

Submitted questions and answers for the Notice of Funding Opportunity

Effects of Outdoor Lighting on Natural Resources and Visitor Enjoyment in National Parks - P21AS00324

Dated 3/16/2021

	Question	Answer
1	My main inquiry is largely about the location of the outdoor lighting lab infrastructure. Should we be coordinating with NPS units ahead of time around this, or is this something the NPS would like to be a part of after funding?	Locations for the lab can be finalized before or after submitting the application. However, the proposed location(s) should be listed in the proposal, as the site selection is important. Further, we strongly encourage any applicant to at least check-in with any park they hope to partner with. The NPS may be able to facilitate park contacts once the agreement is in place, but there is no guarantee. The burden of securing a location is incumbent upon the applicant.
2	Is there a preference to locate the lab in a NPS unit? Could the “outdoor lighting laboratory” be located at one or more local or state park facilities? Would this be a positive feature?	It is not necessary that the lab be based in a NPS unit. The preference is for a “natural resource based setting” with “relative natural night with minimal effects of light pollution to allow for full control of the photic environment.” When choosing a location, applicates should consider many factors including but not limited to: Relevancy/diversity of the human population/sample; biological/ecological aspect of the site; challenges of maintaining/changing the lighting infrastructure of the lab on regular basis for different experiments (especially if that includes travel cost); administrative issues such as the time burden placed on study participants, regulatory compliance

		(e.g., NEPA), and full control of the study.
3	Would the lighting need to be put in a location in a semi-permanent way (like in a single campground/area), or is it expected that it is mobile and can be moved across different NPS units?	We are open to proposals that are permanent (though adaptable), semi-permanent, or mobile.
4	Do you expect this to be a recurring solicitation, or just this once?	At this time, this is a single solicitation.
5	The notice lists two phases – Phase 1 focuses on developing an “outdoor lighting laboratory” and Phase 2 focuses on carrying out various studies involving humans, wildlife and physical measurements. Does the anticipated scope involve Phase 1 only, or both Phase 1 and 2? If Phase 1 only, is funding for subsequent activities anticipated?	The scope of the study should include both Phase 1 and Phase 2.
6	What is the anticipated period of performance?	It is anticipated that the period of performance would be 3 years. It is anticipated that 150k will be allocated the first year, followed by 120K in the second year, and 120k in the third.
8	Will collaborations among institutions be seen as a positive feature of the application?	Partnerships are great. However, what is most important is that the proposal should be interdisciplinary in nature focusing on social science, ecological/biological, and lighting design/engineering.
9	Although the solicitation did not require matching funds, is this a positive feature of an application?	Voluntary committed cost sharing is not expected. It cannot be used as a factor during the merit review of applications or proposals. 2 CFR §200.306 Cost Sharing or Matching.
10	Would product donations from manufacturers be possible (e.g., is this desirable at all or could it be viewed as favoring certain manufacturers, and if acceptable could this be considered as in-kind support)?	Partnering with manufacturers in a way that would reserve funding for improving the study in other areas would be welcome.
11	Have other federal, state or local funding agencies expressed interest in supporting this NPS initiative?	At this time, we do not have any potential partner agencies for this effort.
12	When it comes to criterion 1 about the SOI priorities, does NPS expect us to specifically address how our study does that? It seems like the RFP has that covered in section A	How this is addressed is left up to the applicants, but applications should state how your proposal will ‘utilize science to identify’ best

		lighting practices and help us meet various park objectives for lighting.
13	In the NPS agrees to section, are there any additional specifics on what those items entail. For example, for item #3, does that mean NPS may be able to assist with some of these items such as wildlife monitoring? Any additional info on what we could expect in terms of support from NPS rangers/scientists would be helpful.	There will be a project team from the Natural Sounds and Night Skies Division of the NPS that will work closely with our partner(s) on all aspects of the study, including: a lighting specialist, social scientist, and biologists/ecologist. Partners can expect some level of assistance and technical support from NPS staff, but should not expect NPS staff to lead any of the multi-disciplinary efforts. If the partner is conducting the study at a NPS unit, support from park staff would be coordinated directly with the park and may be very limited .
14	Also under Phase 2, the word “understand” is used a couple of times vs. examine – just to confirm, is NPS asking that experiments be conducted on human physiology, demographics and perceptions? Or reference existing knowledge/best practices on these subjects and apply them to the outdoor lighting lab design?	We would expect that the existing knowledge/best practices be used in the original outdoor lighting lab design, then conduct human and biological/ecological experiments such as those listed in the Notice.
15	Are there additional physiology / demographic classifications that NPS would like examined beyond night adapted vision and gender?	Yes. The NPS would be interested in any variables that might influence human behavior, functional abilities, or perceptions toward artificial light at night.
16	Are there ideas, restrictions, preferences, or guidelines for lighting options that the NPS has for the OLL?	Generally, it is preferred that the experiment would be able to control most aspects of the lighting design and experimental design with as few restrictions as possible. For lighting options, the proposal specifically states, “settings with the options for path lighting, parking lot lighting, and outdoor building lighting are preferred.” Other options, such as street lighting, are welcomed.

17	What assistance, oversight, and guidance will the NPS provide in establishing the OLL and running experiments? For example, will there be an advisory board and/or a designated project lead. What NPS expertise will be provided to coordinate and assist with the project. How will this be provided and by whom? Will there be on-site visits possible from the NPS?	There will be a project team from the NPS that will work closely with our partner(s) on all aspects of the study, including: a lighting specialist, social scientist, and biologists/ecologist. Site visits by the NPS team are anticipated.
18	Are there areas of or issues of importance that the NPS has that could help focus efforts in developing the OLL or the experiments themselves, particularly given the limited budget for a multi-disciplinary study.	Yes. The NPS teams anticipates helping on all aspects of the study with our selected partner(s).
19	Are follow-on funds anticipated to continue the OLL?	As stated above, the period of performance for this project is anticipated to be 3 years. It is difficult to predict funding much further out than this; however, this project is a priority for the Division.
20	Will this be a task award through the CESU network?	Yes. It is our intent to use the CESU network for funding this project.