
- B.** No more than 40% of the work (measured in dollars of Direct Cost) shall be undertaken by academic personnel from a non-Virginian academic institution or federal government entity.
- C.** The Prime Research Contractor cannot apply any indirect rate markup to the subcontractor’s total cost except if that subcontractor’s indirect rate is lower than that allowed for the prime. In such case, the prime contractor may charge the difference. In no case can the subcontractor charge more than the indirect rate allowed by the prime.
- D.** The Prime Research Contractor may designate a specific amount of the contract for program administration costs (8 – 15% of the total award is reasonable depending upon the number of separate projects).

## **VII. Review Criteria**

The proposals will be reviewed and scored based upon the following criteria, with the weighting noted below showing the likely value of each criterion in the award decision:

	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>
1.	Viability of the proposed research program relative to solving the stated need in Section II.A.3. and Section II.C.	30%
2.	Level of interest and expertise of the Principal Investigator(s) in the research topic	20%
3.	Overall proposal quality, innovation, and viability	10%

- |    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 4. | Program administration costs (smaller is better)           | 10% |
| 5. | Number of separate topics (more is better)                 | 10% |
| 6. | Number of institutions (more is better) in your consortium | 10% |
| 7. | Ability to leverage these funds with other funding sources | 10% |

The reviewers and ultimate decision makers reserve the right to modify, at any time during the review process, the weighting of each criterion or simply make a unilateral decision to not follow said weighting in the extraordinary circumstance that the weighting does not result in a practicable outcome.

### **VIII. Submission Requirements**

Your response to this RFP must not exceed four (4) single-spaced, typed pages, plus up to two pages per proposed research project,<sup>6</sup> using 12-point font size and one-inch margins (all sides) and include the following sections:

- A.** Solicitation Offer and Award Form (referenced in Section XII and provided in Appendix A): You must complete all sections on this form and obtain signatures of the appropriate officials.
- B.** Table of Contents: Please include major sections and the corresponding page numbers.
- C.** Executive Summary (limit to one page single spaced): Explain what you plan to do and why your team should be selected.
- D.** Project Team: Describe which institutions and, specifically, the people who will be involved (and to what degree) in this project. Explain why this team is best suited for this project.
- E.** Project Description (one for each proposed project):
  - 1. Objectives: List the specific objectives of each project.
  - 2. Background: Explain the relevance of each project.
  - 3. Preliminary Studies (if applicable): Describe any precursor research you have conducted or are aware of that applies to the project topics and what was determined from those preliminary results.
  - 4. Experimental Procedures/Methodologies: Describe any laboratory or field testing to be performed referencing analytical methods used and commercial products planned to be used or assessed in this program. List and describe each type of device that you will test and evaluate.

---

<sup>6</sup> Text Section (i.e., does not include resumes, budgets, schedules, or SOAF)

5. Description of Resources (i.e., laboratory facilities and/or field sites): Describe the laboratory facilities, testing equipment, field sites, etc. available for conducting the tasks associated with these projects. If WSSI field sites are desired for use, describe which ones and how large an area.
6. Literature Cited: List all sources used.

**F. Scope of Work:**

1. Issue Identification: Identify and briefly describe the issues these projects will be addressing.
2. Work Tasks: Break the project into specific work tasks and describe each work task individually.
3. Time Allocation: Describe how much time (by months) is to be allotted for each work task and when each task is to begin and end.
4. Resource Allocation: For each work task, list the personnel who will be working on that task and specifically what each person will be doing; understanding that specific students will not yet be identified.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control: List measures planned to ensure that high quality results are achieved, such as descriptions of statistics to be used to evaluate data and to compare data to controls; field and lab QA/QC, data handling and security, and how to deal with the potential that graduate student tenures may not coincide with the research schedule.
6. Determination of Goals: Identify the means to be used to determine that project goals are met.

**G. Budget Narrative:** The budget may include salaries, travel, equipment, materials, and services *not including fees or profit*. It is imperative that you specify any overhead, Indirect Costs, or fringe benefits rates, as well as which budget categories are affected by those rates. (For example, Indirect Costs defined as “Facilities and Administration” = 10% of Total Direct Cost less tuition and equipment). In addition, salaries must include personnel descriptions (i.e., faculty, graduate student, hourly worker, etc.), the number of hours expended on the project, and the hourly rate. Supplies must be listed in general terms (i.e., field supplies, general office supplies, etc.). Travel must include a description (trips to field site, conference, etc.), estimated number of hours for travel, and estimated cost per trip. In addition, for travel to conferences, estimate proposed expenses in the budget. For travel to conferences, specific information on conference title, dates of conference, and purpose in attending (i.e., presenting paper, poster session, etc.) must be supplied to WSSI for approval prior to travel. Other Direct Costs must include a general description (i.e., chemical

analysis) and include units and unit cost. As stated in Section IV. C., Indirect Costs are fixed at 35% of Direct Cost. No cost-share funding is required.

Major pieces of equipment (>\$5,000 with lifetime >2 years) are not eligible for purchase with funding from this program unless (i) they are clearly essential to the conduct of the proposed work, (ii) their documented use will be primarily for the proposed work, and (iii) they will be made available for use by future consortium research programs after the funding program is completed.

- H. Proprietary Information:** No information provided in proposals responding to this RFP shall be deemed proprietary. All information in each proposal could be subject to public disclosure or disclosed to other parties.
- I. Organizational Chart:** Provide an organizational chart depicting the structure of your team.
- J. Curriculum Vitae (CV):** Provide CV for each senior investigator involved in the proposed project. Resumes should be no more than two pages with an attachment listing all relevant publications within the past 20 years. Senior investigators include the principal investigator and any other faculty or senior-level personnel involved in the project. CV of lower level researchers may be included at your option.
- K. Peer Review:** Provide the name and contact data (address, telephone, e-mail) for a minimum of three (3) researchers you feel would be qualified to provide a peer review of this proposal without personal or organizational conflict of interest.
- L. Research Schedule:** Provide a projected schedule for each separate project.

## **IX. Payment and Reporting Requirements**

### **A. Reporting Requirements Shall Include:**

1. Quarterly (i.e., March 31, June 30, September 30, December 31) Progress Reports with reports submitted within thirty (30) days after the end of the quarter describing (one or two paragraphs) your progress *on each separate project* relative to the Proposal Schedule and Scope of Work tasks.
2. Draft Final Report for WSSI and MBRT review for each separate project.
3. Final Report (six [6] hard copies and six [6] PDFs on CD) for each separate project.

**NOTE:** The report should be written in a manner (style and English units as primary unit) to encourage reference by regulators and consultants so as to apply the results to regulatory program guidelines and design projects.

4. One short article for Virginia Association of Wetlands Professional Scientists (VAWPS) newsletter for each separate project.
5. One peer reviewed publication article shall be prepared and submitted to an appropriate journal, such as *Wetlands*, is desired but ***only required for projects exceeding \$30,000.00.***
6. One presentation to the VAWPS in the offices of WSSI for any project with a budget exceeding \$50,000.00.

#### **B. Payment Requirements**

1. WSSI and/or MBRT representatives may inspect research facilities and discuss progress with researchers to verify invoice amounts and research progress at their discretion.
2. Send us an invoice for \$500,000.00 upon receipt of contract award (in the form of the signed SOAF) and PFF will pay the Prime in full within 90 days of receipt.

#### **X. Budget Sheet**

Your proposed budget for each individual project shall be submitted in a spreadsheet in a format (to minimize your effort, feel free to utilize any format you desire since the individual projects are small; the goal is to make sure you will have sufficient funding for the proposed projects) similar to the description depicted below (to assist you in completing this form, a sample is provided on the following page).

Please note that this is a fixed price award. We will simply pay \$500,000 and expect (based upon your university's reputation and the penalty of no further participation in the remaining \$1+ million of research funding) performance. The budget form is simply requested to demonstrate that the proposer(s) has thought through the proposed project costs and determined that the scope matches the estimated costs to the maximum extent practicable. ***No additional funds shall be available.*** The proposal may include a separate contingency line item to assist in reducing cost overrun risk to the university with a pledge to return any remaining funds to PFF.

### Budget Sheet

<b>Project Title:</b> _____				
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> _____				
<b>Organization:</b> _____				
<b>Requested Duration in Months:</b> _____				
Item	Unit Rate <sup>7</sup> (A)	Units <sup>8</sup> (B)	Quantity (C)	Cost (D = A x C)
Salaries (list each person or position separately)				
Benefits (list each benefits rate per person / position)				
Tuition				
Supplies <sup>9</sup>				
Equipment <sup>10</sup>				
Subcontracts (provide breakdown of salary, benefits, tuition, supplies, equipment, etc. unless it is a lump sum less than \$5,000)				
Travel				
Other Direct Cost				
<b>Total Direct Cost</b>				
Indirect Cost	35% <sup>11</sup>	N/A	N/A	
<b>Total Cost</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	

<sup>7</sup> i.e., \$/hr; ¢/mile

<sup>8</sup> i.e., LS = lump sum; hr = hours

<sup>9</sup> Items costing <\$2,000 with a useful life <2 years

<sup>10</sup> Items costing ≥\$2,000 with a useful life ≥2 years

<sup>11</sup> This is the maximum rate. Proposer may offer a lower rate.

**SAMPLE**  
**Budget Sheet**

<b>Project Title:</b>		<b>Wetland Hydrology Monitoring</b>		
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>		<b>Sam Jones, Ph.D.</b>		
<b>Organization:</b>		<b>University of Wetlands</b>		
<b>Requested Duration in Months:</b>		<b>18 Months</b>		
<b>Item</b>	<b>Unit Rate<sup>12</sup></b> (A)	<b>Units<sup>13</sup></b> (B)	<b>Quantity</b> (C)	<b>Cost</b> (D = A x C)
Salaries Sam Jones, P.I.	8,000/month	N/A	9 <sup>14</sup>	72,000.00
Jane Waters, Research Associate	3,000/month	N/A	18	54,000.00
Benefits P.I.	20%	N/A	N/A	14,400.00
R.A.	16.5%	N/A	N/A	8,910.00
Tuition	5,000 / semester	semester	3	15,000.00
Supplies	10,000	L.S.	1	10,000.00
Equipment	5,000	L.S.	1	5,000.00
Subcontracts Mineralogy Lab	3,000	L.S.	1	3,000.00
VA Tech Soils Lab	2,000	L.S.	1	2,000.00
Travel	.50/mile	Miles	5,000	2,500.00
Other Direct Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Direct Cost</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	186,810.00
Indirect Cost	35%	N/A	N/A	65,383.50
<b>Total Cost</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	252,193.50

<sup>12</sup> i.e., \$/hr; ¢/mile

<sup>13</sup> i.e., LS = lump sum; hr = hours

<sup>14</sup> 50% of 18 months

**XI. Solicitation Offer and Award Form (SOAF)**

Include one (1) original of the SOAF, signed by the Principal Investigator and Organization's Certifying Representative, with each of the six (6) hard copy submissions, and a PDF of said signed document on the CD containing your proposal.

See Attachment A: Solicitation Offer and Award Form.



**Piedmont Wetlands Research Program  
SOLICITATION OFFER AND AWARD**

Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc. 5300 Wellington Branch Drive, Suite 100 Gainesville, Virginia 20155		<b>1. FOR INFORMATION CONTACT</b> Name: <b>Michael S. Rolband, P.E., P.W.S., P.W.D.</b> Phone: <b>703 679 5602</b> E-mail: <b>mrolband@wetlandstudies.com</b>	
<b>2. SOLICITATION NUMBER</b> <b>RFP #07 – SMALL GRANT PROGRAM</b>	<b>3. TYPE OF SOLICITATION</b> REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)	<b>4. DATE ISSUED</b> _____, 201____	
<b>SOLICITATION</b>			
<b>5. DESCRIPTION OF WORK</b> The Proposer shall furnish all necessary staff, materials, tools, equipment and supervision to provide the research program and deliverables as described in the referenced RFP for Wetland Hydrology Monitoring and Proposer’s Response.			
<b>6. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION</b> All proposals must be delivered to the following address by <b>5:00 PM on March 31, 2010:</b> <b>Michael S. Rolband, P.E., P.W.S., P.W.D.</b> <b>President</b> <b>Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.</b> <b>5300 Wellington Branch Drive, Suite 100</b> <b>Gainesville, Virginia 20155</b>			
<b>7. PROPOSED BUDGET</b> _____ (\$ _____ .00)			
<b>OFFER (Offeror must complete in its entirety)</b>			
<b>8. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR</b> <b>Name and Title:</b> _____ <b>Organization:</b> _____ <b>Mailing Address:</b> _____ <b>Telephone:</b> _____ <b>Fax:</b> _____ <b>E-mail:</b> _____ PI Assurance: I agree to accept responsibility for the scientific conduct of the project, to provide the required reports, to acknowledge Peterson Family Foundation (PFF) and Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc. (WSSI) in any presentations and publications wherein the results of this project are used, and to provide copies of presentation abstracts and publications to PFF and WSSI. I also agree to allow this proposal to be reviewed by industry and/or academia and that there is no proprietary information in this proposal. _____ <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <span><b>Signature of Principal Investigator</b></span> <span><b>Date</b></span> </div>			
<b>9. PROPOSER’S ORGANIZATION</b> <b>Name:</b> _____ <b>Address:</b> _____ <b>Federal Tax ID Number:</b> _____ <b>Certifying Representative:</b> _____ <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <span><b>Name and Title</b></span> </div> Certification and Acceptance: I certify that to the best of my knowledge, the statements contained herein are complete and true and I accept the obligation to comply with PFF and WSSI terms and conditions provided an award is made as a result of this submission. _____ <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <span><b>Signature of Organization’s Certifying Representative</b></span> <span><b>Date</b></span> </div>			
<b>AWARD (To be completed by Review Entities)</b>			
<b>10. APPROVAL AMOUNT</b>		<b>11. DATE OF AWARD</b>	
<b>12. APPROVED RESEARCH START DATE</b>		<b>13. APPROVED RESEARCH COMPLETION DATE</b>	
<b>14. RECOMMENDATION BY WETLAND STUDIES AND SOLUTIONS, INC.</b> _____ Michael S. Rolband, President _____ Date _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed with Conditions:			
<b>15. SELECTION APPROVAL BY MITIGATION BANK REVIEW TEAM – BY U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AS CHAIR</b> _____ By: _____ Date _____ (Print or type name) <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed with Conditions:			
<b>16. AWARD APPROVAL BY THE PETERSON FAMILY FOUNDATION</b> _____ By: _____ Date _____ (Print or type name)			