



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
FORT WORTH DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P. O. BOX 17300
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102-0300

4 September 2026

AMENDMENT 01 - REQUEST FOR FULL PROPOSAL
W9126G262RFP9554

*Applicants must be a member in one of the following
Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units Regions:
Great Plains, Gulf Coast, and Great Rivers Regions*

Project Title: Conservation and Forestry Program Support (2026-2031) for Environmental Natural Resources Management Division, Directorate of Public Works, Joint Readiness Training Center and Fort Polk, Louisiana

A cooperative agreement is being offered ONLY to members of the Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units (CESU) Program Region(s) identified above. Award will be made upon mutual agreement and acceptance of the terms and conditions contained in the request for proposal and the recipient's CESU Joint and Cooperative Agreement (also known as the CESU Master Agreement). Enclosed are the Proposal Instructions, Statement of Objectives, and General Terms and Conditions.

NOTE: For any Cooperative Agreement entered into in response to this Request for Full Proposal (RFP), a maximum 17.5% indirect cost rate will be paid on work covered by such agreement or any modifications thereto. Unless the agreement specifies otherwise, the basis of direct costs against which the agreement's indirect cost rate is applied must be either the same base identified in the recipient's federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement or, if the recipient does not have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, the Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC) base.

NOTE: This project will be awarded under the authority of 16 USC 670c-1, **Sikes Act**. For projects for the implementation and enforcement of integrated natural resources management plans, priority shall be given to award to Federal and State agencies having responsibility for the conservation or management of fish or wildlife.

Period of Performance: The base period of the agreement will extend approximately 10 months from the date of award. Meaningful work must commence by September 30, 2026.

Description of Anticipated Work: See attached Statement of Objectives.

Submission of Your Full Proposal: The proposal must comply with 2 CFR 200, the terms and conditions of the most recent CESU Cooperative and Joint Venture Agreement, and this request for proposal. Your full proposal should address how you plan to meet the objectives listed; include a detailed budget taking into consideration the magnitude of available funding. The maximum funds available for this requirement's period of performance is **\$1,250,000.00**.

Proposals are due by **12:00 P.M. Central Daylight Time, 14 September 2026** via email to: Agreement Specialist, Maria.E.Lopez@usace.army.mil and Agreement Project Manager, Kathy.S.Mitchell@usace.army.mil.

USACE has determined that exigent circumstances justify this availability period.

Reference the RFP number in the email Subject line.

Only the Agreement Specialist or Grants Officer has the authority to extend the proposal due date by written notification to all potential respondents.

Technical questions and/or clarifications shall be submitted in writing via email to the Agreement Specialist and Agreement Project Manager no later than **31 August 2026 prior to 12:00 P.M. Central Daylight Time.**

TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR AWARD, THE RECIPIENT AND ANY PROPOSED SUBRECIPIENTS AND CONTRACT VENDORS MUST HAVE AN ACTIVE NIST SP 800-171 DOD ASSESSEMENT (PERFORMED WITHIN THE LAST 3 YEARS). Additional details are provided as a separate attachment to this document.

ALEXANDER G. RUST
Grants Officer

Enclosures: As stated above

Proposal Instructions

1. Format and Content of Full Proposals

1.1. Proposal submissions will be protected from unauthorized disclosure in accordance with applicable law, and DoD regulations. Respondents are expected to appropriately mark each page of their submission that contains proprietary information. Proposals shall be submitted electronically within the following guidelines:

1.2. Proposal Format:

- a. Paper Size- 8.5 x 11-inch paper
- b. Font Size- no less than 10-point font
- c. Margins- 1 inch
- d. Spacing- Single or double-spaced
- e. Copies - two electronic copies: one copy in PDF and one copy in MS Word/Excel versions containing all the required sections.
- f. Number of Pages - Sections II and III are limited to no more than ~~35~~ 25 pages total. The cover page and table of contents are excluded from the page limitations. Proposals exceeding the page limit will not be evaluated.

1.3. Proposal Organization: Proposals will consist of four Sections:

Section I Administrative Information, Forms, Certifications, **and evidence of compliance with NIST SP-800-171 Assessment (see details below).**

Section II Technical Approach

Section III Experience and Qualifications

Section IV Budget

Section I Administrative Information, Forms, Certifications, and NIST SP 800-171 Assessment Compliance: Include the following:

- Title of Project.
- POC information for Grant Administrators, Unique Entity Identifier (UEI), CAGE code, EIN, and the exact name and address as it appears in the System for Award Management (SAM) at www.sam.gov.
- CESU Region (if competed under the CESU program).
- Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) code.
- Identity of Prime Respondent and complete list of subawards/subrecipients* and contract vendors, if applicable. ***NOTE-All UEI & CAGE codes must be provided***
- **Evidence of compliance with NIST SP 800-171 Assessment (obtained from the Supplier Performance Risk System) corresponding to CAGE codes for the proposing entity AND all proposed subrecipients and contract vendors.**

- Technical Contact (name, address, phone, and e-mail).
- Administrative/Business Contact (name, address, phone, and e-mail).
- Signature Authority. An Official signed document showing who is authorized to sign the agreement and SF 425 (name, title, phone and e-mail).
- Signed copies (in pdf format/hyperlinks are not acceptable) of the SF 424, 424a, 424b and Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL). These forms can be found at: <https://www.grants.gov/forms/forms-repository/sf-424-family> (sort on "Agency Owner" scroll down to Grants.gov):
- A copy of your Federal Audit Report (formerly known as A-133 Audit).

Section II Technical Approach: Fully address how you plan to meet each of the project's tasks and objectives, including the methodology to be used.

Section III Experience and Qualifications: Identify the Principal Investigator/ Field Director and other personnel who will be involved in the project and their specific experience and capabilities in areas related to this project's requirements. Identify the magnitude, scope, cost and a point of contact for the awarding agencies. Identify relevant past projects with brief descriptions of these projects.

Section IV Budget: Submit a complete budget which includes all costs broken out for each task and each period of performance. Breakdown further into direct costs (including labor, travel, supplies and equipment, and subcontracts) and indirect costs. **Complete and return Price List, if provided with the RFP, and provide a detailed cost breakdown in Excel format along with a cost narrative; include applicable cognizant-agency-issued proposal rate agreements/forward pricing rate agreements to support proposed direct costs/fringe rates (excludes CESU indirect rate).**

- **Labor:** Principal Investigator, Student Labor, Technical Support Labor. Include the breakdown of Full Time Equivalent, Part Time Equivalent (of hours), hourly rate(s) and total amounts.
- **Fringe:** Per cognizant-agency rate agreements/NICRA
- **Travel:** Travel, if applicable, will be evaluated based on the description of work in the proposal. Itemize all travel costs to support the travel line item on the SF424a. *All travel costs must comply with normal organizational costs as allowed in your organization's written travel policy (provide a copy of the written travel policy or access to a website with the policy).* In the event no written policy exists, all travel costs must comply with the federal Joint Travel Regulations (JTR).
- **Supplies and Other Equipment:** Include any material and miscellaneous costs associated with the project.
- **Subawards:** If sub-awards are a component of this proposal, include the costs with associated costs per unit of production, as applicable.

- **Facilities and Administration Costs (F&A):** If applying as a member of a Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit (CESU), F&A is limited to 17.5% per signed CESU agreement with Non-Federal Partners. If you are not applying as a CESU member, you must provide a copy of your most recently negotiated indirect rate cost agreement.

2. Evaluation of Full Proposals

2.1. Proposals will be evaluated by a board consisting of one or more people at the installation or receiving activity that are familiar with the project **to determine the overall highest rated proposal (technical merit, qualifications, ability to meet program objectives)**. The criteria to be evaluated are the Technical Approach of the proposed work, the Experience and Qualifications of the team completing the work, and the Budget (Cost) for the work proposed. Technical Approach and Experience and Qualifications will be individually rated, and the proposal will be given an overall rating. The evaluation ratings for the Technical Approach and Experience and Qualifications are considered evenly important. The Budget will be reviewed but not rated.

2.2. Technical Approach will be evaluated for the following elements:

- Goals and Objectives. The proposal clearly demonstrates an understanding of the goals and objectives of the project.
- Methodology. The proposal includes a description of the protocols to be used in conducting the studies or assistance.
- Deliverables. The proposal addresses how data will be handled.
- Schedule and Milestones. The proposal is feasible and contains a reasonable schedule.

2.3. Experience and Qualifications will be evaluated for the following elements:

- Principal Investigator / Field Director. This person must have direct knowledge of project, data analysis and report preparation experience of similar types of projects in this field.
- Experience. Identified experience must show that the proposer has a clear understanding of the requirement and that the proposed approach will meet all the objectives of the SOO effectively and efficiently.

2.4. The budget will be reviewed for costs that are allowable, allocable, and reasonable. All costs must be listed, justified and be consistent with the SOO. Costs must be provided for each task, for each period of performance as applicable.

2.5. Adjectival Evaluation Ratings: The evaluation factors Technical Approach and Experience and Qualifications will be rated using the following adjectives.

Excellent - Proposal/factor demonstrates thorough and detailed understanding of requirements. Technical approach and capabilities significantly exceed performance

and capability standards. Proposal/factor offers one or more strengths. Strengths significantly outweigh weaknesses, if any. The proposal/factor represents a high probability of success with no apparent risk in meeting the Government's requirements.

Good - Proposal/factor demonstrates good understanding of requirements. Technical approach and capabilities exceed performance and capability standards. Proposal/factor offers one or more strengths. Strengths outweigh any weaknesses. The proposal/factor represents a strong probability of success with overall low degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements.

Satisfactory - Proposal/factor demonstrates acceptable understanding of requirements. Technical approach and capabilities meet performance and capability standards. Proposal/factor offers no strengths, or, if there are any strengths, these strengths are offset by weaknesses. The proposal/factor represents a reasonable probability of success with overall moderate degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements.

Marginal - Proposal/factor demonstrates a limited understanding of requirements. There exists doubt they meet performance and capability standards necessary for acceptable contract performance. Proposal/factor strengths are outweighed by weaknesses. The proposal/factor represents a low probability of success with overall high degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements. Proposal/factor might be made satisfactory with additional information and without a major revision of the proposal.

Poor - Proposal/factor demonstrates a lack of understanding of requirements. Technical approach and capabilities do not meet performance and capability standards necessary for acceptable contract performance. Proposal/factor contains significant weaknesses and/or a deficiency. The proposal/factor represents a very low probability of success with an extremely high degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements. Proposal/factor could only be made satisfactory with major revision of proposal.

2.6. Additional Evaluation Definitions

Strength - Any aspect of a proposal that, when judged against a stated evaluation criterion, enhances the merit of the proposal or increases the probability of successful performance of the Assistance Award.

Weakness - A flaw in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful Assistance Award performance.

Deficiency - A material failure of a proposal to meet a government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful Assistance Award performance to an unacceptable level.

Uncertainty - Any aspect of the proposal for which the intent of the Offeror is unclear because there may be more than one way to interpret the offer. This item may require further development before a final decision can be made.

3. Fraud Representation: By submission of its proposal or application, the applicant represents that it does not require any of its employees, contractors, or sub-recipients seeking to report fraud, waste, or abuse to sign or comply with internal confidentiality agreements or statements prohibiting or otherwise restricting those employees, contractors, or sub-recipients from lawfully reporting that waste, fraud, or abuse to a designated investigative or law enforcement representative of a federal department or agency authorized to receive such information. Note that: (1) the basis for this representation is a prohibition in section 743 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015 (Division E of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. 113-235) and any successor provision of law on making funds available through grants and cooperative agreements to entities with certain internal confidentiality agreements or statements; and (2) section 743 states that it does not contravene requirements applicable to Standard Form 312, Form 4414, or any other form issued by a Federal department or agency governing the nondisclosure of classified information.

4. The Government reserves the right to reject the proposal and make no award.

5. The established CESU indirect rate is a maximum of 17.5% to be paid on work covered by such agreement or any modifications thereto. Unless the agreement specifies otherwise, the basis of direct costs against which the agreement's indirect cost rate is applied must be either the same base identified in the recipient's federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement or, if the recipient does not have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, the Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC) base.

End of Proposal Instructions