

RFA # 1410200115

New York State Department of Health Center for Community Health Bureau of Chronic Disease Control

Prostate Cancer Research

Updates, Questions and Answers

UPDATES

1. Two new documents, a sample work plan and a sample budget, have been developed and are posted to the Department of Health's website as part of this questions and answer document.
2. The number of awards and award amounts for each of the three eligible applicant categories as listed on RFA pages 1 and 2 have been revised as indicated below and in the revised Attachment 1 that is part of this question and answer document.

The following has been updated/modified in the RFA. Strike-through indicates deleted text; underlined/bolded text is new.

Category 1:

- Each of these three (3) institutions are eligible to apply for:
 - ~~○ Awards for up to three (3) hypothesis development prostate cancer research projects.~~
 - **Each of the three awards are valued at no more than \$150,000 for a potential Up to and no more than a total grant value of \$450,000 in awards to each of above named institutions.**
 - The awards will be for a two-year period, anticipated to begin March 1, 2015, and end February 28, 2017.

Category 2:

- Each of these three (3) institutions are eligible to apply for:
 - ~~○ Awards for up to two (2) hypothesis development prostate cancer research projects.~~
 - **Each of the two awards are valued at no more than \$150,000 for a potential Up to and no more than a total grant value of \$300,000 in awards to each of above named institutions.**
 - The awards will be for a two-year period, anticipated to begin March 1, 2015, and end February 28, 2017.

Category 3:

- Each of these 23 institutions are eligible to apply for:
 - ~~○ One (1) hypothesis development prostate cancer research project.~~
 - **The research project is valued at Up to and no more than \$75,000.**

- The awards will be for a 15-month period, anticipated to begin March 1, 2015, and end May 31, 2016.

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

Type of Research Studies Supported with this Funding Opportunity

Question 1: Should the studies be clinical studies - meaning directly related to patients and their care or can they be laboratory based?

Answer 1: Funds are to be used to support innovative, hypothesis-developing research, the results of which could provide the scientific rationale upon which new hypotheses or initial proofs-of-principle of innovative hypotheses can be generated. Funds are to be used for research that is either determined to be no greater than minimal risk, exempt under 32 CFR 219.101(b) or eligible for expedited review under 32 CFR 219.110 or 21 CFR 56.110 by the local Institutional Review Board (IRB) of record. As long as the research follows these guidelines, it is not limited to a specific type of research study.

Question 2: There is mention of a later RFP for support and education programs.

What I would like to propose under this RFP is a study of men and their partners, with differential racial/ethnic backgrounds, focused on their experiences with prostate cancer treatment and follow-up, and perhaps also, long-term (1-5 – 10 years) consequences and needs for health and other services. The rationale is to understand consumer needs, the impact on spouses or other close family member, or caregiver of the person who has had prostate cancer, especially in ethnic/racial groups where prostate cancer is most prevalent.

Does that type of proposal for a study fall under the current request for applications – or – are you really only interested in new avenues for prostate treatment in this RFA?

Answer 2: The research addressed by this RFA is not limited to hypothesis-developing research in prostate cancer treatment and can include hypothesis-developing research in other areas. Please see response to question 1.

Principal Investigators (PIs) and Eligible Investigators (Researchers)

Question 3: What is the role of the PI of the grant? Are they the principal researcher on the specific research projects? Or, is this the point person for determining which projects to review, fund and designate allocation of funding?

Question 4: Can multiple principal investigators be designated if the expectation is that multiple awards will be made by the campus (assuming that is allowable)?

Answer 3 and 4: As per, *Attachments and Instructions*, RFA page 8, the grant PI is defined as, “The PI is the investigator designated by the applicant organization within New York State who is responsible for planning, coordinating and implementing all aspects of the work plan if an award is made. The PI will act as liaison between the awarded organization and the Department, and be required to fulfill reporting requirements and submit any revised budgets co-signed by an authorized organizational representative. A Co-PI shares responsibility with the PI for oversight of the entire contract; a co-investigator may be responsible for a specific component of the work plan.”

The applicant institution may designate multiple PIs for each research project that they in turn fund as a result of this grant award, but those PIs are not listed on the face page of this application, nor are they considered the PIs for this grant, as defined above.

Question 5: It is stated in the RFA that the senior level principal investigator will provide oversight of the research projects and act as liaison between the awarded organization and the Department. Therefore, is it acceptable for the Sr. level PI to oversee the research as well as participate in the research work?

Answer 5: Yes, it is acceptable for the PI to also participate in the research work.

Question 6: Does the PI on the application have to recuse themselves from being one of the individual grants being funded by the program - OR can this be addressed by the peer review process?

Answer 6: The PI may be an investigator receiving a research award from the institution; this arrangement can be addressed by the institution's peer review process.

Question 7: The RFP indicates that one requirement of eligible investigators is "affiliation to the eligible institutions." Affiliation is then defined as "employees or contracted entities." Can this affiliation requirement be expanded to include what I would call "discussants?" I define discussants as scientists with whom, over the past year, we have been conferring about a possible prostate cancer collaborative proposal to the NIH, *but only conferred at this stage*. If the answer to my first question is yes, the second question (question 8) is no longer relevant.

Question 8: Can this affiliation requirement be expanded to include "discussants" -- scientists with whom we have conferred about a possible grant proposal -- who are employed at other institutions included in the RFP's list of "eligible institutions"?

Answer 7 and 8: Discussants, as defined in question 7, may be eligible investigators if they are at or above the level of postdoctoral fellow (or equivalent) and are employees of or are contracted entities of the institutions listed in the table under *Eligibility* on page two of the RFA. Investigators may be considered contracted entities under the institution's research project if they are procured via consultant contracts, memoranda of understanding, or other types of agreements. Investigators may be considered eligible whether they are funded on the grant or not (e.g, employees providing in-kind services not funded on the grant, or, contracted entities providing services via an agreement between two research institutions, not funded on the grant). Steps to acquire the contracts or agreements should be listed in the *Work plan Template*, Attachment 4, submitted with the application and in response to the second statement on the *Institutional Commitment to Prostate Cancer Research*, Attachment 3, which asks applicants to describe the institution's plans for research awards, including their process for ensuring the funds will be awarded to investigators that meet the stated criteria.

Eligible Institutions

Question 9: Must the application come directly from the Institution's Cancer Center?

Answer 9: The application should be submitted by the eligible institutions listed in the table under *Eligibility* in the RFA (second page, after the letterhead). It is understood that some of the eligible institutions administer all grant funding through a bona fide agent. In instances where that is the established norm, the bona fide agent will submit the application on behalf of the eligible institution listed on the table under eligibility.

Question 10: We have noted that our institution is listed as eligible under Category 2 as “Albert Einstein College of Medicine/Cancer Center.”

Does this indicate that the Einstein Cancer Center has been invited to apply OR that Einstein has been invited as a Category 2 applicant by virtue of our NIH-funded cancer center?
In other words, must the application be submitted by our cancer center?

Answer 10: The application should be submitted by the eligible institution, which is the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, as listed in the table under *Eligibility* in the RFA.

Question 11: Roswell Park Cancer Institute is designated as an eligible institution under Category 1 along with the other two NCI-designated comprehensive cancer centers in New York State. All grants awarded to Roswell Park Cancer Institute, including the Cancer Center Support Grant from the NCI, are administered through Health Research Inc., Roswell Park Division. Therefore, Health Research Inc., Roswell Park Division will be applying on behalf of Roswell Park Cancer Institute as a Category 1 institution. Please clarify that this understanding is correct. Thank you.

Answer 11: That is correct, Health Research Inc., Roswell Park Division should apply for Category 1 on behalf of Roswell Park Cancer Institute.

Developing Work Plans and Budgets

Question 12: Are there EXAMPLES of this type of application that are available that we can see what exactly you are looking for.

Answer 12: A sample work plan and a sample budget have been provided as an update and supplied as part of the question and answer document.

Question 13: Am I correct that the work plan required for the proposal details not the scientific methodology for the project, but simply the selection process the University will use to determine which of our campus’ projects receive funding?

Question 14: Do I understand correctly that the application should NOT have the projects that will be considered for funding but should only include the process by which they will be selected?

Answer 13 and 14: Yes. The work plan should not include the scientific methodology for the project, nor should it include descriptions of the intended research projects that will be considered for funding by the institution. The work plan submitted by applicants should describe the tasks that will be implemented to: 1) identify appropriate research projects and investigators that meet the funding sponsor criteria; 2) acquire peer review for proposed research projects; 3) engage investigators, initiate and monitor progress on research projects and 4) conduct administrative and fiscal oversight to ensure completion of all required deliverables.

Question 15: Our institution fits into Category 1, will each project need to be defined when the application is submitted?

Answer 15: No, each project will not need to be defined when the application is submitted. Please see the answer to questions 13 and 14.

Question 16: Assuming that (above, question 15) is correct - how shall we develop a budget? We usually develop a budget based on the projects.

Answer 16: A sample work plan and budget has been provided as an update and supplied as part of this question and answer document.

Additionally, as stated in *Developing the Budget Proposal*, Attachment 9, RFA page 31, “Care should be taken to record the true budgetary needs of the application, to the best of the institution’s ability at this stage of the application process. Proposed budgets are expected to incorporate cost of living increases and other reasonably-anticipated adjustments that may be necessary throughout the contract term. **Note: Budgets may be adjusted upon notice of award and contract negotiation with successful applicants as necessary. Budget modifications may be made throughout the contract term as needed based on identification of research projects and investigators and successful institutional peer reviews of proposed projects and will be reviewed, and if appropriate, approved by Department staff.**”

Note that while budget modifications may be made throughout the contract term, the total contract value of the budgets should not exceed those indicated for each applicant/institution category, as listed in the Revised Attachment 1, *Eligible Institutions and Awards*, which is part of this question and answer document.

Question 17: Attachment 9 indicates that we should include budgets pertaining to the research proposed projects. Do you want us to conduct the internal peer review process in advance of submitting this application? If not, how are we to collect accurate information to complete the budget forms?

Answer 17: No. It is not necessary to conduct the internal peer review process in advance of submitting the application. Budgets should be developed using the funding amounts listed in Revised Attachment 1, *Eligible Institutions and Awards*, which is part of this question and answer document, with estimates of personnel and other than personnel costs to the best of the institutions’ abilities at this stage in the application process. Please see responses to questions 13, 14 and 16.

Question 18: Are separate budgets required for each research project?

Answer 18: No, separate budgets are not required for each of the research projects. But, if the information is known, applicants may indicate in the appropriate budget sections with which projects the proposed funded staff, consultants, supplies, travel, and other budget lines are associated. Please see the sample budget included as an update and supplied as part of this questions and answer document for an example of this type of budget proposal.

Question 19: (For Category 1 Institutions) - Is each project to budget a maximum annual amount of \$75,000? \$75,000 x 3 projects for 2 years = \$450,000?

Answer 19: There is no maximum annual amount, as long as the total two-year budget value does not exceed \$450,000. Please see Updates section above for changes in the number of research projects Category 1 institutions may support.

Question 20: Can a Category 3 institution apply for more than one study per grant?

Answer 20: Yes. Please see Updates section above for changes in the number of research projects Category 3 institutions may support. Category 3 institutions may support any number of research projects, as long as the proposed funding does not exceed the Category 3 institution project value of \$75,000 over the course of the 15-month period.

Question 21: On page 2 of the RFA, it states that Binghamton University may apply for “one (1) hypothesis development...project,” valued at \$75,000 or less. In this context, is the “project” considered the award made to Binghamton University, which must then be distributed through our internal selection process? That is, can the one \$75,000 award be split among several different hypothesis development projects on campus?

Answer 21: Yes. Please see Updates section above for changes in the number of research projects that Category 3 institutions may support. Please also see the answer to question 20.

Question 22: To confirm the amounts available for Category 2 applicants: Maximum request may be two projects of \$150K each, which will include both direct and indirect costs of 15% - i.e. Can we request total funds of \$300K?

Answer 22: Please see the Updates section above for changes to the number of research projects and the funding to support each project. Category 2 applicants may support any number of research projects, as long as the total proposed funding does not exceed the Category 2 institution project value of \$300,000 over the course of the two-year period. Category 2 institutions may request a total of \$300,000 to include both direct and indirect costs.

Question 23: If we (Category 2 institution) have 2 research projects, do the funds have to be evenly dispersed? i.e. Could we request funding one project at \$100K and another at \$200K?

Answer 23: No, the funds do not have to be evenly disbursed. Please see Updates section above for changes in the number and funding values of research projects that Category 2 institutions may support. Category 2 institutions may disburse funding to support any number of research projects, as long as the proposed funding does not exceed the Category 2 institution project value of \$300,000 over the course of the two-year period.

Completing the Institutional Commitment to Prostate Cancer Research, Attachment 3

Question 24: Attachment 3 requests a copy of the PI's curriculum vitae. Are there any page limitations for this or is an NIH Bio-sketch preferred?

Answer 24: The PI's curriculum vitae is not counted towards the two-page limit narrative response to *Institutional Commitment to Prostate Cancer Research*, Attachment 3. Applicants may provide the PIs' curriculum vitae or a NIH bio-sketch, there is no preference. Please see, *Attachments and Instructions*, RFA page 9.

Question 25: In the description of the proposed work- should this be a general overview of the institution's cancer research program- or a more specific description of the proposed research projects (and therefore written by the leaders of the research projects and not the overall PI of the grant)?

Answer 25: A specific description of the proposed research projects is not requested as a part of the application process. The application should include both a two-page narrative and a work plan. The narrative should provide background to support the overall need for the funds, demonstrate the institution's commitment to prostate cancer research, and ability to implement research. The two-page narrative should include the number of awards requested and a description of the process for making the awards to meet the criteria listed in the RFA. The work plan should describe the tasks that will be implemented to: 1) identify appropriate research projects and investigators that meet the funding sponsor criteria; 2) acquire peer review for proposed research projects; 3) engage investigators, initiate and monitor progress on research projects and 4) conduct administrative and fiscal oversight to ensure completion of all required deliverables. Please see *Attachments and Instructions*, RFA pages 9 and 10 and *Institutional Commitment to Prostate Cancer Research*, Attachment 3 for a description of the contents of the application.

Question 26: Description of the internal peer review process: Is this the process used for selecting the projects for this particular application?

Answer 26: The two-page narrative should include a general description of the applicant institution's peer review process. The work plan should include a list of the tasks that the institution will implement to acquire peer review for the projects that the institution will support with this grant.

Question 27: Attachment 3 - Institutional Commitment to Prostate Cancer Research Description of the institutions peer review process? Along with the PI's bio-sketch, what should be included in this section? Is it relevant to indicate the sponsored program's office structure to support the management of the award?

Answer 27: There are five sections applicants are asked to respond to on the *Institutional Commitment to Prostate Cancer Research*, Attachment 3. In total, the responses will provide the background to support the institution's demonstration of the overall need for the funds, the commitment to prostate cancer research, and the ability to implement research as described in this solicitation. The applicant may provide information about the sponsored program office's structure to support the management of the award if it supports the response to one of the five questions. For example, if it supports the description of plans for tracking progress and ensuring all reports, vouchers and deliverables are provided to the funder as required.

Completing the Work plan Template, Attachment 4

Question 28: Under CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME, do you want the vendor # as well?

Answer 28: The vendor number is not necessary. If the applicant institution does not have, or does not know the SFS Payee Name, the organization name as listed in the Eligibility table in the RFA should be inserted.

Question 29: Within the Project Overview box, is this project overview limited to a maximum lines of text?

Answer 29: The Project Overview on the *Work plan Template* summary page has been completed for applicants. It describes the overall intent of the Prostate Cancer Research RFA grant funding and is not a description of the individual applicant proposals. It should not be altered by applicants. Please see *Attachments and Instructions*, Attachment 4, Work Plan, RFA page 9.

Question 30: The RFA indicates the "Summary" should not exceed one page. Is this referring to a separate page outside the boxed area?

Answer 30: The *Work plan Template* summary page is the first page, or the cover page, to the work plan. Many of the fields on the summary page have been populated for applicants and applicants should not change nor add information. The only information on the *Workplan Template* summary page that applicants should complete is the SFS payee name and the contract period. Please see *Attachments and Instructions*, Attachment 4, Work Plan, RFA page 9. Please see answers to questions 28 and 29.

Question 31: Under Detail pages, should the PI indicate all those colleagues within Upstate who are involved in this specific research?

Answer 31: The detail pages in the *Work plan Template*, Attachment 4, do not need to include identification of the persons that will be implementing the tasks listed in the Work plan. If they are known at the time of application, they may be included in the work plan as is done in the sample work plan included as an update and supplied as part of this question and answer document.

Additionally, applicants should include proposed funding for anticipated staffing in the budget proposal, to the degree that they are able at the time of application submission. Please see *Budget Template Guidance Document*, Attachment 9, which provides instructions for inclusion of staff positions in the budget proposal.

Question 32: Additionally, under Performance measures. What type of measures should this PI indicate to 'measure' is success for the research? Further clarification for this section would be appreciated.

Answer 32: Work plan performance measures should relate directly to the objectives and proposed tasks. A sample work plan and budget that includes sample performance measures has been provided as an update and supplied as part of this question and answer document.

Question 33: Attachment 4 – Work Plan - What is the minimum font size that will be acceptable?

Answer 33: Applicants are encouraged to use no less than 10 point font in the work plan and no less than 12 point font in the *Institutional Commitment*, two-page narrative. However, points will not be reduced for failure to comply with this preference.

Completing Attachment 7, M/WBE Procurement Forms

Question 34: Is Attachment # 7, M/WBE Procurement Forms, required if the prime institution does not budget for Subawards?

Answer 34: *M/WBE Procurement Forms*, Attachment 7, should be completed by all applicants, regardless of whether or not they propose to subcontract grant work.

**New York State Department of Health
Center for Community Health
Bureau of Chronic Disease Control
Request for Applications
Prostate Cancer Research RFA # 1410200115**

REVISED ATTACHMENT 1 Eligible Institutions and Awards

The following has been updated/modified in the RFA. Strike-through indicates deleted text; underlined/bolded text is new.

Institution	No. of Research Awards to each Institution	Individual Research Award Values	Total Award Value Available to Institution	Contract Period
CATEGORY 1				
Columbia University Medical Center/ Herbert Irvine Comprehensive Cancer Center	3	\$150,000	\$450,000	2 years
Roswell Park Cancer Institute Corp				
Memorial Sloan-Kettering Inst. Cancer Research				
CATEGORY 2				
Albert Einstein College of Medicine/ Cancer Center	2	\$150,000	\$300,000	2 years
Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Cancer Center				
New York University School of Medicine/ Laura and Isaac Perlmutter Cancer Center				
CATEGORY 3				
Brooklyn College	1	\$75,000	\$75,000	15 months
City College of New York				
College at Old Westbury				
Feinstein Institute for Medical Research				
Fordham University				
Hauptman-Woodward Medical Research Institute, Inc.				
Health Research Inc., Roswell Park Division				
Hunter College				
Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai				
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute				
Riverside Research Institute				
Rockefeller University				
St. John's University				
SUNY Albany				
SUNY Binghamton				
SUNY Buffalo				
SUNY Downstate Medical Center				
Union College				
University of Rochester Medical Center				
Upstate Medical University				
VA Medical Center				
Weill Medical College of Cornell University				
York College				

RFA # 1410200115
Prostate Cancer Research
SAMPLE WORKPLAN

SUMMARY

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: Cold Springs Harbor Laboratory

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015

To: 2/28/2017

Project Overview: Innovative, hypothesis-developing research in prostate cancer that is either determined to be no greater than minimal risk, exempt under 32 CFR 219.101(b) or eligible for expedited review under 32 CFR 219.110 or 21 CFR 56.110 by the local Institutional Review Board (IRB) of record. Research will be conducted by investigators at or above the level of postdoctoral fellow (or equivalent) affiliated with their facilities.

**SAMPLE WORK PLAN
DETAIL**

OBJECTIVE	BUDGET CATEGORY/ DELIVERABLE (if applicable)	TASKS	PERFORMANCE MEASURES
1: Identify appropriate research projects and investigators that meet the funding sponsor criteria.		a. Facilitate routine meetings with Dr. James and other appropriate faculty and staff to research project proposals	i. Meetings conducted; minutes shared with involved parties
		ii. Draft proposals sent for review, revised as needed	
		iii.	
		b. Develop selection criteria	i. Review tools reflect selection process
		c. Complete selection process	ii.
		iii.	
		d. Within the first three months of the contract, the PI will ensure development of proposals for the two research projects, seeking input from appropriate researchers.	i. Research proposals developed and prepared for institutional review
		ii.	
		iii.	

**SAMPLE WORK PLAN
DETAIL**

OBJECTIVE	BUDGET CATEGORY/ DELIVERABLE (if applicable)	TASKS	PERFORMANCE MEASURES
2: Acquire peer review for proposed research projects.		a. Proposal(s) submitted to internal institutional review board	i. Proposal(s) meet submission requirements
			ii. IRB review concerns are addressed in a timely manner
			iii. Institutional review board approval granted
		b.	i.
			ii.
			iii.
		c.	i.
			ii.
			iii.

**SAMPLE WORK PLAN
DETAIL**

OBJECTIVE	BUDGET CATEGORY/ DELIVERABLE (if applicable)	TASKS	PERFORMANCE MEASURES
3: Engage investigators, initiate and monitor progress on research projects.		a. Project #1 Research Assistant recruitment conducted, assistant hired by contract month five	i. Staff hired, resume and hiring paperwork on file
		ii. Payroll documentation	
		iii.	
		b. Within the first three months of the contract, the PI will oversee execution of a consultant contract to acquire the Research Consultant for Project #2 that meets the sponsor criteria	i. Research Consultant curriculum vitae on file with human resources meets sponsor criteria
		ii. Executed contract	
		i. Meeting minutes, progress reports	
		c. PI conducts routine meetings to ensure progress	i. Meeting abstract, travel vouchers
		ii.	
		iii.	
		d. PI, Researcher and Research Consultant attend conference to promote project milestones	

**SAMPLE WORK PLAN
DETAIL**

OBJECTIVE	BUDGET CATEGORY/ DELIVERABLE (if applicable)	TASKS	PERFORMANCE MEASURES
4: Conduct administrative and fiscal oversight to ensure completion of all required deliverables.		a. Submit monthly vouchers	i. Vouchers submitted
			ii. Appropriate back up documentation maintained
			iii. Payments received
		b. Submit required reports September 31, 2015; March 31, 2016; September 31, 2016; March 31, 2017.	i. Reports submitted
			ii.
			iii.
		c. Purchase computer and software for Project 1 research	i. Computer and software invoiced
			ii.
			iii.

**SAMPLE WORK PLAN
DETAIL**

OBJECTIVE	BUDGET CATEGORY/ DELIVERABLE (if applicable)	TASKS	PERFORMANCE MEASURES
		a.	i.
			ii.
			iii.
		b.	i.
			ii.
			iii.
		c.	i.
			ii.
			iii.

SAMPLE BUDGET

ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET
SUMMARYPROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development ResearchCONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORYCONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	GRANT FUNDS	MATCH FUNDS	MATCH %	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL
1. Personal Services					
a) Salary	\$160,800		0.00%		\$160,800
b) Fringe	\$24,120		0.00%		\$24,120
Subtotal	\$184,920	\$0	0.00%	\$0	\$184,920
2. Non Personal Services					
a) Contractual Services	\$110,000		0.00%		\$110,000
b) Travel	\$2,000		0.00%		\$2,000
c) Equipment	\$2,630		0.00%		\$2,630
d) Space/Property & Utilities	\$0				\$0
e) Operating Expenses	\$450		0.00%		\$450
f) Other	\$0				\$0
Subtotal	\$115,080	\$0	0.00%	\$0	\$115,080
TOTAL	\$300,000	\$0	0.00%	\$0	\$300,000

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET
DETAIL**

SALARY					
POSITION TITLE	ANNUALIZED SALARY PER POSITION	STANDARD WORK WEEK (HOURS)	PERCENT OF EFFORT FUNDED	NUMBER OF MONTHS FUNDED	TOTAL
1. Principal Investigator/Dr. Smith - Projects 1 and 2	\$ 90,000	40	25.00%	24	\$ 45,000
2. Researcher/Dr. James - Project 1	\$ 78,000	40	60.00%	24	\$ 93,600
3. Research Assistant/TBH - Project 1	\$ 42,000	40	20.00%	24	\$ 16,800
4. Administrative Assistant/Mr. Taylor- Projects 1 and 2	\$ 27,000	40	10.00%	24	\$ 5,400
5.					\$ -
6.					\$ -
7.					\$ -
8.					\$ -
9.					\$ -
10.					\$ -
11.					\$ -
12.					\$ -
13.					\$ -
14.					\$ -
15.					\$ -
Subtotal					\$ 160,800
FRINGE - TYPE/DESCRIPTION					
Fringe rate 15%					\$ 24,120
PERSONAL SERVICES TOTAL					\$ 184,920

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET
DETAIL**

CONTRACTUAL SERVICES - TYPE/DESCRIPTION		TOTAL
1.	Project 2 - Research Consultant	\$ 110,000
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
	TOTAL	\$ 110,000

TRAVEL - TYPE/DESCRIPTION		TOTAL
1.	Project 1 - PI and Researcher Conference Travel	\$ 2,000
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
	TOTAL	\$ 2,000

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET
DETAIL**

EQUIPMENT - TYPE/DESCRIPTION	TOTAL
1. Project 1 - Computer for advanced data analysis	\$ 2,380
2. Project 1 - Data analysis software license	\$ 250
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
TOTAL	\$ 2,630

SPACE/PROPERTY EXPENSES: RENT - TYPE/DESCRIPTION	TOTAL
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
TOTAL	\$ -

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET
DETAIL**

SPACE/PROPERTY EXPENSES: OWN - TYPE/DESCRIPTION	TOTAL
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
TOTAL	\$ -

TYPE/DESCRIPTION OF UTILITY EXPENSES	TOTAL
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
TOTAL	\$ -

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET
DETAIL**

OPERATING EXPENSES - TYPE/DESCRIPTION		TOTAL
1.	Project 1 - Office Supplies	\$ 350
2.	Project 1 - Conference Registration Fee	\$ 100
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
	TOTAL	\$ 450

OTHER - TYPE/DESCRIPTION		TOTAL
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
	TOTAL	\$ -

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET -
NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION**

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORY

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015
To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	BUDGETED	DETAILS
1. Personal Services		
a) Salary		
1. Principal Investigator/Dr. Smith - Projects 1 and 2	\$45,000	PI will devote 25% effort to plan, coordinate and implement all activities associated with Project 1 and Project 2. Annual salary is \$90,000 x 2 years = \$180,00 x 25% effort = \$45,00 total requested salary.
2. Researcher/Dr. James - Project 1	\$93,600	Researcher - Project 1 will devote 60% of time developing hypothesis. Annual salary is \$78,000 x 2 years = \$156,000 x 60% effort = \$93,600 total requested salary.
3. Research Assistant/TBH - Project 1	\$16,800	The Research Assistant will devote 20% effort assisting Project 1 Researcher in all aspects of hypothesis development. Annual salary is \$42,000 x 2 years = \$84,000 x 20% effort = \$16,800 total requested salary.
4. Administrative Assistant/Mr. Taylor- Projects 1 and 2	\$5,400	The Administrative Assistant will devote 10% effort providing clerical support to the PI for Projects 1 and 2, including assisting with preparation of required reports. Annual salary is \$27,000 x 2 years - \$54,000 x 10 effort = \$5,400 total requested salary.
5. 0	\$0	
6. 0	\$0	
7. 0	\$0	
8. 0	\$0	
9. 0	\$0	
10. 0	\$0	
11. 0	\$0	
12. 0	\$0	
13. 0	\$0	
14. 0	\$0	
15. 0	\$0	

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET -
NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION**

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORY

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015
To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	BUDGETED	DETAILS
16. 0	\$0	
17. 0	\$0	
18. 0	\$0	
19. 0	\$0	
20. 0	\$0	
21. 0	\$0	
22. 0	\$0	
23. 0	\$0	
24. 0	\$0	
25. 0	\$0	
26. 0	\$0	
27. 0	\$0	
28. 0	\$0	
29. 0	\$0	
30. 0	\$0	
31. 0	\$0	
32. 0	\$0	
33. 0	\$0	
34. 0	\$0	
35. 0	\$0	
36. 0	\$0	
37. 0	\$0	
38. 0	\$0	
39. 0	\$0	
40. 0	\$0	
41. 0	\$0	

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET -
NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION**

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORY

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015

To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	BUDGETED	DETAILS
42. 0	\$0	
43. 0	\$0	
44. 0	\$0	
45. 0	\$0	
46. 0	\$0	
47. 0	\$0	
48. 0	\$0	
49. 0	\$0	
50. 0	\$0	
51. 0	\$0	
52. 0	\$0	
53. 0	\$0	
54. 0	\$0	
55. 0	\$0	
56. 0	\$0	
57. 0	\$0	
58. 0	\$0	
59. 0	\$0	
60. 0	\$0	
b) Fringe	\$24,120	
Personal Services Subtotal	\$184,920	
2. Non Personal Services		
a) Contractual Services		

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET -
NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION**

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORY

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015

To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	BUDGETED	DETAILS
1. Project 2 - Research Consultant	\$110,000	Project 2 Research Consultant will provide 868 man-hours at an hourly rate of \$125/hr. in support of hypothesis development. Total salary requested for the 2 year contract is \$108,500. Travel expenses will be reimbursed for a 2-day conference to promote project milestones. Estimated expenses are airfare (\$500), hotel (\$250) and incidentals such as parking at the airport, meals, from airport to hotel (\$250). \$500 is requested to support software license fee (\$250/yr).
2. 0	\$0	
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
6. 0	\$0	
7. 0	\$0	
8. 0	\$0	
9. 0	\$0	
10. 0	\$0	
b) Travel		
1. Project 1 - PI and Researcher Conference Travel	\$2,000	The PI and Project 1 Researcher will attend 2-day conference to share project milestones. Travel expenses include airfare (\$500 per traveler), hotel (\$250 per traveler), and incidentals such as parking at the airport, meals, from airport to hotel (\$250 per traveler)
2. 0	\$0	
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
6. 0	\$0	
7. 0	\$0	

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET -
NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION**

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORY

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015

To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	BUDGETED	DETAILS
8. 0	\$0	
9. 0	\$0	
10. 0	\$0	
c) Equipment		
1. Project 1 - Computer for advanced data analysis	\$2,380	A high speed computer to run advanced data analysis dedicated to Project 1 Researcher. Existing resources are not available for use to perform the necessary functions to complete hypothesis development.
2. Project 1 - Data analysis software license	\$250	Data analysis software licenses necessary for hypothesis development. License is an annual charge of \$125.
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
6. 0	\$0	
7. 0	\$0	
8. 0	\$0	
9. 0	\$0	
10. 0	\$0	
d) Space/Property & Utilities		
Rent		
1. 0	\$0	
2. 0	\$0	
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
Own		
1. 0	\$0	

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET -
NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION**

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORY

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015

To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	BUDGETED	DETAILS
2. 0	\$0	
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
Utilities		
1. 0	\$0	
2. 0	\$0	
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
e) Operating Expenses		
1. Project 1 - Office Supplies	\$350	Basic office supplies are requested such as paper and printer cartridges. Associated costs are: paper - 3 boxes x \$40 per box = \$120; printer cartridges - 2 x \$115 each = \$230.
2. Project 1 - Conference Registration Fee	\$100	2-day conference fee for PI and Project 1 Researcher \$50 x 2 staff.
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
6. 0	\$0	
7. 0	\$0	
8. 0	\$0	
9. 0	\$0	
10. 0	\$0	
11. 0	\$0	
12. 0	\$0	
13. 0	\$0	

**ATTACHMENT 5 - EXPENDITURE BASED BUDGET -
NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION**

PROJECT NAME: Prostate Cancer Hypothesis Development Research

CONTRACTOR SFS PAYEE NAME: COLD SPRINGS HARBOR LABORATORY

CONTRACT PERIOD: From: 3/1/2015
To: 2/28/2017

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	BUDGETED	DETAILS
14. 0	\$0	
15. 0	\$0	
f) Other		
1. 0	\$0	
2. 0	\$0	
3. 0	\$0	
4. 0	\$0	
5. 0	\$0	
6. 0	\$0	
7. 0	\$0	
8. 0	\$0	
Non Personal Services Subtotal	\$115,080	
TOTAL	\$300,000	