

**From:** [Allen, Sarah](#)  
**To:** [Lauver, Christopher](#); [Lilette Baltodano](#)  
**Subject:** Re: do you have comments to add to: my review of the GOGA dog package?  
**Date:** Monday, April 17, 2017 1:54:18 PM  
**Attachments:** [PNW\\_17\\_02\\_GOGA dog mon cll SA.docx](#)

---

Here are additional comments - I agree with what you put forward in your email, and might be even more strong given that little information is provided for each of the PIs or the contractors except their adding the publications.

The public purpose was week in addition.

Thanks for keeping this going

Sarah

Sarah Allen, PhD  
Science Program Lead, PWR  
510-643-0665 (o)/510-541-4241 (c)

Californian Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit  
University of California  
College of Natural Resources-ESPM  
133 Mulford Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-3114

On Mon, Apr 17, 2017 at 12:12 PM, Lauver, Christopher <[chris\\_lauver@nps.gov](mailto:chris_lauver@nps.gov)> wrote:

Hi,

Below follows the comments I plan to send to GOGA this week. Please feel free to add your own to these (or ask me to add), and otherwise let me know what you think -- thanks!

Hi Bill and Mike,

Please find attached my edits and comments on your revised CESU TA docs for the GOGA dog project. Some specific comments are:

1 – On the SSJ, which I've reorganized, it still needs more work. It lacks specific details that demonstrate the PI's unique qualifications. Please have her write up several sentences to include (and then accompany with just key publications). Also, the case hasn't been clearly made about how bringing this team together is unique based on their technical expertise. Please have her address how (what's unique) she pulled this particular team together (vs having some other PI do the same thing).

2 – On the TA, I changed the start date (to a guesstimate) and end date. Please review the changes I made to the project schedule, and revise as needed. This is still an ambitious timeline to get all this work done in 20 months. There are several steps that could easily take longer than anticipated (i.e., the peer reviews, field visits, and public meetings). Please consider adding more time in to the schedule.

3 – Please review the SOW for both parties for accuracy. On the OSU side, tasks 4 and 9 appear to overlap, please revise.

4 - For the project products, please review the objectives, SOW, schedule, and product descriptions to make sure they are consistently referenced throughout.  
5 – On the budget, please double-check the Postdoc benefits rate, and itemize the supplies line.  
Please revise both docs and send back soon.

Thanks,  
Chris

\*\*\*\*\*

Chris Lauver, PhD  
Senior Science Advisor, Pacific West Region, National Park Service  
Pacific Northwest CESU and Great Basin CESU

Affiliate Associate Professor  
School of Environmental and Forest Sciences  
University of Washington  
Box 352100  
Seattle, WA 98195

Email: [Chris\\_Lauver@nps.gov](mailto:Chris_Lauver@nps.gov)  
Phone: 206-685-7404  
Web sites: <http://coenv.washington.edu/faculty/chris-lauver/>  
<http://depts.washington.edu/pnwcesu/>

**PACIFIC NORTHWEST COOPERATIVE ECOSYSTEM STUDIES UNIT**  
**Task Agreement Number [FBMS will assign agreement number, Contracting will insert]**  
Under  
Cooperative Agreement Number P16AC00003  
Between the  
United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
and  
Oregon State University  
DUNS No: 053599908  
308 Kerr Administration Bldg  
Corvallis, OR 97331-8517

CFDA: 15.945, Cooperative Research and Training Programs – Resources of the National Park System (CESU)

Project Title: Development of Dog Management Monitoring Program and Protocols for Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Amount of Federal Funds Obligated: \$344,484

Total Amount of Task Agreement Award: \$344,484

Period of Performance: ~~05/4/28/2017~~ | ~~04/2/248/2018~~

Commented [C1]: A guesstimate: I generally set start date at 2 months past my estimate of when TA is CESU-approved  
Contracting will need an add'l 60 days to process

This Task Agreement by and between the National Park Service (NPS) and Oregon State University (OSU), is issued against the Pacific Northwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit Cooperative and Joint Venture Agreement, P16AC00003, for the purpose of mutual assistance in conducting a project entitled "Development of Dog Management Monitoring Program and Protocols for Golden Gate National Recreation Area." Unless otherwise specified herein, the terms and conditions as stated in the Cooperative Agreement will apply to this Task Agreement.

## ARTICLE I – BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

### A. Background

Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA) contains more than 20 land and coastal units (Attachment A) within the urban San Francisco Bay Area. Management of domesticated dogs poses many issues in the San Francisco Bay Area, and within GOGA particularly. Some of these issues are contentious and have a long history of public engagement. The history of dog walking in some areas of GOGA began prior to the establishment of the park, when dog walking, including off-leash, occurred informally at sites under various public jurisdictions in San Francisco and Marin counties. In the park's early years, those practices continued largely uninterrupted in spite of the existence of the NPS pet regulation (36 CFR 2.15) prohibiting off-leash dog walking within NPS areas.

The coastal areas within GOGA are very popular parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, a region whose population is currently over 7 million and is expected to grow to 8 million by 2020. GOGA visitation itself has grown from 7 to 8 million visits in the 70's to more than 17 million visits per year currently. Coupled with this growth is the number of private and commercial dog walkers in the park. The number of conflicts between park users with and without dogs has also risen, as has the fear of dogs and dog bites or attacks. Park resources are also impacted by the presence of dogs and varied dog management practices. These resources include several species with habitat in areas used by dog walkers that have been listed as threatened, endangered, or special-status species requiring special protection.

Underscoring the increasing conflict over off-leash dog use, dog walking groups and individuals have filed two lawsuits against the NPS when park management actions threatened the status of off-leash areas. The federal district court found that, except in an emergency, the NPS did not have the authority to either close or impose significant, long-term restrictions of public use of areas that had previously allowed off-leash dog walking without first completing an environmental and rulemaking public notice and comment process.

In 2002, the NPS issued an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking asking for public input as to whether the NPS should consider developing new regulations for dog walking in GOGA. Following review of public comments, the NPS initiated planning under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) in an effort to develop a proposed rule with stakeholder input. The park released a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for dog management, and a Record of Decision and Final dog walking rules are pending completion of an external review. To maintain visitor safety and to monitor whether the public is following the regulations and whether associated impacts fall within the range analyzed in the FEIS, a monitoring program for dog management is needed.

The monitoring-based management program is being created for the sustainability and long-term management of park resources, and to protect park resources, visitors, and staff. The monitoring-based management program developed under this CESU agreement would be implemented to document compliance with dog walking regulations and monitor impacts to resources and visitors, and would apply to all action alternatives. Staff would monitor and record noncompliance as well as impacts to natural and cultural resources. That data would inform park management and law enforcement when, where, and how to prioritize responses to noncompliance. Noncompliance would include dog walking within restricted areas, dog walking under voice and sight control in designated on-leash dog walking areas, and dog walking under voice and sight control outside of established voice and sight control areas. When the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable based on violations and/or impacts to resources or other visitors, primary management actions such as focused enforcement of regulations, education, and establishment of buffer zones, time and use restrictions, and special use permit (SUP) restrictions would be implemented. If noncompliance continues, secondary management actions including short-term closures, typically one year or less would be implemented through the compendium. The park would evaluate whether to propose a long-term closure or additional restrictions, which could require additional actions by the park, including public comment. As a result, the monitoring-based management program would provide for the long-term protection of park resources and a quality visitor experience for all.

Commented [SA2]: Consider removal – this study is not looking at type of management action but on detecting compliance

NPS and OSU will collaborate in developing a robust and peer-reviewed dog management monitoring program with protocols for use at GOGA. This effort includes the generation of monitoring protocols for visitor use and biophysical impact-related indicators, and development of a field guide with protocols for the implementation of a dog management monitoring program for (21) park sites.

Expected products and outcomes from this collaboration include:

- a visitor use and ecological matrix that identifies core visitor experience and site-related resource impact issues;
- a peer-reviewed monitoring and protocol field guide to monitor the impacts of current and proposed dog management on GOGA/NRA with Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs); and
- a field guide for implementation including methods for data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting;

- a database for managing project data;
- a report on recommended technology and software for the monitoring program;
- minutes and notes from planned public meetings outlining the dog management monitoring program; and
- a technical annual monitoring report with public summary of initial the first phase of dog management monitoring data that includes a public summary collected.

Commented [SA3]: Easier to read as bullets

## B. Objectives

Investigators from OSU and NPS staff will collaborate to accomplish the following specific objectives.

The specific objectives of this project are to:

1. Conduct a literature review to inform development of a matrix of visitor use-specific impacts on ecological conditions; the matrix will be used to select resource indicators to monitor, and techniques for monitoring these indicators.
2. Develop visitor use and biophysical impact-related indicators that will inform development of dog monitoring protocols.
3. Develop draft dog management monitoring protocols, including Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), for specific use at GOGA and obtain peer review. The primary objectives of the monitoring program are to: (1) determine the degree to which people are complying with the park dog walking regulations, (2) determine whether dog walking impacts on visitor experience are within the range of impacts analyzed in the FEIS; and (3) determine whether dog walking impacts to resources are within the range analyzed in the FEIS. The monitoring program shall include the development of indicators as proxies for key impacts at each of 21 park sites in FEIS. Possible indicators for analyzing resource impacts include: vegetation damage, wildlife disturbance, disturbance to threatened and endangered species, violation of areas closed to dogs, unattended and uncontrolled dogs, and others to be determined.
4. Develop a field guide with protocols for the implementation of a dog management monitoring program.
5. Hold three public meetings, or open houses, to facilitate a public engagement process to inform the public of the dog monitoring plan, indicators to be used to represent impacts, milestones for implementation and the range of actions that may be taken to ensure that impacts do not approach and unacceptable levels, while ensuring that public reports are available on the park's website following evaluation periods.
6. Following independent peer review and public meetings, finalize dog management monitoring protocols and field guide for implementation at GOGA.
7. Train NPS assigned personnel on protocols to collect data with recommended software packages.
8. Develop a draft and final technical annual monitoring report with a public summary using dog management monitoring data collected by NPS.

## C. Public Purpose

This project will benefit the public by providing a greater understanding of the indicators, standards, and protocols needed to develop a scientifically-based monitoring protocol for use with domesticated dogs being walked in, or brought into, the park. Implementing a dog management monitoring program within GOGA will provide have public safety and resource protection benefits by helping to

Commented [SA4]: Add students to be involved in this project to enhance public purpose "Students will be trained in evaluation of potential visitor impacts to park resources"  
Remember public purpose is not to benefit the park but the public broadly

ensure that impacts to visitor experience and natural resources, and compliance with dog walking regulations, are within appropriate ranges. The dog management monitoring program will be presented to the public through a series of public meetings, and the monitoring protocols and related information will be posted on the publicly available GOGA web site. Several OSU students will be involved in the project, and gain experience in the application of visitor use and biophysical impact-related indicators in developing monitoring protocols.

## ARTICLE II – LEGAL AUTHORITY

Pursuant to 54 USC §101702(b), to facilitate the administration of the System, the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may consider advisable, may—(A) enter into cooperative agreements with public or private educational institutions, States, and political subdivisions of States to develop adequate, coordinated, cooperative research and training programs concerning the resources of the System; and (B) pursuant to an agreement, accept from and make available to the cooperator technical and support staff, financial assistance for mutually agreed upon research projects, supplies and equipment, facilities, and administrative services relating to cooperative research units that the Secretary considers appropriate. This subsection does not waive any requirements for research projects that are subject to Federal procurement regulations.

## ARTICLE III – STATEMENT OF WORK

### A. OSU will:

1. Collaboratively undertake a project titled “Development of Dog Management Monitoring Program and Protocols of Golden Gate National Recreation Area” as described throughout this Task Agreement.
2. Appoint Troy Hall as Principal Investigator (PI) and Ashley D’Antonio as co-PI.
3. Appoint students and hire other staff as needed with required skill sets to conduct the project.
4. Conduct a literature review on recent research (from 2012 to present) and develop an ~~outlined~~ **matrix** report on visitor use-specific impacts on both the quality of a visitor’s experience and the park’s ecological conditions (that is regionally specific and/or applicable to dog/pet/walker recreational impacts). The report should include a matrix of all impacts with recommended indicators to monitor the impacts, with initial estimates of potential ranges for different levels of standards. Synthesize information and critical elements for GOGA application with the intent to develop a practical, science-based, program to monitor compliance with dog regulations and impacts to inform a monitoring-based dog management strategy.
5. Collaborate with NPS to conduct a five-day field visit to GOGA to review and advise on 21 selected park areas (Attachment A) with recreation, monitoring, and ecological specialists and park managers. Develop an outline and prioritize the issues and current state of knowledge surrounding dog management and development of a GOGA dog monitoring program.
6. Instruct OSU personnel that when working with any NPS personnel in a United States Government-owned or managed vehicles, OSU personnel may not operate that vehicle and to establish and enforce compliance with those instructions.
7. Conduct a second five-day field visit to GOGA to prioritize ecological and dog monitoring indicators with GOGA staff, and produce a summary of the field visits with minutes.
8. Collaborate with NPS to develop a summary work plan that describes the project methods and timeline for achieving objectives and for specifying task items for OSU and NPS team members.

Commented [SA5]: Do they need to get a research permit with the park? If so, add here

Commented [LCL6]: What is a matrix report? Do you mean a matrix that has an outline? Please revise for clarity

Commented [SM7]: Matrix of all impacts with corresponding recommended indicators representing impacts being monitored, with initial draft of potential range for different levels for standards

Commented [C8]: Based on your reply above, I added in this statement. Please review, and revise as needed

9. Develop a visitor use and ecological monitoring matrix and assessment report that contains key visitor experience components and sensitive natural resources that are being impacted at the selected sites. Utilize NPS and external data sources on species location, visitor use data, and other data sources to establish the importance of resource issues.
10. Develop scientifically valid sampling strategies for the GOGA dog management monitoring program.
11. Collaborate with NPS to conduct a workshop at GOGA to review and finalize indicators and to establish standards for the monitoring indicators within the dog monitoring program. OSU will pair indicators with impacts for the selected park areas, and recommend a range of potential standards for relevant indicators tied to impacts levels to help NPS avoid unacceptable impacts.
12. Develop a dog management monitoring guide and protocol for GOGA. The protocol will include a field monitoring guide with protocols that describes the procedures for staffing and training, sampling, collecting data, and managing, analyzing, and reporting on dog management monitoring data. This product will serve as the final ~~monitoring guide and protocol project~~ report. The protocols will target prioritized indicators to implement at GOGA. The protocols and guide will:
  - a. Identify data needed to establish baseline conditions for each indicator to assess change over time.
  - b. Establish a range of recommended sampling strategies for different park areas and corresponding indicators with frequencies for monitoring those indicators to ensure a defined range of statistical confidence.
  - c. Include identification of stratified staffing needs for different sampling approaches for different highly-visited and sensitive habitats vs. more remote backcountry park areas, addressing seasonal visitation differences and the representativeness of results at each park area.
  - d. Contain data management SOPs.
  - e. Outline the types of quantitative analyses required to report on monitoring results with recommended software programs for field applications where web access may be difficult.
  - f. Identify best available technology, software applications/programs and methodologies for data collection in front country and backcountry areas for efficient and effective data summarization and integration of collected data.
  - g. Consider and discuss capabilities for summarizing results and the associated representativeness and limitations of such results.
13. Revise the draft protocols and field monitoring guide (final report) based upon independent peer reviews obtained from NPS and non-NPS subject matter experts, and submit final report.
14. Collaborate with NPS to convene and facilitate three public meetings (or open houses) to gather public input relevant to the monitoring program, especially the proposed indicators and standards. In this effort, OSU will:
  - a. Develop a maximum of four briefing statements and 12 posters and tools for public engagement, GOGA stakeholders, and others with dog management and monitoring interests.
  - b. Serve as monitoring program 'experts' on indicators and standards selected for visitor use impacts.
  - c. Address public concerns that arise about the indicators and standards recommended through a Frequently Asked Questions Fact sheet and key response summaries (following the public meetings) with citations of scientific literature supporting such indicators and standards, or with other supporting materials.
  - d. Finalize workshop minutes and identify appropriate substantive comments to be addressed in the monitoring program and facilitate any needed revisions to the protocols, field guide and report.
15. Travel to GOGA to train field staff on adopted protocols for the dog management monitoring

Commented [C9]: This may be redundant or overlaps with task 4. Can you revise this to be a separate task, or combine/modify task 4?

program. OSU will provide field training on both protocols and use of best software program and technology for data collection, integration, and summarization of indicators. OSU will provide field data collection sheets in hard copy and software applications, and conduct pre-testing of field monitoring observations by staff with a QA/QC report to ensure sampling representativeness and accuracy.

16. Develop and submit recommendations for a user-friendly database for use by park personnel to collect and summarize GOGA dog monitoring data.
17. Perform analysis on dog monitoring data collected by NPS during ~~the winter/spring~~ 2018 and integrate into an annual technical monitoring report using software program applications developed for GOGA with a public summary.
18. Hold a video teleconference with GOGA staff to discuss analysis of dog monitoring data and collect NPS comments prior to providing final annual monitoring report.
19. Cooperate with the NPS Agreement Technical Representative (ATR) to ensure that the conduct of the project complies with "Quality Control of Scientific and Other Scholarly Products in the Pacific West Region."
20. Ensure that reports and other formal materials (including publications and presentations) resulting from this collaborative project acknowledge the NPS and that the project was conducted through the Pacific Northwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit, and reference this Task Agreement number.
21. Upon request of the NPS, obtain digital photographs with captions of project activities and make these available to the NPS Pacific Northwest CESU Senior Science Advisor and others for use in presentations and reports.

B. The NPS will:

1. Collaboratively undertake a visitor use monitoring research project titled "Development of GGNRA Dog Management Monitoring Program and Protocols" as described throughout this Task Agreement.
2. Provide financial assistance to the OSU as provided in Article VI. The budget, included as Attachment B, is incorporated in this Task Agreement.
3. Assign Steve Ortega as the ATR, and Mike Savidge and Bill Merkle as Co-Project Managers.
4. Provide relevant bibliography for use in literature review by OSU, and provide initial draft outline of matrix on potential natural resource indicators by site, where available, as starting point to consider along with table of adverse impacts for understanding of impacts at each park area.
5. Provide access to GOGA natural resource and visitor use data to increase understanding of the issues associated with the key GOGA resource conditions, specific (flora and fauna) species sensitive to dog walking and applicable to the selected monitoring sites.
6. Develop itineraries and agenda for two field visits by OSU to familiarize OSU with GOGA resources and to perform field reviews of physical areas of impact and critical resource concerns.
7. At its discretion, allow recipient staff participating in this project to ride in Government-owned or managed vehicles for the sole and limited purpose of transportation required for work authorized under this Task Agreement. Only NPS personnel may operate the vehicle.
8. Provide overview and orientation associated with all park visits including: Briefings on safety procedures; introductions to park staff; and logistical support for field work operations, which include coordination with the park and making safety a priority.
9. Assist with safe undertaking of fieldwork within the park and have appropriate NPS staff accompany recipient workers when needed in the field.
10. Collaborate with OSU to develop a summary work plan that describes the project methods and timeline for achieving objectives and for specifying task items for OSU and NPS team members.



11. Collect dog monitoring data during winter/spring 2018 and provide to OSU for analysis and to produce an annual monitoring report.
12. Participate in the development of and review of key products with OSU staff.
13. Identify an independent peer review manager and obtain three external (non-NPS) peer reviews of draft dog management monitoring protocols. The peer review manager will summarize the reviews and submit peer review results to OSU. Ensure that OSU addresses all comments by peer reviewers.
14. Coordinate appropriate NPS leadership team and staff and logistics to conduct a 3-day workshop to review indicators and identify corresponding standards for those monitoring indicators within the dog monitoring program before finalizing monitoring protocols.
15. Collaborate with OSU to convene and facilitate three public meetings for public engagement on the dog monitoring program.
16. Provide facilities and staff for training and field-testing with OSU on both indicators and adopted protocols for dog monitoring program.
17. In cooperation with OSU, provide recommended equipment for data collection efforts and field data collection sheets for simple recording and summarization.
18. Provide timely review of all draft project products.
19. Post final documents to the publicly available GOGA website.
20. Cooperate with the OSU PI to ensure that the conduct of the project complies with "Quality Control of Scientific and Other Scholarly Products in the Pacific West Region." The ATR (or designee) is the administrative reviewer for this project. NPS will designate a peer review manager to conduct the peer review process of the draft monitoring protocols.
21. Ensure that reports and other formal materials (including publications and presentations) resulting from this collaborative project acknowledge the OSU and that the project was conducted through the Pacific Northwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit, and reference this Task Agreement number.

#### ARTICLE IV – TERM OF AGREEMENT

This Task Agreement is effective ~~on May 15, 2017~~ on June 15, 2018, 2017 through ~~February 24, 2018~~ February 24, 2019.

#### ARTICLE V – KEY OFFICIALS

A. For the NPS:

1. ATR:  
Steve Ortega  
Bldg. 201, GOGA HQTRS, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Phone: (415) 561-4725  
Fax: Fax: (415) 561-4710  
Email: steve\_ortega@nps.gov
2. Awarding Officer:  
Lilette J. Baltodano, Financial Agreements Officer  
National Park Service, Pacific West Regional Office  
333 Bush Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Phone: 415-623-2251  
Fax: 415-623-2384  
Email: [lilette\\_baltodano@nps.gov](mailto:lilette_baltodano@nps.gov)

3. Co-PM:  
Mike Savidge, Chief, Strategic Planning and Social Science, GOGA  
Bldg. 201, GOGA HQTRS, Ft.Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Phone: (415) 561-4725  
Fax: (415) 561-4710  
Email: [michael\\_j\\_savidge@nps.gov](mailto:michael_j_savidge@nps.gov)

4. Co-PM:  
Bill Merkle, Supervisory Wildlife Ecologist  
Bldg. 201, GOGA HQTRS, Ft.Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Phone: (415) 289-1843  
Fax: (415) 561-4710  
Email: [bill\\_merkle@nps.gov](mailto:bill_merkle@nps.gov)

B. For OSU:

1. PI:  
Troy Hall  
Oregon State University, School of Forestry  
Professor & Department Head  
Forest Ecosystems & Society  
321B Richardson Hall  
Corvallis, OR 97331-5703  
541.737.1306  
Email: [Troy.Hall@oregonstate.edu](mailto:Troy.Hall@oregonstate.edu)
2. Co-PI:  
Ashley D'Antonio  
Oregon State University, School of Forestry  
Associate Professor  
Forest Ecosystems & Society  
321B Richardson Hall  
Corvallis, OR 97331-5703  
541.737.5043  
Email: [Ashley.D'Antonio@oregonstate.edu](mailto:Ashley.D'Antonio@oregonstate.edu)

- C. Communications: OSU will address any communication regarding this Task Agreement to the Awarding Officer, with a copy also sent to the ATR. Communications that relate solely to technical matters may be sent only to the ATR.

- D. Changes in Key Officials: Neither the NPS nor the OSU may make any permanent change in a key official without written notice to the other party reasonably in advance of the proposed change. The notice will include a justification with sufficient detail to permit evaluation of the impact of such a change on the scope of work specified within this Task Agreement. Any permanent change in key officials will be made only by modification to this Task Agreement.

#### ARTICLE VI – AWARD AND PAYMENT

- A. NPS will provide financial assistance to the OSU in the amount of \$344,484. for the work provided herein. The chargeable appropriation(s) and funding source(s) for this Task Agreement is as follows:

Fiscal Year:	Cost Structure:	Fund Source:	Amount:
2017	PPWGOGAB0 PFE00FEPR.YP0000 PX.PA207874A.00.1	Rec Fee	\$344,484.

- B. Payment Procedures: Advances/Reimbursements through the Automated Standard Application for Payments (ASAP) System
1. Method of Payment. Payment will be made to the recipient by advance and/or reimbursement through the Department of Treasury's ASAP system.
  2. Requesting Advances. Requests for advances must be made through the ASAP system. The recipient may submit requests as frequently as required to meet its needs to disburse funds for the Federal share of project costs. If feasible, the recipient should time each request so that payment is received on the same day that funds are dispersed for direct project costs and the proportionate share of any allowable indirect costs. If same-day transfers are not feasible, advance payments must be as close to actual disbursements as administratively feasible.
  3. Requesting Reimbursement. Requests for reimbursements must be made through the ASAP system. Requests for reimbursement should coincide with the recipient's normal billing pattern. Each request must be limited to the amount of disbursements made for the Federal share of direct project costs and the proportionate share of allowable indirect costs incurred during that billing period.
  4. Adjusting payment requests for available cash. The recipient must disburse any funds that are available from repayments to and interest earned on a revolving fund, program income, rebates, refunds, contract settlements, audit recoveries, credits, discounts, and interest earned on any of those funds before requesting additional cash payments from National Park Service.
  5. Payments. All payments are made by electronic funds transfer to the bank account identified on the ASAP Bank Information Form that the recipient filed with the U.S. Department of Treasury.
  6. Supporting Documents for Agency Approval of Payments. When a recipient is determined "high risk" or has had performance issues. If the Agency approval requirement is in effect for this award, the ASAP system will indicate that Agency approval is required when the request for payment is submitted. The recipient must notify the Agreement Technical Representative (ATR) identified in this agreement that a payment request has been submitted. The payment authorizing official may request additional information from the recipient to support the payment requests prior to release of funds, as deemed necessary. The recipient is required to comply with these requests. Supporting documents include invoices, copies of contracts, vendor quotes, and other expenditure explanations that justify the reimbursement requests.

**ARTICLE VII – PROJECT PRODUCTS**

A. Financial Reports: The OSU must submit Standard Form (SF) 425, “Federal Financial Report” (FFR), on a quarterly basis.

1. The FFRs may be submitted using one of the following methods:
  - a. One original, mailed to: Contracting Division, National Park Service, Pacific West Regional Office, 333 Bush Street, Suite 500, San Francisco, CA 94104
  - b. One scanned copy, emailed to: PWR\_Agreements@nps.gov
  - c. Electronic submission through FedConnect
2. The recipient will report program outlays and program income on a cash or accrual basis.
3. The first interim FFR will be due in accordance with the following table:

Award Performance Start Date	First Quarterly Interim Report End Date	First Quarterly Interim Report Due Date
April 1 – June 30	September 30	October 30
July 1 – September 30	December 31	January 30
October 1 – December 31	March 31	April 30
January 1 – March 31	June 30	July 30

4. Subsequent interim FFRs are due 30 calendar days after the end of each federal fiscal quarter which ends on December 31, March 31, June 30, and September 30.
5. The final FFR will be submitted 90 calendar days after the end of the term of agreement, or upon termination. Transactions which occurred after the award expired will also be included in the final reports. These expenses shall include wrap-up activities incurred during the project period and where the transaction occurred after the award expired. Transactions for the entire award period will be included in this final report and will reflect the transactions for the entire award amount.
6. All financial and programmatic records submitted by recipients, supporting documents, statistical records, and other grants-related records shall be maintained in accordance with 2 CFR § 200.333.

B. Performance Reports: The OSU must submit performance reports on a quarterly basis.

1. The performance reports may be submitted using one of the following methods:
  - a. One original, mailed to the ATR at the address shown in Article V, and to the following: Contracting Division, National Park Service, Pacific West Regional Office, 333 Bush Street, Suite 500, San Francisco, CA 94104
  - b. One copy, emailed to the ATR at the email address shown in Article V, and to the following: PWR\_Agreements@nps.gov
  - c. Electronic submission through FedConnect
2. The performance reports must detail the following, in accordance with [2 CFR §200.328](#):
  - a. A comparison of actual accomplishment to the objectives of the award established for the period;
  - b. The reason why goals were not met, if appropriate; and
  - c. Additional pertinent information including, when appropriate, analysis and explanation of cost overruns or high unit costs.
3. The first interim performance report will be due in accordance with the following table:

Award Performance	First Quarterly Interim	First Quarterly Interim
-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

Start Date	Report End Date	Report Due Date
April 1 – June 30	September 30	October 30
July 1 – September 30	December 31	January 30
October 1 – December 31	March 31	April 30
January 1 – March 31	June 30	July 30

4. Subsequent interim performance reports are due 30 calendar days after the end of each federal fiscal quarter which ends on December 31, March 31, June 30, and September 30.
5. The final performance report will be submitted no later than 90 calendar days following the end of the term of agreement, or upon termination.

C. Schedule/Milestones/Dates

1. OSU completes draft literature review and survey of literature to inform first site visit, by ~~7/5/17~~ 1/5/17.
2. OSU travels to GOGA (Field visit 1) to visit with specialists in field by ~~5/31/17~~ 5/31/17.
3. OSU submits draft meeting minutes from field trip 1, by ~~6/8/17~~ 6/8/17.
4. OSU completes and submits final literature review by ~~6/8/17~~ 6/8/17.
5. OSU travels to GOGA (Field visit 2) to visit selected sites and meet with NPS staff to discuss indicators; by ~~7/9/17~~ 7/9/17.
6. OSU submits draft meeting minutes from field trip 2; by ~~7/9/17~~ 7/9/17.
7. OSU completes and submits draft visitor use and ecological matrix and assessment report, and NPS submits ~~this report matrix~~ to external reviewers; by ~~8/10/17~~ 8/10/17.
8. NPS reviews (internal) draft matrix, submits comments to OSU by ~~8/10/17~~ 8/10/17.
9. NPS completes external peer review of matrix and proposed representative indicators with range of potential standards, by ~~9/11/17~~ 9/11/17.
10. OSU submits Final visitor use and ecological matrix ~~report~~ by ~~9/11/17~~ 9/11/17.
11. OSU and NPS: Hold workshop to select indicators and range of potential standards tied to approaching levels of adverse effects, by ~~9/11/17~~ 9/11/17.
12. OSU delivers recommendations on technology and software to be used for capturing dog monitoring field data, by ~~10/2/17~~ 10/2/17.
13. OSU completes initial draft of GOGA dog management monitoring field guide and protocols by ~~11/04/17~~ 11/04/17.
14. NPS submits draft field guide and protocols (with indicators and standards) to three external peer reviewers by ~~11/11/17~~ 11/11/17.
15. NPS submits (internal) review comments on draft final field guide and protocols to OSU by ~~11/20/17~~ 11/20/17.
16. NPS returns external peer review comments on draft field guide, protocols, indicators and standards to OSU by ~~12/3/17~~ 12/3/17.
17. OSU and NPS: Hold 3 Public meetings by ~~2/4/18~~ 2/4/18.
18. OSU completes meeting/workshop minutes/notes summary, by ~~2/4/18~~ 2/4/18.
19. OSU finalizes draft final dog monitoring field guide and protocols (following public workshops), by ~~3/5/18~~ 3/5/18.
20. NPS reviews and provides final input by ~~4/6/18~~ 4/6/18.
21. OSU submits final dog monitoring protocols and field guide, by ~~5/7/18~~ 5/7/18.
22. OSU travels to GOGA to ~~field~~ train staff on data collection ~~and monitoring~~ protocols ~~and monitoring~~ QA/QC by ~~6/8/18~~ 6/8/18.
23. NPS initiates full monitoring program by ~~8/6/18~~ 8/6/18 through ~~10/8/18~~ 10/8/18 and provides data to OSU by ~~9/11/18~~ 9/11/18.

Commented [C10]: A minimum of 2 months will be needed to complete 3 external reviews

24. OSU completes draft technical annual monitoring report (containing integrated data analyses, findings and recommendations) with draft public summary by 10/30/18.
25. OSU and NPS: hold video conference to discuss technical annual monitoring report, by 11/15/18.
26. NPS reviews draft technical annual monitoring report and submits comments to OSU, 11/30/18.
27. OSU submits final technical monitoring report to NPS, by 12/31/18.

D. Description of Project Products/Reports

1. The literature review will be submitted in Word format.
  2. Draft and final visitor use and ecological matrix (in Excel format) and assessment report (Word format) will outline the core visitor experience and resource impact issues which are being protected at the study locations.
  3. ~~Work plan (in Word format) will outline the project methods and timeline for achieving objectives and for specifying task items for OSU and NPS team members.~~
  4. ~~Report (in Word format) on technology and software choices for capturing field monitoring data with recommendations for application at GOGA.~~
  5. ~~Minutes and notes from the public meetings (in Word format) that will contain key issues to address regarding the dog monitoring program and recommended follow up action.~~
  6. The draft and final report (in Word format) will consist of the GOGA dog management monitoring protocols and field guide for implementation. Below follows a recommended checklist to ensure that all the needed sections, chapters, and critical instructions of the protocol are included. This checklist serves only as a guide for both constructing and evaluating the draft protocol. OSU may submit a different format and content for NPS review and approval. This recommended format for the protocol consists of three basic sections:  
Section 1, Narrative;  
Section 2, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs);  
Section 3, Appendices and/or Supplementary Material  
These sections are based on the model provided in Oakley et al. 2003 (Guidelines for long-term monitoring protocols. Wildlife Society Bulletin 31(4):1000-1003).  
The Narrative is divided into chapters that include a summary or overview of the detailed information in one or more SOPs or Appendices. The Chapters are:  
Chapter 1 – Background and Objectives,  
Chapter 2 – Sampling Design,  
Chapter 3 – Field Methods,  
Chapter 4 – Data Analysis, Handling, and Reporting,  
Chapter 5 – Operational Requirements,  
Chapter 6 – Personnel Requirement and Training,  
Chapter 7 – Literature Cited  
Chapters do not have to correspond exactly with the Chapters identified here if another organization makes more sense. SOPs may be organized into a separate volume or be in the same volume with the Narrative.
74. Report (in Word format) on technology and software choices for capturing field monitoring data with recommendations for application at GOGA.
  5. Microsoft access database, or other software package identified as part of technology review, for use with GOGA dog monitoring data will include data entry form that matches field data collection forms.
  6. Minutes and notes from the public meetings (in Word format) that will contain key issues to address regarding the dog monitoring program and recommended follow up action.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.25"

7. Annual technical monitoring report (in Word format) that includes analysis on dog monitoring data collected by NPS during 2018, and contains a 3 to 5 page executive summary.

E. Delivery of Project Products

1. Financial and performance reports will be submitted in accordance with Article VII.A. and VII.B., respectively.
2. One electronic (pdf) and four hard copies of all products will be submitted to the NPS PM at the address shown in Article V, NPS Key Officials.
3. One electronic (pdf) copy of the final report will be submitted to the Chief, NPS Social Science office, Attn: Bret Meldrum.
4. One electronic (pdf) copy of the final report will be submitted to the NPS Pacific Northwest CESU Senior Science Advisor.
5. One electronic (pdf) copy of the final report will be submitted to: Carol Simpson, Technical Information Center, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, carol\_simpson@nps.gov.

**ARTICLE VIII – PRIOR APPROVAL**

The recipient shall obtain prior approval for budget and program revisions, in accordance with 2 CFR § 200.308.

**ARTICLE IX – CLOSEOUT PROCEDURES**

- A. This Task Agreement shall be closed out in accordance with the procedures stated in 2 CFR §§200.343-345.
- B. The recipient shall submit, within 90 calendar days after the end date of the award, all financial, performance, property, and other reports as required by the terms and conditions of the award. NPS may approve extensions when requested by the recipient.
- C. Unless NPS authorizes an extension, the recipient shall liquidate all obligations incurred under the award not later than 90 calendar days after the end date of the agreement.
- D. The recipient shall promptly refund any balances of unobligated cash that NPS has advanced or paid and that are not authorized to be retained by the recipient for use in other projects.
- E. The recipient shall account for any real and personal property acquired with Federal funds or received from NPS in accordance with 2 CFR §§200.310-316.

**ARTICLE X – GENERAL AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS**

A. Special Provisions:

1. Recipient Employee Whistleblower Rights and Requirement to Inform Employees of Whistleblower Rights.
  - a. This award and employees working on this financial assistance agreement will be subject to the whistleblower rights and remedies in the pilot program on Award Recipient employee whistleblower protections established at 41 U.S.C. 4712 by section 828 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Pub. L. 112-239).

- b. The Award Recipient shall inform its employees in writing, in the predominant language of the workforce, of employee whistleblower rights and protections under 41 U.S.C. 4712.
  - c. The Award Recipient shall insert the substance of this clause, including this paragraph (c), in all subawards or subcontracts over the simplified acquisition threshold, 42 CFR § 52.203-17 (as referenced in 42 CFR § 3.908-9).
2. Conflict of Interest.
- a. The Recipient must establish safeguards to prohibit its employees and Sub-recipients from using their positions for purposes that constitute or present the appearance of a personal or organizational conflict of interest. The Recipient is responsible for notifying the Awarding Officer in writing of any actual or potential conflicts of interest that may arise during the life of this award. Conflicts of interest include any relationship or matter which might place the Recipient or its employees in a position of conflict, real or apparent, between their responsibilities under the agreement and any other outside interests. Conflicts of interest may also include, but are not limited to, direct or indirect financial interests, close personal relationships, positions of trust in outside organizations, consideration of future employment arrangements with a different organization, or decision-making affecting the award that would cause a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts to question the impartiality of the Recipient and/or Recipient's employees and Sub-recipients in the matter.
  - b. The Awarding Officer and the servicing Ethics Counselor will determine if a conflict of interest exists. If a conflict of interest exists, the Awarding Officer will determine whether a mitigation plan is feasible. Mitigation plans must be approved by the Awarding Officer in writing.
  - c. Failure to resolve conflicts of interest in a manner that satisfies the government may be cause for termination of the award. Failure to make required disclosures may result in any of the remedies described in 2 CFR § 200.338, Remedies/or Noncompliance, including suspension or debarment (see also 2 CFR Part 180).
3. Reporting Subawards and Executive Compensation.
- a. Reporting of first-tier subawards.
    - 1. Applicability. Unless you are exempt as provided in paragraph D. of this award term, you must report each action that obligates \$25,000 or more in Federal funds that does not include Recovery Act funds (as defined in section 1512(a)(2) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Pub. L. 111-5) for a subaward to an entity (see definitions in paragraph E. of this award term).
    - 2. Where and when to report.
      - i. You must report each obligating action described in paragraph A.1. of this award term to <http://www.fsrs.gov>.
      - ii. For subaward information, report no later than the end of the month following the month in which the obligation was made. (For example, if the obligation was made on November 7, 2010, the obligation must be reported by no later than December 31, 2010.)
    - 3. What to report. You must report the information about each obligating action that the submission instructions posted at <http://www.fsrs.gov> specify.
  - b. Reporting Total Compensation of Recipient Executives.
    - 1. Applicability and what to report. You must report total compensation for each of your five most highly compensated executives for the preceding completed fiscal year, if—
      - i. The total Federal funding authorized to date under this award is \$25,000 or more;



- ii. In the preceding fiscal year, you received—
  - a. 80 percent or more of your annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts) and Federal financial assistance subject to the Transparency Act, as defined at 2 CFR 170.320 (and subawards); and
  - b. \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts) and Federal financial assistance subject to the Transparency Act, as defined at 2 CFR 170.320 (and subawards); and
- iii. The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. (To determine if the public has access to the compensation information, see the U.S. Security and Exchange Commission total compensation filings at <http://www.sec.gov/answers/execomp.htm>.)
2. Where and when to report. You must report executive total compensation described in paragraph A.1. of this award term:
  - i. As part of your registration profile at <https://www.sam.gov>.
  - ii. By the end of the month following the month in which this award is made, and annually thereafter.
- c. Reporting of Total Compensation of Subrecipient Executives.
  1. Applicability and what to report. Unless you are exempt as provided in paragraph D. of this award term, for each first-tier subrecipient under this award, you shall report the names and total compensation of each of the subrecipient's five most highly compensated executives for the subrecipient's preceding completed fiscal year, if—
    - i. In the subrecipient's preceding fiscal year, the subrecipient received—
      - a. 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts) and Federal financial assistance subject to the Transparency Act, as defined at 2 CFR 170.320 (and subawards); and
      - b. \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts), and Federal financial assistance subject to the Transparency Act (and subawards); and
    - ii. The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. (To determine if the public has access to the compensation information, see the U.S. Security and Exchange Commission total compensation filings at <http://www.sec.gov/answers/execomp.htm>.)
  2. Where and when to report. You must report subrecipient executive total compensation described in paragraph c.1. of this award term:
    - i. To the recipient.
    - ii. By the end of the month following the month during which you make the subaward. For example, if a subaward is obligated on any date during the month of October of a given year (i.e., between October 1 and 31), you must report any required compensation information of the subrecipient by November 30 of that year.
- d. Exemptions.
  1. If, in the previous tax year, you had gross income, from all sources, under \$300,000, you are exempt from the requirements to report:
    - i. Subawards, and
    - ii. The total compensation of the five most highly compensated executives of any subrecipient.
- e. Definitions. For purposes of this award term:

1. Entity means all of the following, as defined in 2 CFR part 25:
  - i. A Governmental organization, which is a State, local government, or Indian tribe;
  - ii. A foreign public entity;
  - iii. A domestic or foreign nonprofit organization;
  - iv. A domestic or foreign for-profit organization;
  - v. A Federal agency, but only as a subrecipient under an award or subaward to a non-Federal entity.
2. Executive means officers, managing partners, or any other employees in management positions.
3. Subaward:
  - i. This term means a legal instrument to provide support for the performance of any portion of the substantive project or program for which you received this award and that you as the recipient award to an eligible subrecipient.
  - ii. The term includes your procurement of property and services needed to carry out the project or program. The term does not include procurement of incidental property and services needed to carry out the award project or program.
  - iii. A subaward may be provided through any legal agreement, including an agreement that you or a subrecipient considers a contract.
4. Subrecipient means an entity that:
  - i. Receives a subaward from you (the recipient) under this award; and
  - ii. Is accountable to you for the use of the Federal funds provided by the subaward.
5. Total compensation means the cash and noncash dollar value earned by the executive during the recipient's or subrecipient's preceding fiscal year and includes the following (for more information see 17 CFR 229.402(c)(2)):
  - i. Salary and bonus.
  - ii. Awards of stock, stock options, and stock appreciation rights. Use the dollar amount recognized for financial statement reporting purposes with respect to the fiscal year in accordance with the Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 123 (Revised 2004) (FAS 123R), Shared Based Payments.
  - iii. Earnings for services under non-equity incentive plans. This does not include group life, health, hospitalization or medical reimbursement plans that do not discriminate in favor of executives, and are available generally to all salaried employees.
  - iv. Change in pension value. This is the change in present value of defined benefit and actuarial pension plans.
  - v. Above-market earnings on deferred compensation which is not tax-qualified.
  - vi. Other compensation, if the aggregate value of all such other compensation (e.g. severance, termination payments, value of life insurance paid on behalf of the employee, prerequisites or property) for the executive exceeds \$10,000.
4. System for Award Management and Universal Identifier Requirements.
  - a. Requirement for System for Award Management

Unless you are exempted from this requirement under 2 CFR 25.110, you as the recipient must maintain the currency of your information in the SAM until you submit the final financial report required under this award or receive the final payment, whichever is later. This requires that you review and update the information at least annually after the initial registration, and more frequently if required by changes in your information or another award term.

b. Requirement for unique entity identifier

If you are authorized to make subawards under this award, you:

1. Must notify potential subrecipients that no entity (see definition in paragraph C of this award term) may receive a subaward from you unless the entity has provided its unique entity identifier to you.
2. May not make a subaward to an entity unless the entity has provided its unique entity identifier to you.

c. Definitions

For purposes of this award term:

1. System for Award Management (SAM) means the Federal repository into which an entity must provide information required for the conduct of business as a recipient. Additional information about registration procedures may be found at the SAM Internet site (currently at <http://www.sam.gov>).
2. Unique entity identifier means the identifier required for SAM registration to uniquely identify business entities.
3. Entity, as it is used in this award term, means all of the following, as defined at 2 CFR part 25, subpart C:
  - i. A Governmental organization, which is a State, local government, or Indian Tribe;
  - ii. A foreign public entity;
  - iii. A domestic or foreign nonprofit organization;
  - iv. A domestic or foreign for-profit organization; and
  - v. A Federal agency, but only as a subrecipient under an award or subaward to a non-Federal entity.
4. Subaward:
  - i. This term means a legal instrument to provide support for the performance of any portion of the substantive project or program for which you received this award and that you as the recipient award to an eligible subrecipient.
  - ii. The term does not include your procurement of property and services needed to carry out the project or program (for further explanation, see 2 CFR 200.330).
  - iii. A subaward may be provided through any legal agreement, including an agreement that you consider a contract.
5. Subrecipient means an entity that:
  - i. Receives a subaward from you under this award; and
  - ii. Is accountable to you for the use of the Federal funds provided by the subaward.

## ARTICLE XI – ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are hereby incorporated into this Task Agreement. In the event of any apparent conflict between the terms of the Task Agreement and the attachments, the terms of the Task Agreement, including its designations and modifications, will prevail.

- A. List of Golden Gate National Recreation Area Areas Considered for Dog Management Monitoring
- B. Budget
- C. Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance (incorporated by reference)
- D. Standard Form 424A, Budget Information (incorporated by reference)
- E. Standard Form 424B, Assurances – Non-Construction Programs (incorporated by reference)
- F. Standard Form 425, Federal Financial Report (incorporated by reference)

**\*Grants.gov lobbying form required at \$100,000.\***

G. Certification Regarding Lobbying from Grants.gov (incorporated by reference)

**\*SF-LLL required at \$100,000 if the recipient participates in lobbying activities.\***

H. Standard Form LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (incorporated by reference)

**ARTICLE XII – SIGNATURES**

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Task Agreement on the date(s) set forth below.

**FOR THE OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Aedra McCarthy  
Senior Grant and Contract Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**FOR THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lilette J. Baltodano  
Financial Assistance Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Attachment A – List of Golden Gate National Recreation Area Areas Considered for Dog Management Monitoring**

Maps of sites are available at ~~may be viewed on the following weblink:~~  
<https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=303&projectID=11759&documentID=55416>

<b>Marin County</b>
Stinson Beach (parking lots/picnic areas only; northern access trail to Upton beach)
Homestead Valley
Alta Trail / Orchard Trail
Oakwood Valley
Muir Beach
Rodeo Beach & Vicinity/Marin Headlands
Rodeo Valley/Marin Headlands
Fort Baker
<b>San Francisco County</b>
Fort Mason
Crissy Field (including Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area, WPA)
Fort Point Promenade / Fort Point National Historic Site (NHS) Trails
Baker Beach and Bluffs to Golden Gate Bridge
Fort Miley
Lands End
Sutro Heights Park
Ocean Beach (including Ocean Beach Snowy Plover Protection Area, SPPA)
Fort Funston
<b>San Mateo County</b>
Mori Point
Milagra Ridge
Sweeney Ridge (including Baquiano trail)
Rancho Corral de Tierra

Formatted Table

Attachment B - Budget

**Budget**  
**Development of Dog Management Monitoring Program and Protocols**  
**for Golden Gate National Recreation Area**  
**Principal Investigator: Dr. Troy Hall**  
**03/28/2017 - 12/31/2018**

Category	Description	Rate	Units	Amount	Total
<b>SALARIES</b>		monthly	months		
	PI - Troy Hall	\$14,146.	1.9	\$26,897.74	
	Co-PI - Ashley D'Antonio	\$9,155.59	3.4	\$31,129.00	
	Other Professional - Lisa Ganio	\$9,579.05	2.1	\$20,116.00	
	Graduate Student (MS)	\$3,873	2.94	\$11,389.62	
	Postdoc RA	\$1,931.20	8.75	\$16,898.00	
	<b>Subtotal</b>				\$106,411.07
<b>BENEFITS</b>					
	Lead PI - Troy Hall	40%		\$10,750.96	
	CoPI - Ashley D'Antonio	46%		\$14,319.34	
	Other Professional - Lisa Ganio	44%		\$8,851.04	
	Graduate Student (MS)	34%		\$3,871.45	
	PostdocRA	95%		\$16,053.10	
	<b>Subtotal</b>				\$35,968.85
<b>TRAVEL</b>	(see narrative for details)	per trip	# people		
	GOGA field visit 1	\$2,264	3	\$6,792	
	GOGA field visit 2	\$2,264	3	\$6,792	
	GOGA workshop	\$1,977	4	\$7,908	
	Public meetings	\$2,264	3	\$6,792	
	Train field staff	\$1,612	1	\$1,612	
Optional(TBD & approved by NPS)	Presentation of results at a professional scientific Social & Natural Science meeting	\$2,789	3	\$8,367	
	<b>Subtotal</b>				\$38,263
<b>SUPPLIES</b>					
	Books & Printed materials, including field supplies	\$500	1	\$500	
	<b>Subtotal</b>				\$1,500
<b>OTHER FEES &amp; SERVICES</b>					
	Facilitator Fees (SF public meetings)	\$1,500	3	\$4,500	
	Consultant - Deonne VanderWoude	\$35,923	1	\$35,923	
	Consultant - Jules Evens	\$11,796	1	\$11,796	

Commented [C11]: Is this correct? Seems excessive  
 Formatted: Highlight  
 Formatted: Highlight

Commented [C12]: Please list here (or below) items to be purchased, ie, lab notebooks, write in the rain paper, thumb drives, pens, paper, etc

	Consultant - Jeremy Wimpey	\$10,800	1	\$10,800	
	Consultants (GIS, database development, and document production support)	\$23,000	1	\$23,000	
<b>Subtotal</b>					<b>\$86,019</b>
<b>TUITION</b>	(exempt from indirect costs)				
	Grad tuition - 2 academic terms	4581	2	\$9,1562	
<b>Subtotal</b>					<b>\$9,5162</b>
<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>					<b>\$294,602196.</b>
					<b>91</b>
<b>INDIRECT COSTS</b>	MTDC	17.5%		\$285,040034	
				.91	\$49,8821.10
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>					<b>\$344,484078.</b>
					<b>01</b>

**Budget Narrative**

*Budgets and justifications have been reviewed and institutionally approved by OSU Office of Sponsored Research and Award Administration. All OSU budget amounts are rounded to nearest dollar and include latest rates and amounts that adhere to institutional guidelines.*

Commented [C13]: NPS doesn't round  
 Commented [SM14]: Rates and budget have been reviewed and approved by OSU

**Salaries & Wages—~~\$106,411~~**

- Troy Hall (PI) will coordinate work among the project team, guide overall development of monitoring approaches, provide review of documents and deliverables, facilitate meetings with National Park Service staff, and participate as subject matter expert in public meetings.
- Ashley D'Antonio (co-PI) will be lead subject matter expert related to ecological impacts of dogs (e.g., impacts to birds, wildlife, and vegetation), including development of indicators and creation of monitoring protocols for those indicators. She will also be responsible for reviewing and coordinating field geospatial analyses and products necessary for protocols. She will participate in all field visits, serve as subject matter expert during public meetings, and work with contractor on staff training.
- Lisa Ganio will be the project statistician, responsible for developing sampling plans and drafting the narrative justifications for sampling. She will participate in site visits and serve as subject matter expert during public meetings.
- Postdoc Research Associate will participate in travel to San Francisco, be responsible for literature review, lead writing on the protocol with input from others, and developing and submitting all meeting minutes.
- Graduate Student (GRA) salary (for a MS student) is included for two terms (summer and fall, 2017) to conduct data analysis and draft the example report.

**Fringe Benefits—~~\$53,847~~**

Fringe benefits follow institutionally approved guidelines and are as shown in table. *Application of rates to salary are rounded to nearest dollar.*

Commented [C15]: We use cents, with no rounding (actual cents)

**Travel – Domestic—~~\$38,263~~**

NOTE- These funds are for OSU travel only. Consultant travel costs for VanderWoude, Wimpey and Evans are included in the consultant services budget below.

- GOGA field visits: 3 OSU employees x 2 trips travel to San Francisco (GOGA field visits and meetings with park specialists). Costs per person per trip are calculated as follows: RT airfare \$650 plus per diem \$68/day x 6 days+ \$200/night x 5 nights for 3 persons = \$6,174; ground transportation of airport shuttle, \$390; rental car\_=\$228; per -trip total = \$6792 (or \$2264/per). ~~2 trips = \$13,584.~~
- GOGA workshop: 4 OSU employees travel to San Francisco to conduct a 3-day workshop with GOGA leadership. Costs for the trip are calculated as follows: RT airfare \$650 plus per diem \$68/day x 5 days+ \$200/night x 4 nights (= \$1790/per) for 4 persons = \$7160; airport shuttle \$520; rental car\_=\$228; trip total = \$7908 (or \$1977/per).-
- Public Meetings: 3 OSU employees travel to San Francisco to facilitate public meetings. Costs for the trip are calculated as follows: airfare \$650 plus per diem \$68/day x 6 days+ \$200/night x 5 nights for 3 persons = \$6174; airport shuttle\_-\$390-; rental car\_=\$228; trip total = \$6792 (or \$2264/per).
- Train field staff: 1 OSU employee travels to San Francisco to train field staff on adopted protocols. Costs for the trip are calculated as follows: airfare \$650 plus per diem \$68/day x 3 days+ \$200/night x 2 nights for 1 person = \$1254; ground transportation \$130; rental car\_ \$228-; per trip total = \$1612.
- ~~Option in budget~~ Professional Conference Presentation: 3 OSU employees travel to professional meeting(location TBD) to present results from the project. Costs for the trip are estimated as follows: RT airfare \$800 plus per diem \$68/day x 6 days+ \$200/night x 5 nights for 3 persons= \$6624-; ground transportation \$390; registration \$1125; rental car\_=\$228-; trip total- = \$8367 (or \$2789/per).

**Supplies—\$500**

Field supplies and printing materials for meetings, trainings and field work.

Commented [LCL16]: Need itemization here, similar to travel expenses. List items, how many units per, cost per unit, etc

**Other Fees & Services—\$86,019.**

- \$4500 is requested to hire a facilitator who will run 3 public meetings in San Francisco estimated at \$1500 per meeting.
- Consultant Services (Contracts)
  - \$35,923. - Deonne VanderWoude is a national leader in monitoring impacts of dogs. She will be the lead subject matter expert for all work related to describing and monitoring human impacts of dogs (visitor conflict, dog behavior, etc). She will be the lead author on all documents. She will participate in all field visits and work with D'Antonio on staff training.
  - \$10,800 - Jeremy Wimpey is a national leader on geospatial techniques used in monitoring ecological impacts of recreation. He will provide review and consultation services.
  - \$11,796 - Jules Evans is a specialist of endangered shorebirds. He will provide expertise regarding the location and identification of species of concern, input on relevant indicators, and review of protocols for monitoring impacts to birds.
  - 23,000 – Consultants to provide support for GIS, developing a database and data management issues, and document development support.

**Tuition - \$9,150**

Graduate student tuition and fees for 2 academic terms are included in the budget. Per term cost is \$4,575~~81~~ and is exempt from indirect costs.



DRAFT