## Q's & A's from the AppLCC 3/19/2012 Conference Call

There were approximately 12 participants on this second informational call. Many had participated in our first call, but new entities included: Downstream Strategies, Ecological Modeling, U. of VA., Penn. State, and Environmental Services.

**Q:** There are 2 phases on the Terrestrial Mapping topic. This seems like a tremendous amount of work. Can we submit a multi-year proposal? And, how much money can we ask for?

A: Yes, you can submit a multi-year proposal – just make sure you have a discreet deliverable at 12 month mark (or before) and that your budget is also presented incrementally. Regarding the second question, although we have approximately \$600,000 for all projects, we don't have a maximum ceiling for any one topic area. It is our intent to fund the best proposals that are submitted until funding runs out. This may mean that we cannot fund an application for each of the RFAs during this round, and/or that we cannot fund every phase of each application that is selected. We will need to review the applications to determine a strategic plan forward.

**Q:** If we propose to address Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Terrestrial Mapping Topic, can we ask for a larger budget?

**A:** There is no funding cap, but it is critical that you present both your budget and your deliverables as using an incremental implementation approach.

**Q:** Can there be multiple P.I.'s on a project?

A: Multiple P.I.'s are fine.

**Q:** Can proposals be submitted electronically?

**A:** Yes, we need an electronic copy and five hard copies by the due date.

**Q:** You have \$600,000 for projects in six topic areas. Can we assume that approximately \$100,000 will be available for each topic area?

**A:** Not necessarily, we might not fund projects in some topic areas if we do not receive high quality application for these or have insufficient funds. It would be incorrect to assume that we'll automatically

give about \$100,000 to each of the six RFAs. Again, it's our intent to fund the best proposals that are submitted until funding runs out regardless of which topic area they address.

Q: Do hard copies need to be received by 3/29 or just postmarked by then?

A: They need to be received by 3/29.

Q: What level of resolution are you looking for with the Energy topic?

**A:** We don't have specific guidance here. We recommend that you be as specific as possible. The budget will likely drive this.

**Q:** Are you looking for the Energy model to be something that you can run yourself?

**A:** Possibly, the LCC and/or its partners; what we would not want is a model that could only be run and was only accessible to the applicant's institution. Our goal is to share all of the products that result from the RFAs.

**Q:** Under the Energy topic, the deliverables are a model and a GIS system. Would a technical report also be needed?

**A:** A modest amount of narrative will likely be needed to explain the other products, but the vendor will work closely with LCC staff to determine this.

**Q:** If a successful vendor provides the deliverables on Phase 1 of a project, can a different vendor be awarded Phase2.

**A:** That is possible, but the Phase 1 vendor would likely have a competitive advantage, presuming that we were satisfied with his/her performance. Regardless, we might still have to advertise it depending on the funding source and time that has elapsed.

Q: Under the Rare Endemics topic, how many taxonomic groups should be addressed?

**A:** This will be determined by the applicant; however, we will be looking for an assessment of Federal and state listed species ranges, as well as other Species of Concern in the State Wildlife Action Plans that are endemic to the area covered by the geographical boundary of the AppLCC.

**Q:** Under the Aquatic Habitat Classification topic, do you (AppLCC) have any data compiled to be used in the models?

**A:** The AppLCC itself does not currently have data compiled. Work on this topic has been completed in the Northeast and is just getting underway in the Southeast. Coordination with these other efforts would be necessary. So, some data are available and it will be up to the vendor to access it.

**Q:** Under the Terrestrial Landscapes topic, will the accuracy level for mapping be different for public and private lands?

**A:** We would be open to that if that is the recommendation of the applicant based on technical reasons.

Q: Under the Terrestrial Landscape topic, are you looking for a traditional accuracy assessment?

**A:** We are also leaving this up to the applicant's judgment.

**Q:** Would you consider contracting these funds under an existing IDIQ (were the vender has already competed for FWS funding)?

**A:** FY11 funds will not be routed through an IDIQ, as it has already been committed to a cooperative agreement with the Wildlife Management Institute (WMI). For any future applications or funding decisions (although the merit of the specific proposal will continue to be the primary driver), we will have the option of using existing IDIQs – therefore, yes, the Interim Steering Committee could consider it for FY12 funds.

**Q:** The way the Terrestrial Mapping topic is divided between Phase 1 and Phase 2, the first year could be all Phase 1 and Phase 2 could be done in the following year. Is that correct?

**A:** Yes, deliverables can extend beyond the 12 month mark, as long as we have a discreet deliverable at the end of the first year.

**Q:** Is there an overhead cap?

**A:** There was no overhead cap stated in the original RFAs and we are not going to set one at this late date in the application process; however, overhead rates may be limited in final contracts.