



## Technical Proposal

# Strategy Review System Finance Forum—Expert Consultant(s)

## A. OUR TEAM

ERG helps government and nonprofit clients, including the CBP, protect the environment and achieve other positive outcomes. Founded in 1984, we now have more than 400 technical, communications, and IT specialists in offices across the United States. An employee-owned company, ERG works only in the public interest.

**ERG brings outstanding qualifications to this project.** ERG has specialized in providing clients with experts for peer review and other services continually since our inception in 1984. As the most experienced peer review contractor currently serving government agencies, we have identified, screened, contracted with, and managed the work of well over a thousand environmental and public health experts. In addition, our Conference Services Group has contracted with several hundred experts over the past 20+ years to provide design, participation, and post-meeting support for environmentally focused meetings.

**ERG has the staff, systems, and processes to provide streamlined, cost-effective support.** Because budgets for peer reviews and meetings are typically frugal, we have developed highly efficient and cost-effective processes and systems for procuring expert services. To provide these efficiencies to CBP, ERG is proposing its senior peer review manager, Laurie Waite, as the project manager. Over her 17 years' experience managing and coordinating projects involving expert consultants, Ms. Waite has developed and perfected many of the systems and processes we use for expert-focused projects. Robert Bongiovi (a junior analyst) and other junior staff as needed will assist Ms. Waite with administrative tasks. Ms. Waite and Mr. Bongiovi are fully available to provide the support described below.

I have served on several ERG peer review panels on the toxicity of various substances. These reviews generally were conducted for the EPA. In each case, Laurie Waite has overseen the logistics for each review. She always does an excellent job of providing details, collecting and disseminating information. She always provides advance notice for potential schedules of reviewers which is extremely useful. I greatly appreciate her timely responses to all of my emails. I certainly praise Laurie's outstanding efforts.

—David Gaylor, Ph.D., Peer Reviewer

## B. SCOPE

This proposal covers Scope #12B, Strategy Review System Finance Forum—Expert Consultant(s). Under this project, ERG will contract with about 10 to 30 private-sector experts on environmental financing, who will collectively provide an estimated 400 to 600 hours of work. All experts will attend a one-day Finance Forum and provide ongoing advice, as consultants, to selected Goal Implementation Teams/Workgroups (GITs/WGs) after the Forum. Some experts may also need limited support for travel to the Forum. Starting with the list of experts provided and prescreened by the CBP,<sup>1</sup> ERG will contact the experts and ascertain their availability and interest in serving as experts for this project, along with their hourly rate and travel support needs, if any; determine, based on CBP priorities, the most cost-effective set of experts for ERG to contract with (i.e., the set that best meets CBP priorities and provides maximum hours within the fixed price project budget); contract with the selected experts; manage, track, and pay them an honorarium for their work; and provide reports to the CBP by expert as described in the RFP.

## C. OUR APPROACH

The maximum fixed-price budget for this project is \$30,000. ERG understands that the CBP wants to allocate as large a portion of this budget as possible to expert consultants rather than administrative expenses. Our approach will achieve this in two ways. First, we will keep our administrative costs to a minimum by using an efficient approach throughout the project. Second, as proposed below, we will work with the CBP to obtain the maximum value of expert support feasible based on its priorities, given the budget available for expert support (see Section F).

<sup>1</sup> Based on the CBP's response to questions, we assume that it is responsible for identifying and pre-vetting experts to be contacted for this work and have not budgeted any hours for ERG to screen experts or search for additional experts.

## Key Steps

**1. Hold kickoff.** Within one or two weeks of award, Laurie Waite will hold a call with the CBP to kick off this project. During this call, she will establish lines of communication with the CBP; obtain the list of experts from the Budget and Finance Workgroup (BFWG) and discuss it (e.g., which experts, if any, have been contacted already and what information they have provided to the CBP); discuss the current proposed or actual target date(s) for the Forum and establish an initial schedule based on the earliest possible Forum date; and obtain information to be provided to experts, including a list of the GITs/WGs the experts will advise and a description of the Forum's purpose and agenda. She will also discuss and confirm details of the CBP's expectations for the roles experts will play at and after the Forum, including the nature and extent of the experts' post-Forum consultation to the GITs/WGs. (For example: What type of consultation might the GITs/WGs require? How will it be determined which and how many GITs/WGs each expert will consult for? How will it be determined how many hours of each expert's time the CBP would like ERG to contract with the expert for? How does the CBP want GITs/WGs to prioritize and communicate their consultation needs to experts?) Finally, Ms. Waite will discuss reporting to the CBP, including the frequency of any interim reports of expert work, and will confirm the format and information needed for these reports.

**2. Contact experts.** After the kickoff call, Ms. Waite will prepare a contact email to send to experts identified by the CBP. This email will provide an overview of the Forum, the desired expert participation, and estimated maximum level of effort (LOE). She will ask experts to respond regarding their interest and availability to attend the Forum on the projected date(s) and to provide post-Forum advice and consultation. Ms. Waite will follow up with interested experts to obtain their lowest hourly rate and ascertain whether they require travel support to participate in the Forum. She understands that the CBP's preference is to minimize travel expenses, if any, and will communicate and negotiate accordingly with experts. Ms. Waite will coordinate with her junior staff to collate this information into a spreadsheet and will provide it to the CBP.

**3. Select experts and determine hours of support needed.** The CBP will have choices about which and how many of the experts to use and how much post-Forum consultation to obtain from each expert. For example, the CBP may want to use a few experts for a higher consultation LOE, and several others for varying lower LOEs. Also, some experts may require higher honoraria than others. The spreadsheet Ms. Waite will provide is a tool to optimize the value of the available expert budget to the CBP's needs. It will list all experts who are interested and available to participate in this project. It will also indicate the cost for each expert's time at the Forum and estimated travel cost to attend, if any. In addition, it will have a column where the CBP can indicate how many hours of each expert's time it would like to have for post-Forum consultation. When hours data are entered into that column, the spreadsheet will calculate the total cost for each consultant to participate, as well as the total cost of all consultants. This will enable the CBP to experiment with different combinations of experts and hours based on its needs and priorities. Any combination up to the amount allocated for consultants in our cost proposal (see Section F) is workable. The spreadsheet will also enable the CBP to specify which GITs/WGs they anticipate each expert may support. Once the CBP has settled on the combination of experts and hours that best meets those needs, ERG can proceed to contract with each expert chosen for the total LOE indicated by the CBP. (If the CBP will not know how many hours of post-Forum work it needs from each expert until after the Forum, we will contract with all experts before the Forum and provide not-to-exceed LOEs for consultation after the Forum.)

**4. Develop the scope of work, reviewer instructions, and tracking worksheet.** The RFP indicates that experts will provide post-Forum "consultation" and "ongoing" and "follow-up advice" to selected GITs/WGs. Given the advisory nature of the post-Forum work, we anticipate that Ms. Waite can develop a single scope of work (SOW) that will be suitable for all consultants, which will streamline our contracting process. For example, deliverables, if any, are anticipated to consist of comments on draft products or emails or brief memos providing the requested input. As needed or requested, Ms. Waite will provide the draft SOW to the CBP for review. Ms. Waite will email selected experts to confirm their continued interest and hourly rate and travel costs (if any), and let them know that an agreement will be forthcoming. She will also prepare a letter of instruction to the experts, as well as a worksheet for them to document which GITs/WGs they advise, what type of advice they provide (e.g., discussion, review/comment), and how many hours total of advice they provide to each GIT/WG.

**5. Execute agreements with experts.** Over the past 30+ years of contracting with experts for peer reviews, meetings, and other projects, ERG has developed well-honed templates and systems for contracting with experts and tracking their work. Robert Bongiovi will use these resources to prepare individualized letters of instruction and consulting agreements. For travel reimbursement, if any, Mr. Bongiovi will prepare not-to-exceed cost-reimbursement agreements and provide instructions for compliance with government travel regulations, including retaining receipts.

(We have found that using separate contracts for expert work and travel expenses is the most efficient approach.) After a QC check, Ms. Waite will deliver the agreements to the experts. She will follow up with experts to respond to any questions and obtain signed executed agreements.

**6. Manage, track, and document the work of experts.** Laurie Waite will work with the CBP to ensure that all experts are included in the participant list for the Finance Forum and that Forum organizers provide them with the logistical and any other pre-meeting information and materials important to their participation. If the CBP prefers to wait until after the Forum to establish the post-Forum consultation time desired for each expert, then the spreadsheet described under Step 3 can be utilized at this stage to provide that information, and Ms. Waite will issue contract addendums by email to each consultant to provide a not-to-exceed consultation LOE and indicate which GITs/WGs may contact them for consultation. She will also clearly communicate to experts the process that GITs/WGs will use to contact them. For example, we suggest that one point of contact (POC) be designated for each GIT/WG. When there is a need for consultation, each POC will be responsible for describing that need in an email, along with the estimated the number of hours. The POC may email the expert directly, copying Laurie Waite. This may result in dialogue with the expert regarding details, all of which will need to occur via email, copied to Laurie Waite, so she can monitor requests for consultation to ensure that they are consistent with the SOW and reviewer LOE. After all is clear, the consultation can proceed. As noted above, Ms. Waite will provide experts with a form and instructions to track their work. She will instruct them not to exceed their LOE and to notify her immediately should any questions or issues develop.

**7. Document experts' work and process invoices.** ERG will process invoices, if any, for travel reimbursement after the Forum, and invoices for honorarium after all work is completed. Once an expert has reached his or her maximum LOE (or the CBP has confirmed that no further consultation is needed), Ms. Waite will ask the expert to submit his/her final invoice and required documentation per the tracking worksheet (see Step 4). For travel invoices, experts will be required to provide a cost breakout and expense receipts. Ms. Waite will review and approve all invoices. Then, ERG will process invoices for payment in a timely manner (generally within a month).

**8. Provide interim and final reports to the CBP.** At a frequency/schedule agreed on the kickoff call, Ms. Waite will provide the CBP with one more reports that provide, for each expert, the: (1) number of hours spent advising each GIT/WG; (2) amounts paid (totals and by hour); (3) Workgroup(s) advised, including a short description of expertise provided (e.g., advice through discussion, review/comment on documents); and (4) proof of payment of honoraria to experts. Upon all completion of work by experts, Ms. Waite will submit a final report to the CBP that provides the total hours by expert for each GIT/WG/outcome and amounts paid (totals and by hour).

## Schedule

Based on the assumption that the Financial Forum takes place in March or April 2018, we propose the following schedule:

- Kickoff call: within two weeks of award.
- Receive list of experts from the CBP: no later than 45 days in advance of the scheduled Finance Forum.
- Contact experts: within two days of receiving the list from the CBP.
- Provide the CBP with spreadsheet of available experts: within two weeks from start of contact.
- Choose experts: one week after providing the spreadsheet to the CBP (this gives the CBP one week to indicate which experts the CBP would like ERG to contract with).
- Draft SOW for experts: within two working days of receiving final details from the CBP.
- Receive and process executed agreements: within two weeks of issuance (to be executed at least one week in advance of the Finance Forum).
- Verify and process expert invoices, or obtain missing information: within three working days of receipt.
- Issue payments to experts: within 30 days from date of proper invoice.
- Provide the final report to the CBP: within two weeks after processing all expert invoices.

## D. QUALIFICATIONS

### Corporate Experience

As noted in Section A, ERG has exceptional qualifications for this project. We have contracted with well over a thousand environmental and health experts to provide peer review and other specialized services to clients and several hundred experts to support environmentally focused meetings. As a result, we routinely identify, screen, contract with, manage the work of, and process invoices for expert consultants and have developed and honed streamlined processes for

expert procurement. Examples of this experience are provided below. ERG's proposed project manager, Laurie Waite, served as project manager or otherwise played a key role in all projects described in this section.

ERG's peer review experience includes nine successive (1984 to present) prime peer review contracts with EPA's National Center for Environmental Assessment (NCEA)—contracts that Ms. Waite has supported throughout her 17 years at ERG. Under our current contract with NCEA, ERG organizes peer reviews and expert consultations, prepares background and summary documents, and conducts literature searches. A client reference for this contract is provided in Section E. Examples of specific reviews performed under these contracts include:

- **Procurement and management of six experts to review EPA's draft report *The Potential Role of Ecosystem Services in Strategies to Restore the Chesapeake Bay*.**

EPA had developed a modeling framework, described in this draft report, to test alternative policy scenarios that examined the effects of various regulatory and incentive policy scenarios on the costs of achieving TMDLs and the bonus ecosystem services delivered. Developed by EPA in concert with USDA's Environmental Markets Division, the World Resources Institute, the Bay Bank, and other NGOs, the scenarios reflected existing state and federal policies, as well as innovative policies and institutions proposed by public and private parties to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Chesapeake Bay restoration. For this review, Ms. Waite searched for, screened, and selected six scientific experts with expertise in cost-effective strategies to meet TMDLs, innovative strategies to restore the Chesapeake Bay, quantification and valuation of ecosystem services, restoration policies and implementation in large watersheds, valuation of environmental benefits, water quality trading and offset programs (particularly for the Chesapeake Bay or other large watershed), watershed implementation planning, and familiarity with the Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Model. She negotiated and contracted with these experts; monitored all work and deliverables; collected and processed invoices; and prepared the peer review report.

On behalf of everyone involved with developing this report, thank you, for a truly excellent job managing this peer review for ORD. Given the high-profile topic and accelerated schedule, there were inevitable but unpredictable challenges along the way. ERG rose to the occasion every time with superior performance and professionalism. Your experience, knowledge, and ability to respond rapidly to changing circumstances made this important review a success.

—Laurie Alexander,  
EPA NCEA Task Order Manager for the Streams  
and Wetlands Connectivity Peer Review

- **Procurement and management of 138 experts to review applications to EPA's SBIR program.** ERG was awarded an-\$800,000 task order to organize workshop peer reviews of over 370 proposals submitted in response to the EPA National Center for Environmental Research's (NCER's) annual Requests for Applications for Phase I Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR). All workshops and final deliverables had to be completed within 3½ months. To successfully meet the requirements of this quick-response task order, ERG assembled a project team involving over 25 ERG staff from across the company to search for qualified reviewers in nine highly diverse expertise areas; screen the qualifications of more than 400 potential candidates; select and contract with 138 final experts to review 375 documents; provide review packages to all reviewers; quality-control the over 1,000 initial reviewer pre-meeting deliverables; organize, identify venues and reviewer accommodations for, and facilitate nine one- to two-day panel meetings that took place back-to-back over five weeks; and quality-control 373 final reviewer deliverables. ERG successfully completed this project on budget and on schedule.
- **Procurement and management of 250 experts to review applications to EPA's STAR program.** Following the success of the SBIR peer review, NCER awarded ERG a similar but even larger (\$1.5 million) task order to organize external workshop peer reviews of 1,500 research applications to NCER's Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Graduate Fellowship Program. Following the same process successfully applied for SBIR, in just four months, we identified and contracted with 250 reviewers in 19 widely varying expertise areas; quality-controlled 4,500 reviewer pre-meeting deliverables; organized and facilitated 21 back-to-back one- to two-day peer review panel meetings (some on the same day as each other); and quality-controlled over 400 final reviewer deliverables.

In addition to our peer review work for EPA NCEA, ERG has provided peer review and meeting support to several other EPA offices; other federal agencies—including ATSDR (22 years), OSHA (six years), the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (three years), and the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers—as well as state and local agencies. Examples of this work include:

- **Support to the Department of Human and Health Services (HHS) in procuring expert services.** Ms. Waite provided two years of support to HHS to procure experts for various services needed. She negotiated and contracted with

10 subcommittee members to attend three meetings and specific site visits. She also negotiated and contracted with a consultant to provide technical writing support at three yearly SACHRP meetings, and with an expert to provide website services. For each contract she developed the SOW; tracked and reported consultant hours and deliverables; reviewed, coordinated HHS approval of, and processed invoices; monitored the budget; and prepared quarterly reports. A client reference for this work is provided in Section E.

- Procurement and management of experts for an EPA Climate Change Division (CCD) scientific peer consultation.** For CCD's Climate Change Impacts and Risk Analysis (CIRA) program, Ms. Waite coordinated a quick turnaround (over a three-week period) peer consultation via teleconference. She contacted a list of experts provided by EPA, tracked responses, collected schedules, and reported availability to EPA; negotiated honoraria and contracted with six final experts; developed the SOW; coordinated and facilitated a one-hour briefing teleconference and coordinated a two-hour consultation teleconference; developed agendas; provided a notetaker; collected final comments from panelists; prepared and delivered a final summary report to EPA; collected and tracked receipt of signed contracts and invoices; and reviewed, approved, and processed invoices in a timely manner. A client reference for this work is provided in Section E.

## Team Experience

ERG's proposed project manager, Ms. Waite, has 17 years of experience managing projects to provide expert/consultation support to clients. She has coordinated well over 100 peer reviews and other expert support projects at ERG since 2000. As ERG's senior peer review manager, she manages a support staff including Robert Bongiovi and others and is responsible for developing, maintaining, implementing, and evolving efficient processes and systems for expert support. Section D provides examples of projects she has managed or otherwise provided key support for. Her resume in Appendix A describes her education and experience in more detail.

## E. REFERENCES

**Table 1: Selected references who can attest to the high quality of the ERG team's work**

Lisa Bacanskas	U.S. EPA, Climate Change Division	<a href="mailto:Bacanskas.Lisa@epa.gov">Bacanskas.Lisa@epa.gov</a> 202-343-9758	Contracting officer representative (COR) for EPA's CIRA peer consultation and peer reviews (see Section D)
Irene Stith-Coleman	Department of Human and Health Services, OHRP	<a href="mailto:Irene.Stith-Coleman@hhs.gov">Irene.Stith-Coleman@hhs.gov</a> 240-453-8138	Project officer for logistical support to OHRP and SACHRP (see Section D)
Reene Watt	U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development	<a href="mailto:Watt.Reene@epa.gov">Watt.Reene@epa.gov</a> 541-754-4654	Project officer for EPA's NCEA peer review contract (see Section D)

## F. BUDGET

Our budget for this project is provided in a separate file using the Trust's budget expenditures form. The budget shows the hours, rates, overhead, and profit proposed for ERG labor. Our budget includes junior analyst Robert Bongiovi, who will work on this project, but his rate is also a proxy for other support staff. ERG is committed to regarding the total loaded cost of \$4,680 shown in our cost proposal as an upper bound for ERG labor under this project so that the CBP can count on the remaining amount (\$25,255) being available for experts. To maximize the amount available for experts, we are writing off our standard G&A costs associated with the experts' overhead, so no G&A rate is shown for expert honoraria or travel in our cost proposal. ERG is also lowering its fee for this bid to only 5% of labor costs. ERG's overhead and G&A rates have been audited and approved by EPA.

## G AND H. RESUMES AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Appendix A provides a brief resume for our project manager, Ms. Waite. We encourage you to learn more about our people, our portfolio, and our strong track record at [www.erg.com](http://www.erg.com).



## **Appendix A**

### **Resume for Key ERG Staff**

## EDUCATION

B.S., Plant and Soil Science (minor, Environmental Science), College of Food and Natural Resources, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 2000

A.S., Floriculture, Stockbridge School of Agriculture, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 1991

## EXPERIENCE

Senior Project Manager, Eastern Research Group, Inc., 2000–present

Assistant to Office Manager, College of Engineering, University of Massachusetts, 1995–2000

Assistant Supervisor, Transcript Department, Undergraduate Registrar's Office, University of Massachusetts, 1988–1995



## PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY

Ms. Waite is a senior project manager with 17 years of experience coordinating hundreds of letter, teleconference, and workshop peer reviews and expert panel meetings and consultations for EPA's National Center for Environmental Assessment (NCEA), Office of Water (OW), Climate Change Division (CCD), Office of Transportation and Air Quality (OTAQ); the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (DOT NHTSA); the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR); and other federal and state agencies. Her responsibilities have included overseeing the coordination of each step of the peer review process while managing multiple simultaneous reviews, including preparing the scope of work, and negotiating and contracting with selected consultants. Additionally, for all peer reviews, she coordinates database and web searches for qualified scientific experts over a wide range of topics; prepares and sends reviewer packages, including instructions; coordinates and facilitates pre-review teleconferences; monitors progress, schedules, and task budgets; and collects and compiles peer review reports. For peer reviews that involve a meeting component, Ms. Waite also coordinates travel and hotel arrangements; attendee registration; logistical arrangements including audiovisual support (AV), signage, name tags, and handout packets; collects, compiles, and distributes speaker materials; develops logistical fact sheets; maintains databases; performs post-meeting follow-up; prepares meeting reports; and approves and processes consultant and vendor invoices. Examples of Ms. Waite's project experience are provided below.

## EXPERIENCE RELEVANT TO THE STATEMENT OF WORK

Support for EPA Peer Reviews, EPA NCEA and OW. Under eight prime EPA peer review contracts (five with NCEA and three with OW) over the past 17 years, Ms. Waite has served as project manager for well over a hundred letter and workshop peer reviews of draft EPA scientific and technical documents. For these projects, she searches for, identifies, and screens experts based on EPA's required expertise criteria; negotiates honoraria and contracts with the final selected experts; coordinates and facilitates briefing and consultation teleconferences; manages and tracks the experts' work; handles all logistics and provides notetakers, facilitators, and onsite support staff for peer review meetings; collects and collates peer review comments; prepares peer review reports; provides all required project documentation; and reviews and approves reviewer invoices.

Letter Peer Review of *The Potential Role of Ecosystem Services in Strategies to Restore the Chesapeake Bay*, EPA NCEA. Coordinated the search to identify six scientific experts on cost-effective strategies to meet TMDLs, innovative strategies to restore the Chesapeake Bay, quantification and valuation of ecosystem services, restoration policies and implementation in large watersheds, valuation of environmental benefits, water quality trading and offset programs (particularly for the Chesapeake Bay or other large watershed), watershed implementation planning, and familiarity with the Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Model. Negotiated and contracted with consultants and acted as liaison between consultants and client. Monitored the progress of the review; collected, reviewed, and submitted written comments to EPA to meet the schedule; and developed and submitted a peer review report. Collected and tracked signed contracts and invoices; reviewed, approved, and processed invoices.

Logistical and Technical Support Activities, U.S. Department of Human and Health Services (DHHS). Provided logistical support to the Office of Human Research Protection (OHRP) and the HHS Secretary's Advisory Committee on Human Research Protections (SACHRP) by negotiating and contracting with 10 subcommittee members to attend three SACHRP meetings and specific site visits. Negotiated and contracted with a consultant to provide technical writing support at three yearly SACHRP meetings. Negotiated and contracted with a technical support consultant to provide website services to HHS. For each, developed the scope of work; tracked and reported consultant hours and deliverables; reviewed, coordinated HHS approval, and processed invoices; monitored the budget and prepared quarterly reports and invoices.

Climate Change Division Peer Consultation, EPA Office of Air and Radiation, Climate Change Division. Coordinated a quick-turnaround peer consultation via teleconference over a three-week period. Contacted a list of experts provided by EPA, tracked responses, collected schedules, and reported availability to EPA; negotiated and contracted with six final panelists; developed the scope of work; coordinated and facilitated a one-hour briefing teleconference and a two-hour consultation teleconference; developed agendas; coordinated with an ERG note-taker; collected final comments from panelists, and prepared and delivered a final report to EPA. Collected and tracked receipt of signed contracts and invoices; reviewed, approved, and processed invoices. Monitored the budget.

Peer Review Meeting for Wild Rice Sulfate Standard Study Preliminary Analysis, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. Coordinated the search to identify seven qualified, independent scientific experts on biogeochemistry, environmental engineering, hydrology, toxicology, statistical analysis, aquatic systems with emergent plants, and water quality criteria development. Coordinated all negotiations, contracts, and communication with reviewers. Prepared and sent review packages. Monitored the review process to meet task schedules. Compiled and distributed premeeting comments. Coordinated logistical arrangements for a one-day meeting including hotel arrangements, workshop signage, name tags, and registration packages. Monitored the receipt of post-meeting comments. Approved and processed consultant and vendor invoices, monitored the budget, and prepared monthly progress reports.

Peer Review Meeting for *Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters—A Review and Synthesis of the Scientific Evidence*, EPA NCEA. Coordinated the search to identify 11 qualified, independent scientific experts with expertise in hydrology, and wetland and stream ecology (chemical-nutrient influences and movement of aquatic/semi-aquatic organisms). Coordinated all negotiations, contracts, and communication with reviewers. Prepared and sent review packages. Monitored the review process to meet task schedules. Compiled and distributed premeeting comments. Coordinated logistical arrangements for a one-day meeting including hotel arrangements, workshop signage, name tags, and registration packages. Monitored the receipt of post-meeting comments. Approved and processed consultant and vendor invoices; monitored the budget; and prepared monthly progress reports.

Peer Review Workshops of Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Graduate Fellowships Applications, EPA NCEA. Coordinated the search to identify qualified scientific experts for three of the 15 application categories (aquatic systems ecology, terrestrial systems animal ecology, and terrestrial systems plant and soil ecology; proposed and selected final reviewers; coordinated the scheduling of three separate meeting dates; provided technical support for contracting with 250 reviewers, including negotiations of fee, contract language, and GSA travel rules; and reviewed receipts and processed invoices.

Letter Peer Review of *A Method to Assess Climate-Relevant Decisions: Application in the Chesapeake Bay*, EPA NCEA. Coordinated the search to identify three scientific experts on decision analysis/support, estuarine management, best management practices related to streams and estuaries, climate change effects on estuaries, and familiarity with the Chesapeake Bay. Negotiated and contracted with consultants and acted as liaison between consultants and client. Monitored the progress of the review; collected, reviewed, and submitted written comments to EPA to meet schedule; and developed and submitted a peer review report. Collected and tracked signed contracts and invoices; and reviewed, approved, and processed invoices.



# Chesapeake Bay Trust - Financial Management Spreadsheet

Welcome to the Chesapeake Bay Trust's Financial Management Spreadsheet, which:

- a) contains a series of budget forms you will submit to the Trust at various points in your request/award process
- b) will be used to manage the financial components of your request/award from the time of application through (if request is approved) the time of award close-out.

This file contains the following forms each in different worksheets that can be found in tabs along the bottom:

- 1) Application Budget Instructions and Application Budget Worksheet:** To be used when applying for an award
- 2) Expense Worksheet Instructions and Expense Worksheet:** For successful award requests only: To be used for submitting status and final reports that require reports on expenses to date
- 3) Budget Revision Request Instructions and Budget Revision Request Worksheet:** For successful award requests only: To be used as part of the Award Revision Request process (which includes both scope and budget revision per your Award Agreement) to request changes to your approved budget.

## **If you are part-way through managing your award and are seeing this form for the first time:**

This form, a one-stop shop for financial information about your project, was released in fall 2017 as a tool to facilitate financial reporting and tracking, saving awardees time. If you have already applied for an award or are part-way through an award at the time of release of this form, you will be asked to transfer data from your previous Application Budget Status Expense Report Forms. You will see instructions specifically for you at the bottom of each instruction page. Please contact your program officer with questions or for assistance.

*Date Updated: December 17, 2017*



**Cell B2:  
Organization  
Name**

**Rows 3-11:  
Summary  
Table**

**Rows 12+:**

---

**Column A:  
Budget Item:**

---

**Column B:  
Budget  
Category:**

---

**Column C:  
Quantity  
Requested:**

---

**Column D:  
Cost Per  
Unit:**

---

**Column E:  
Amount  
Requested:**

---

**Column F:  
Cash Match:**

---

**Column G:  
Source of  
Cash Match:**

---

---

**Column H:  
Status of  
Cash Match:**

---

**Column I: In-  
Kind Match:**

---

**Column J:  
Source of In-  
Kind Match:**

---

**Column K:  
Status of In-  
Kind Match:**

---

**Column L:  
Total:**

---

## Chesapeake Bay Trust - Application Budget Instructions

The "Application Budget" worksheet is to be used for the following purposes:

- a) To apply for a new award (follow the instructions below)
- b) To update a budget at the request of the Trust as per the Award Agreement
- c) For those part-way through an award: to allow proper tracking and calculations in later worksheets.

Enter the name of your organization

No action necessary: These data will automatically fill and self-calculate. When you get the point of uploading this file into the system, you will be asked for some of this information.

In these rows, you will fill in your Application Budget Data as per the instructions below. (For those mid-way through an award with a separate Application Budget, copy and paste your approved budget here):

Enter individual budget items needed for the project in this column. Please be as detailed as possible. List supplies separately (row). List staff cost requests for individual personnel separately, and list benefits separately. For example, if you are reporting salaries expended for 3 separate staff positions, you should have 6 associated lines.

Please choose the most closely aligned general budget category (7 options) associated with each budget item. You must choose from the menu. Any high level budget category can be associated with more than one row. Definitions of the high level categories are as follows:

"Personnel" should be chosen for any staff time and/or benefits/fringe requests. Please list each staff position for whom salary is requested in a separate row. The quantity column for personnel should show the number of hours and the cost per an item column should show the applicable pay rate.

"Supplies" should be chosen for all supplies and materials, including plants, planting supplies, rain barrels, tools, etc.

"Contractual" should be chosen for all hiring of consultants, construction firms, or other outside firms. Do NOT lump all contractual costs together. Contractual costs should be extremely detailed, and should match the scope of work the contractor provided to the applicant.

"Travel" should be chosen for all travel-related costs, including field trip transportation as well as mileage for other requests.

"Field trip fees" should be chosen only for education-related requests, and should include only field trip program fees and substitute travel. Field trip transportation should be listed under "Travel."

"Other" should be chosen sparingly, only if you absolutely cannot fit your budget item into one of the other categories.

"Indirect" refers to administrative and management costs used to support the award. Follow allowable indirect cost request guidelines in the Trust's Proposals and the Trust's Indirect Policy at [www.cbtrust.org/forms](http://www.cbtrust.org/forms)

List the number of items identified in Column A you wish to purchase with award funds. For personnel requests, this column should show the number of hours requested.

List the cost per unit or item. For personnel requests, this column should be the hourly rate.

No action necessary: This column will self-calculate

List the amount in dollars of cash match/leverage you have in-hand, pledged, or applied for. Do NOT include cash match that is required by the Trust. Items should be listed as cash match only if the source is another source of funding. Existing supplies that you have for the project should be listed as in-kind match. Most salary should be listed as in-kind match unless it is derived from another grant. Cash match requirements: Some Trust programs have requirements; others do not.

List the source of the cash match. DO NOT leave this column blank if you have entered a cash match in a given row.

---

Choose the status of the cash match from the drop-down menu. Select "in-hand" if you have already received the cash for the item if the cash has been awarded but you do not already possess it. Select "applied for" if you have submitted an application for the item but have not yet received word on the outcome of the application. DO NOT leave this column blank if you have entered a cash match in a given row.

---

List the amount in dollar value of in-kind match/leveraged resources you have in-hand, pledged or applied for. Existing items applied for such as donated contractor time, should be listed as in-kind match. Most salary should be listed as in-kind match. Do not include volunteer hours; you will add volunteer hours in the online system.

---

List the source of the in-kind match. DO NOT leave this column blank if you have entered in-kind match in a given row.

---

Choose the status of the in-kind match from the drop-down menu. Select "in-hand" if you have already received the item or have it on hand. Select "pledged" if the donation has been promised but you do not already possess it. Select "applied for" if you have submitted an application for the item but have not yet received word on the outcome of the application. DO NOT leave this column blank if you have entered in-kind match in a given row.

---

No action necessary - this value will automatically total

---

**SAVE the file** with the following title format: "Application Budget-Your Organization Name." You will be asked to upload it in the next step.

---

**If you are part-way through managing your award and are seeing this form for the first time:**

Copy and paste your approved budget (as modified through any Award Agreement contingencies or approved Budget Revision Form) into the appropriate columns in the Application Budget worksheet (third tab on the bottom).



## Chesapeake Bay Trust - Application Budget Worksheet

**Applicant Name:**

*Eastern Research Group, Inc.*

**Title:**

## Scope #12B: SRS Finance Forum

<b>SUMMARY TABLE</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>		Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Total
Total personnel	\$ 2,186		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,186
Total supplies	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total contractual	\$ 23,550		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,550
Total travel	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total field trip fees	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total other	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total indirect	\$ 4,199		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,199
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 29,935</b>		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,935

[illegible]



















**Cell C3: Award #**

**Rows 3-15:**

**Rows 18+:**

**Column A: Back-  
up Document #**

**Column B:  
Purchased/  
Obtained Item**

**Column C: High  
Level Budget  
Category**

---

**Column D:  
Cumulative Award  
Expenses**

---

**Phase 1: Columns  
E-J**

---

**Column E:  
Quantity this  
Expense Report**

---

**Column F: Cost  
per Unit**

---

**Column G: Award  
Funds Spent this  
Phase**

---

**Column H: Cash  
Match**

---

**Column I: In-Kind  
Match**

---

**Column J: Source  
of Match**

---

**For Funding  
Phases 2-15**

---



# Chesapeake Bay Trust - Expenses Worksheet

The "Expenses Worksheet" is to be used for the following purposes:

a) To report expenses for the final report

b) To report expenses in cases in which a status report is required and must be accompanied by a financial report

Enter the Award Number, which can be found on your Award Agreement document

No action necessary: These data will automatically fill and self-calculate, providing you a summary of your expenses and guidance on your expenditures to date. For example, if the amount expended per High Level Budget Category significant (>10%) from your approved budget, you should have submitted an Award Revision Request for Trust approval.

In these rows, you will fill in your Expense Data as per the instructions below:

You do not need to input information into Column A. For awards in which invoices/receipts/timesheets are required as documentation, you will use these numbers in Column A to mark your backup documentation (in the top right of each piece of documentation must then be submitted in numerical order (by backup document #) in one PDF file.

Please enter individual expenses separately in this column. This list of expenses may be identical or similar to the budget they appear in your Application/Approved Budget (Column A, yellow tab #3 in this spreadsheet file). However, the expenses differ slightly: How you will list items will be primarily driven by the actual expenses you have incurred based on invoice sets of timesheets, etc. Tips:

1) Gather all the receipts, invoices, and sets of timesheets for costs that this award has been used to fund for this report

2) Each entry must correspond with a receipt, invoice or set of timesheets. In the case of a receipt that contains multiple items in the same high level budget category (e.g., a \$200 receipt for plants, shovels, stakes, soil mix from one local nursery may report the receipt on one line item. In this case, list quantity as 1 and unit cost as the total receipt amount. In case multiple items appear on one invoice from your vendor that are in different high level budget categories, list the items in separately.

3) For any staff costs, list staff costs for individual personnel separately, and list benefits separately. If you are reporting benefits expended for 3 separate staff positions, you should have 6 associated lines.

Please choose the High Level Budget Category associated with each budget item. You must choose from the drop-down of the High Level Budget Categories may be associated with multiple rows (e.g., you may have several "Supplies" rows supplies listed separately).

"Personnel" should be chosen for any staff time and/or benefits/fringe requests. This should only be chosen when the staff is an employee of the grantee organization and receives his or her paycheck directly from the grantee organization. If he or she is a contractual employee, this person's time should be listed as "Contractual" (see information on this category below). Please list staff position for whom salary is requested or listed as match in a separate row. The quantity column for personnel should show number of hours and the cost per an item column should show the applicable pay rate.

"Supplies" should be chosen for all supplies and materials, including plants, planting supplies, rain barrels, tools, etc. that are purchased by the grantee organization directly. Any supplies and materials provided by partners/consultants/contractor should be listed as "Contractual" (see information on this category below).

"Contractual" should be chosen for all hiring of partners, consultants, construction firms, or other outside firms. Do NOT combine contractual costs into one row. Each contractual row entry must match one receipt/invoice.

"Travel" should be chosen for all travel-related/mileage costs incurred by the grantee organization. This category should be chosen for any transportation fees associated with K-12 environmental education field trips. However, this should not be chosen for travel costs included in contracted work by partners/consultants/contractors; travel associated with contractual should be listed as the "Contractual" costs for that partner/consultant/contractor (see information on this category above).

"Field Trip Fees" should be chosen only for education-related requests, and should include only field trip program fees and teacher costs. Field trip transportation should be listed under "Travel."

"Other" should be chosen sparingly, only if you absolutely cannot fit your budget item into one of the other categories.

"Indirect Costs" should be chosen according to the most current "Indirect and Fringe Benefits Guidance Policy" that can be found on the Trust's website at <https://cbtrust.org/forms-policies>.

No action is needed. Data in this column will self-calculate from your entries in columns to the right, and will keep a running total of how much has been spent on each budget item cumulatively across expense reporting periods.

You will report on your expenses according to the phases outlined in your Award Agreement.

- For awards with only one distribution, or phase, of funding (i.e., you will receive only one check from the Trust for the your award), you will fill out only the "Expense Report 1" section (columns E-J) and submit this spreadsheet with your final report.
- For awards distributed in two phases in which the final 10% of funds (or some other portion) is contingent upon submission of your final report, you are expected to have spent 100% of the funds at the time of the report. Complete your project and fill out the "Expense Report 1" section (columns E-J) and submit with your final report.
- For all other awards, you'll fill out a set of columns for each expense reporting period with each status report and the final report to the Trust. If 10% (or some other portion) of funds were held upon approval of your final report, you will report on the expenses incurred during the last expense reporting period plus the final 10% (or other portion) of the award held.

Input the number of units of the item identified in Column B (Purchased/Obtained Item) that you purchased with grant funds during the expense reporting period only. For example: If the budget item is "maple trees," indicate the number of trees. For personnel, this column should contain the number of hours. If you have entered a group of items in Column B (Purchased/Obtained Item) because they appear on one receipt, use "1" for the quantity.

Input the cost per unit for the item. For personnel requests, this column should be the hourly rate. Round to the nearest whole dollar. If you have entered a group of items in Column B (Purchased/Obtained Item) because they appear on one receipt, use the receipt's cost per unit.

No action necessary: This column will self-calculate.

Indicate the cash match/leverage received during this expense reporting period. Items should be listed as cash match if the source is another source of funding. Existing items applied to the project should be listed as in-kind match. Most salary should be listed as in-kind match unless it is derived from another grant.

List the in-kind match/leveraged resources for this expense reporting period. Items already paid for that were applied to such as donated contractor time, should be listed as in-kind match. Most salary should be listed as in-kind match unless from another grant.

List the source of the cash and/or in-kind match. If you have both cash and in-kind match for the same item, list both sources in this cell. DO NOT leave this column blank if you have entered either kind of match in a given row.

Repeat the steps explained above for Columns E-J for any subsequent expense reporting periods. You may add new "purchased/obtained items" in Column B at the end of the list created in previous expense reporting periods (do NOT delete entries), or use an existing line if the item description in Column B is identical to a purchase in a subsequent expense report. For awards that require backup documentation, the numbers on the top right of your individual pieces of documentation do not have to be sequential, but they must still be submitted in numerical order.

**IF you are partway through an award:**

Copy and paste the amounts you already reported to the Trust in previous expense reporting periods (Expense Report exactly how you submitted them in your previous Status Report Expenditures Worksheet into the appropriate columns in the Expenses Worksheet (fifth tab at the bottom of this screen). This step will allow proper cumulative reporting on your account moving forward, follow the instructions above for the next expense reporting period.

**Save this form** with a filename in the format: "Expenses-Expense Report # - Grant Number," e.g., "Expenses 1- 19546 form in the attachments section in the Status or Final Report Form component of the online award management system

	Expenses		Chesapeake
--	----------	--	------------

Expenses  
e Bay Trust - Expe

|

Budget Revision Instructions



