

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FEDERAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Federal Agency Name(s): Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research (CSCOR), National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA), Department of Commerce

Funding Opportunity Title: Ecological Effects of Sea Level Rise (SLR)

Announcement Type: Initial Announcement

Funding Opportunity Number: SLR 2005

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number: 11.478, Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research, Coastal Ocean Program

Program Authorities: 16 U.S.C. 1456c

Dates: The deadline for receipt of proposals at the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP office is 3 p.m., local time. October 5, 2004.

Funding Opportunity Description: The purpose of this document is to advise the public that NCCOS/CSCOR/COP is soliciting research proposals for projects of two to three years in duration for the development of useful modeling and mapping tools to better assess and predict the fate of ecologically and economically valuable natural resources threatened by sea level rise. Funding is contingent upon the availability of Fiscal Year 2005 Federal appropriations. It is anticipated that final recommendations for funding under this announcement will be made in early Calendar Year 2005, and that projects funded under this announcement will have a May 1, 2005 start date.

Electronic Access: A summary of the ongoing NOS modeling, and a workshop report on ecological effects of sea level rise is available on the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP website at [www.cop.noaa.gov](http://www.cop.noaa.gov).

FULL ANNOUNCEMENT TEXT

I. Funding Opportunity Description

A. Program Objective

The Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research/ Coastal Ocean Program (CSCOR/COP) is committed to providing decision makers with high quality scientific information and predictive tools in formats appropriate to promoting near-term improvements in coastal ecosystem management. This announcement solicits proposals for projects of two to three years in duration with the purpose of developing maps and modeling tools that will be useful to coastal managers in their responses to coastal sea level rise.

In the coastal United States, ecological impacts due to sea level rise have already been significant and will likely increase. Planners need to begin weighing the impacts of future sea level rise when making land use decisions, especially in vulnerable coastal wetlands, which are important habitat for a number of commercially valuable fish and shellfish. More proactive approaches are needed rather than regulatory protection alone. Since state governments have the primary responsibility for developing strategies to mitigate adverse impacts, CSCOR/COP's approach is to work with state managers to develop plans that will best respond to their needs.

This new research program will be a collaborative effort with the NOS' Office of Coast Survey (OCS), National Geodetic Survey (NGS), and Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services (CO-OPS). These offices are developing a three-stage approach to modeling sea level rise in coastal North Carolina which will be used to predict and assess the ecosystem impacts of sea level rise in the sounds and nearby estuaries and coastal regions. Stage 1 is a hydrodynamic tide model of Pamlico, Albemarle, Core, and Bogue Sounds and adjacent estuarine and coastal waters. Stage 2 is a high-resolution, topographic/bathymetric digital elevation model (DEM) which integrates recent airborne Lidar (Light Detecting and Ranging) topographic data and bathymetric data. Stage 3 is a hydrodynamic coastal flooding model which integrates the DEM and the tide model. The coastal flooding model includes coastal land and water and will be used to predict and assess the sea level rise impacts in the Pamlico and Bogue Sounds and the Neuse River. Thus, the Pamlico and Bogue Sounds and the Neuse River are the areas where the desired ecological sub-models such be focused. Proposals must coordinate with and directly utilize the products of the ongoing modeling being performed by NOS. As a tool to facilitate coordination among successful proposals, and with the NOS modeling, a series of two-day workshops will be held throughout the duration of the funded awards. Proposers should budget time and resources needed to attend two such workshops per year in the Maryland-Virginia-North Carolina region for the duration of their award and up to six conference calls per year. More information

about the NOS modeling effort can be found at the CSCOR/COP website [www.cop.noaa.gov](http://www.cop.noaa.gov).

The ultimate goal of the CSCOR study is to provide meaningful ecological data embedded in sub-models that can be integrated with the coastal flooding model. These combined models will predict the ecological effects of projected sea level rise including landscape responses relevant to critical natural resources. Given the relatively short time frame to produce a final product with management relevance, it is expected that the ecological modeling will be developed primarily through the synthesis of existing data. If significant process studies or data collection are needed which are imperative to successful sub-models, ecological research may be necessary and will be supported through this announcement. However, the products of this research must be directly applied to the sub-model being developed. It is hoped that this study will lead to the identification of other knowledge gaps that can be addressed in future studies that will allow the inclusion of more biological communities and greater precision in analyses of sea level rise impacts.

#### B. Program Priorities

The CSCOR research program is concerned with the localized effects of sea level rise on ecological resources and its effect on coastal communities. Initial efforts are focused on the North Carolina coast and, if successful, the program will expand to other coastal areas. Therefore, proposals that focus on habitats and resources important to the North Carolina region will be required, although the ability to extend research results to other regions will also be important.

A program of this scope requires careful planning to avoid overlap with existing programs, and to map out a strategy that will address needs in a complementary manner. Therefore, CSCOR/COP sponsored a sea level rise workshop in Beaufort, North Carolina on February 4 and 5, 2004. The goal of the workshop was to obtain guidance from the research and management community on the major areas of research needed to help coastal managers forecast the regional ecological impacts of sea level rise. The advice has been invaluable in aiding CSOR/COP in designing a pilot program to study potential ecological effects of projected sea level rise scenarios. A workshop report is available at [www.cop.noaa.gov](http://www.cop.noaa.gov). Habitats judged to be important by the workshop participants are coastal forests, marshes and forested wetlands, intertidal and subtidal benthic environments, and the nearshore pelagic environment.

The workshop identified data needs and understanding gaps

for forests, marshes, and forested wetlands. Some of these needs were common for all of these vegetated environments, such as:

- Primary production, sedimentation, organic deposition, decomposition, degradation due to sulfates, and compaction (due to shallow subsidence) and their effects on vertical accretion of soils.
- Water level, storm surges and salinity regimes

Some needs were specific to forests and forested wetlands, including:

- Linkages of surface soil salinity to estuarine and ground water salinity.
- Field and lab studies on regeneration and its relationship to age, salinity, inundation and sulfide.
- Soil type maps tied to vegetation/land cover and elevation.

Other needs were specific to marsh environments, including:

- Wave energy and edge erosion and their effects on horizontal accretion
- Determination of feedback and transition processes between marsh and forest, marsh and subtidal environments and specifically what thresholds are needed to initiate state changes from one zone to another due to salinity, inundation regime, or episodic events such as fire, floods, hurricanes, invasive species, herbivory, disease, etc. Rules are needed to identify when state change occurs.

Examples of data needs and understanding gaps identified by the workshop for intertidal and subtidal benthic environments, and the nearshore pelagic environments include:

- Nursery and spawning functions of estuarine and coastal habitats, relative functionality of different types of habitats
- Spawning areas, staging areas, refugia, and migration corridors for important species.
- Seagrass distribution, dynamics, physiology and production, and the relationship between seagrass areal coverage and habitat functionality
- Conditions for oyster reef survival and restoration, and relationships between reef area and its function/production
- Rates of sediment delivery and areal/community change in soft-bottom intertidal habitats
- Landscape scale of ecological interactions, edge effects, and interactions of different habitats at their boundaries

Examples of critical links between physical and ecological models include:

- Hydrology of study area (both surface and subsurface), including substrate characteristics
- Fine-scale flow through coastal wetlands
- The supply of sediment and organics to coastal wetlands
- The wind wave climate in the Sounds and how waves erode coastal wetlands.

Sea level rise may result in ecosystem changes from the shifting or disappearance of desired habitats and the relocation of economically important or threatened species. Such changes may require adjustments of ongoing and planned management responses.

Therefore, model linkages with management actions are a top priority. In all cases, it is recognized that modeling will be the key tool to link existing data and information on biological communities to the NOS modeling efforts. It is important that proposers specify the important time and space scales needed to link biological/ecological models and also specify the key variables that will drive the linkages. Sub-models of ecological processes must be designed to be integrated with the coastal flooding model. This will require close communication with the NOS modeling group. Ideally, teams of researchers with complementary expertise in mining data sources, process-based studies, modeling and management application will be supported.

All proposed research must have a clear and relevant application with specific endpoint based on management issues, produce a detailed sub-model with a comprehensive explanation of how the sub-model will be linked with the current NOS modeling, and be tractable within the time and budget proposed. Proposals should include justification for the questions chosen, in terms of local importance, ability to extend results to other coastal ecosystems, and their relationship to important management issues. Proposals should include evidence of linkages between the scientific questions and management needs.

C. Program Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1456c

## II. Award Information

### A. Funding availability

Funding is contingent upon availability of Federal appropriations. NOAA is committed to continual improvement of the grants process and accelerating the award of financial assistance to qualified recipients in accordance with the recommendations of the Program Review Team (Information available at [www.noaa.gov](http://www.noaa.gov)). In order to fulfill these responsibilities this solicitation announces that award amounts to be determined by the proposals and available funds typically will not exceed

\$300,000 per project per year with project durations from two to three years. It is anticipated that 3-5 projects will be funded. Support in out years after FY 2005 is contingent upon the availability of funds. Support in out years after FY 2005 is contingent upon the availability of funds.

Applicants are hereby given notice that funds have not yet been appropriated for this program. In no event will NOAA or the Department of Commerce be responsible for proposal preparation costs if this program fails to receive funding or is cancelled because of other agency priorities.

There is no guarantee that sufficient funds will be available to make awards for all qualified projects. Publication of this notice does not oblige NOAA to award any specific project or to obligate any available funds. If one incurs any costs prior to receiving an award agreement signed by an authorized NOAA official, one would do so solely at ones own risk of these costs not being included under the award.

Publication of this notice does not obligate any agency to any specific award or to obligate any part of the entire amount of funds available. Recipients and subrecipients are subject to all Federal laws and agency policies, regulations and procedures applicable to Federal financial assistance awards.

#### B. Project/Award period

Full proposals can cover a project/award period of up to three years. Multi-year awards may be funded incrementally on an annual basis, but, once awarded, those awards will not compete for funding in subsequent years. Each annual award shall require a project description that can be easily divided into annual increments of meaningful work representing solid accomplishments (if prospective funding is not made available, or is discontinued).

The following is a description of Multi-Year Awards for those applicants subsequently recommended for award. This information can also be found on the COP web site under Grants Information. Multi-Year Awards: Multi Year Awards are awards which have an award/project period of more than 12 months of activity. Multi Year Awards are partially funded when the awards are approved, and are subsequently funded in increments. One of the purposes of Multi Year Awards is to reduce the administrative burden on both the applicant and the operating unit. For example, with proper planning, one application can suffice for the entire multi year award period. Funding for each years activity is contingent upon the availability of funds from Congress, satisfactory performance, and is at the sole discretion of the agency. Multi-year funding is appropriate for projects

to be funded for 2 to 5 years. Once approved, full applications are not required for the continuations into the out years.

#### C. Type of funding instrument

The funding instruments will be Cooperative Agreements. A cooperative agreement implies that NOAA will assist recipients in conducting the proposed research. Since the proposed research should be collaborative with the ongoing modeling effort in NOS, this instrument will be appropriate. The application should be presented in a manner that demonstrates the applicant's ability to address the research problem in a collaborative manner with the existing NOS model.

A cooperative agreement is appropriate when substantial NOAA involvement is anticipated. This means that the recipient can expect substantial agency collaboration, participation, or intervention in project performance. Substantial involvement exists when: responsibility for the management, control, direction, or performance of the project is shared by the assisting agency and the recipient; or the assisting agency has the right to intervene (including interruption or modification) in the conduct or performance of project activities.

In an effort to maximize the use of limited resources, applications from non-Federal, non-NOAA Federal and NOAA Federal applicants will be competed against each other. Research proposals selected for funding from non-Federal researchers will be funded through a cooperative agreement.

Research proposals selected for funding from non-NOAA Federal applicants will be funded through an interagency transfer, provided legal authority exists for the Federal applicant to receive funds from another agency. PLEASE NOTE: Before non-NOAA Federal applicants may be funded, they must demonstrate that they have legal authority to receive funds from another Federal agency in excess of their appropriation. Because this announcement is not proposing to procure goods or services from the applicants, the Economy Act (31 U.S.C. section 1535) is not an appropriate basis. Support may be solely through COP or partnered with other Federal offices and agencies.

Proposals deemed acceptable from NOAA Federal researchers will be funded through an intraagency transfer.

#### D. Permits and Approvals

It is the applicants responsibility to obtain all necessary Federal, state, and local government permits and approvals where necessary for the proposed work to be conducted. Applicants are expected to design their proposals so that they minimize the

potential adverse impact on the environment. If applicable, documentation of requests or approvals of environmental permits must be included in the proposal package. Applications will be reviewed to ensure that they have sufficient environmental documentation to allow program staff to determine whether the proposal is categorically excluded from further NEPA analysis or whether an Environmental Assessment is necessary in conformance with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. For those applications needing an Environmental Assessment, affected applicants will be informed after the peer review stage and will be requested to assist in the preparation of a draft of the assessment (prior to award).

Failure to apply for and/or obtain Federal, state, and local permits, approvals, letters of agreement, or failure to provide environmental analyses where necessary (i.e., NEPA environmental assessment) will also delay the award of funds if a project is otherwise selected for funding.

### III. Eligibility Information

#### A. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants are institutions of higher education, other non-profits, state, local, Indian Tribal Governments, and Federal agencies that possess the statutory authority to receive financial assistance.

(1) Researchers must be employees of an eligible institution listed above; and proposals must be submitted through that institution. Non-Federal researchers should comply with their institutional requirements for proposal submission.

(2) Non-NOAA Federal applicants will be required to submit certifications or documentation showing that they have specific legal authority to receive funds from the Department of Commerce (DOC) for this research.

(3) NCCOS/CSCOR/COP will accept proposals that include foreign researchers as collaborators with a researcher, who has met the above stated eligibility requirements; and who also is an employee of an eligible institution listed above.

(4) Non-Federal researchers affiliated with NOAA-University Joint Institutes should comply with joint institutional requirements; they will be funded through cooperative agreements either to their institutions or to joint institutes.

#### B. Cost Sharing or Matching Requirements

None

#### C. Other Requirements

Each proposal must also include the nine elements listed under Proposal Submission/Required Elements, (a)-(i) or it will be returned to sender without further consideration.

#### IV. Application and Submission Information

##### A. Address to Request Application Package

Submit the original and 15 copies of your proposal to Attn. SLR2005, Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research/Coastal Ocean Program (N/SCI2), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 1305 East-West Highway, SSMC4, 8th Floor Station 8243, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Technical Information. Carol Auer, SLR2005 Program Manager, NCCOS/CSCOR/COP, 301-713-3338/ext.164, Internet:

[carol.auer@noaa.gov](mailto:carol.auer@noaa.gov)

Business Management Information. Leslie McDonald, NCCOS/CSCOR/COP Grants Administrator, 301-713-3338/ext. 155, Internet: [Leslie.McDonald@noaa.gov](mailto:Leslie.McDonald@noaa.gov)

##### B. Content and Form of Application Submission

NOAA and Standard Form Applications with instructions are accessible on the following NCCOS/CSCOR/COP Internet site: <http://www.cop.noaa.gov> under the COP Grants Information Section, Part D, Application Forms for Initial Proposal Submission.

Forms may be viewed and, in most cases, filled in by computer. All forms must be printed, completed, and mailed to NCCOS/CSCOR/COP with original signatures. If you are unable to access this information, you may call NCCOS/CSCOR/COP at 301-713-3338 to leave a mailing request.

This document requests full proposals only. The provisions for proposal preparation provided here are mandatory. Proposals received after the published deadline (refer to DATES) or proposals that deviate from the prescribed format will be returned to the sender without further consideration. Information regarding this announcement, additional background information, and required Federal forms are available on the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP home page.

##### 1. Proposals

Applications submitted by mail in response to this announcement require an original proposal and 15 proposal copies at time of submission. This includes color or high-resolution

graphics, unusually sized materials, or otherwise unusual materials submitted as part of the proposal. For color graphics, submit either color originals or color copies. The stated requirements for the number of proposal copies provide for a timely review process and is cleared by OMB control number 0648-0384. (See Collection of information requirements.) Facsimile transmissions and electronic mail submission of full proposals will not be accepted.

## 2. Required Elements

For clarity in the submission of proposals, the following definitions are provided for recipient use: Funding and/or Budget Period - The period of time when Federal funding is available for obligation by the recipient. The funding period must always be specified in multi-year awards, using fixed year funds. This term may also be used to mean budget period. A budget period is typically 12 months. Award and/or Project Period - The period established in the award document during which Federal sponsorship begins and ends. The term award period is also referred to as project period in 15 CFR 14.2(cc).

Each proposal must include the following nine elements or it will be returned to sender without further consideration:

(a) Standard Form 424. At time of proposal submission, all applicants anticipating direct funding shall submit the Standard Form, SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance, to indicate the total amount of funding proposed for the whole project period. This form is to be the cover page for the original proposal and all requested copies. Multi-institutional proposals must include signed SF-424 forms from all institutions requesting funding.

(b) Signed Summary title page. The title page should be signed by the Principal Investigator (PI). The Summary title page identifies the project's title, starting with the acronym: SLR2005, a short title (less than 50 characters), and the PI's name and affiliation, complete address, phone, FAX and E-mail information. The requested budget for each fiscal year should be included on the Summary title page. Multi-institution proposals must also identify the lead investigator for each institution and the requested funding for each fiscal year for each institution on the title page, but no signatures are required on the title page from the additional institutions. Lead investigator and separate budget information is not requested on the title page for institutions that are proposed to receive funds through a subcontract to the lead institution; however, the COP Summary Proposal Budget Form and accompanying budget justification must be submitted for each subcontractor. For further details on budget information, please see Section (g) Budget of this Part.

(c) One-page abstract/project summary. The Project Summary (Abstract) Form, which is to be submitted at time of application, shall include an introduction of the problem, rationale, scientific objectives and/or hypotheses to be tested, and a brief summary of work to be completed. The prescribed NCCOS/CSCOR/COP format for the Project Summary Form can be found on the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP Internet site under the Grants Information section, Part D.

The summary should appear on a separate page, headed with the proposal title, institution(s), investigator(s), total proposed cost, and budget period. It should be written in the third person. The summary is used to help compare proposals quickly and allows the respondents to summarize these key points in their own words.

(d) Project description. The description of the proposed project must be complete and divided into annual increments of work that include: identification of the problem, scientific objectives, proposed methodology, relevance to the SLR2005 program goals, and its scientific priorities. The project description (including relevant results from prior support) should not exceed 15 pages. Page limits are inclusive of figures, other visual materials, and letters of endorsement, but are exclusive of references, a milestone chart, and letters of collaboration from unfunded collaborators.

This section should clearly identify project management with a description of the functions of each PI within a team. It should provide a full scientific justification for the research, rather than simply reiterating justifications presented in this document. It should also include:

(i) The objective for the period of proposed work and its expected significance;

(ii) The relation to the present state of knowledge in the field and relation to previous work and work in progress by the proposing principal investigator(s);

(iii) A discussion of how the proposed project lends value to the program goals;

(iv) Potential coordination with other investigators, and anticipated coordination with the NOS model.

(e) References cited. Reference information is required. Each reference must include the names of all authors in the same sequence they appear in the publications, the article title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publications. While there is no established page limitation, this section should include bibliographic citations only and should not be used to provide parenthetical information outside of the 20-page proposal descriptions.

(f) Milestone chart. Provide time lines of major tasks

covering the duration of the proposed project. Include semiannual workshops to present results to other SLR2005 participants.

(g) Budget. At time of proposal submission, all applicants are required to submit a COP Summary Proposal Budget Form for each fiscal year increment. Multi-institution proposals must include a COP Summary Proposal Budget Form for each institution, and multi-investigator proposals using a lead investigator with a contractor/subgrantee approach must submit a COP Summary Proposal Budget Form for each contractor/subgrantee.

Each contractor or subgrantee should be listed as a separate item. Describe products/services to be obtained and indicate the applicability or necessity of each to the project. Provide separate budgets for each subgrantee or contractor regardless of the dollar value and indicate the basis for the cost estimates. List all subgrantee or contractor costs under line item number 5 Subcontracts on the COP Summary Proposal Budget Form.

The use of this budget form will provide for a detailed annual budget and for the level of detail required by the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP program staff to evaluate the effort to be invested by investigators and staff on a specific project. The COP budget form is compatible with forms in use by other agencies that participate in joint projects with NCCOS/CSCOR/COP and can be found on the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP home page under Grants Information section, Part D.

All applications must include a budget narrative and a justification to support all proposed budget categories. Include travel costs for the semiannual workshops required in (f) above, assuming that the workshops will be somewhere in the Maryland-Virginia-North Carolina geographic area. The SF-424A, Budget Information (Non-Construction) Form, will be requested only from those applicants subsequently recommended for award.

Ship time needs must be clearly identified in the proposed budget. The proposer is responsible for requesting ship time through appropriate channels and for meeting all requirements to ensure the availability of requested ship time. Copies of relevant ship time request forms should be included with the proposal.

(h) Biographical sketch. All principal and co-investigators must provide summaries of up to 2 pages that include the following:

(i) A listing of professional and academic credentials and mailing address;

(ii) A list of up to five publications most closely related to the proposed project and five other significant publications.

Additional lists of publications, lectures, and the rest should not be included;

(iii) A list of all persons (including their organizational affiliation) in alphabetical order, with whom the investigator has collaborated on a project or publication within the last 48 months, including collaborators on the proposal and persons listed in the publications. If no collaborators exist, this should be so indicated;

(iv) A list of persons (including their organizational affiliation) with whom the individual has had an association like thesis advisor or postdoctoral scholar sponsor;

(v) A list of the names and institutions of the individuals own graduate and postgraduate advisors.

The material presented in (c, d, and e) is used to assist in identifying potential conflicts or bias in the selection of reviewers.

(i) Current and pending support. Describe all current and pending federal financial/funding support for all principal and co-investigators, including subsequent funding in the case of continuing grants. The capability of the investigator and collaborators to complete the proposed work in light of present commitments to other projects. Therefore, please discuss the percentage of time investigators and collaborators have devoted to other Federal or non-Federal projects, as compared to the time that will be devoted to the project solicited under this notice

(j) Proposal format and assembly. The original proposal should be clamped in the upper left-hand corner, but left unbound. The 15 additional copies can be stapled in the upper left-hand corner or bound on the left edge. The page margin must be one inch (2.5 cm) at the top, bottom, left, and right, and the typeface standard 12-point size must be clear and easily legible. Proposals should be single spaced.

### C. Submission Date and Time

Proposals must be received by 3 p.m. eastern time on Oct. 5, 2005. Proposals received after that time will not be considered for funding. NCCOS/CSCOR/COP determines whether an application has been submitted before the deadline by date/time stamping the applications as they are physically received in the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP office. (Note that late-arriving applications provided to a delivery service on or before October 5, 2004, with delivery guaranteed before 3 p.m., local time on October 5, 2004, will be accepted for review if the applicant can document that the application was provided to the delivery service with delivery to the address listed below guaranteed by the specified closing date and time; and, in any event, the proposals are received in the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP office by 3 p.m., local time, no later than 2 business days following the closing date.)

#### D. Intergovernmental review

Applications under this program are not subject to Executive Order 12372, an "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs".

#### E. Funding Restrictions

**Indirect Costs:** Regardless of any approved indirect cost rate applicable to the award, the maximum dollar amount of allocable indirect costs for which DOC will reimburse the recipient shall be the lesser of (a) the line item amount for the Federal share of indirect costs contained in the approved budget of the award or (b) the Federal share of the total allocable indirect costs of the award based on the indirect cost rate approved by a cognizant or oversight Federal agency and current at the time the cost was incurred, provided the rate is approved on or before the award end date.

#### F. Other Submission Requirements

All applicants are to submit hard copy proposals only. Electronic proposals are not yet accepted by NCCOS/CSCOR/COP. The hard copies may be submitted by postal mail, commercial delivery service or hand-delivery.

### V. Application Review Information

#### A. Evaluation Criteria

The following evaluation criteria and weighting of the criteria are as follows:

1. Importance and/or Relevance and Applicability of proposed project to the program goals:(30 percent) This ascertains whether there is intrinsic value in the proposed work and/or relevance to NOAA, federal, regional, state, or local activities. For purposes of this competition also the likelihood that the research will make substantial contributions or develop products leading to improved management of coastal resources will be assessed.

2. Technical/Scientific Merit (30 percent): This assesses whether the approach is technically sound and/or innovative, if the methods are appropriate, and whether there are clear project goals and objectives. For purposes of this competition, intrinsic scientific value of the proposed work and the likelihood that it will lead to fundamental advancements, new discoveries or will have substantial impact on progress in that field. The proposed work has focused science objectives and a complete and efficient strategy for making measurements and observations in support of

the objectives. The approach is sound and logically planned throughout the cycle of the proposed work.

3. Overall Qualification of Applicants (20 percent): This ascertains whether the applicant possesses the necessary education, experience, training, facilities, and administrative resources to accomplish the project. For purposes of this competition also the capability of the investigator and collaborators to complete the proposed work as evidenced by past research accomplishments, previous cooperative work, timely communication, and the sharing of findings, data, and other research products.

4. Project Costs (10 percent): The budget is evaluated to determine if it is realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time-frame. For purposes of this competition also the adequacy of the proposed resources to accomplish the proposed work, and the appropriateness of the requested funding with respect to the total available funds.

5. Outreach and Education (10 percent): NOAA assesses whether this project provides a focus and effective education and outreach strategy regarding NOAA's mission to protect the Nation's natural resources. For purposes of this competition also the demonstrated connections to management entities who will use the results of the proposed work; ability to provide results in accessible format to a variety of audiences including the general public.

## B. Review and Selection Process

Once a full application has been received by NOAA, an initial administrative review is conducted to determine compliance with requirements and completeness of the application. All proposals will be evaluated and scored individually in accordance with the assigned weights of the above evaluation criteria by independent peer mail review and/or by independent peer panel review. Both Federal and non-Federal experts in the field may be used in this process. The peer mail reviewers will be several individuals with expertise in the subjects addressed by particular proposals. Each mail reviewer will see only certain individual proposals within his or her area of expertise, and score them individually on a scale of one to five, where scores represent respectively: Excellent (1), Very Good (2), Good (3), Fair (4), Poor (5).

The peer panel will comprise 4 to 8 individuals, with each individual having expertise in a separate area, so that the panel, as a whole, covers a range of scientific expertise. The panel will have access to all mail reviews of proposals, and will use the mail reviews in discussion and evaluation of the entire

slate of proposals. All proposals will be evaluated and scored individually. The peer panel shall rate the proposals using the evaluation criteria and scores provided above and used by the mail reviewers. The individual peer panelist scores shall be averaged for each application and presented to the program officers. No consensus advice will be given by the independent peer mail review or the review panel.

The program officers will neither vote or score proposals as part of the independent peer panel nor participate in discussion of the merits of the proposal. Those proposals receiving an average panel score of ``Fair'' or ``Poor'' will not be given further consideration, and proposers will be notified of non-selection.

For the proposals rated by the panel as either ``Excellent,'' ``Very Good,'' or ``Good'', the program officers will (a) rank the proposals to be recommended for funding by average panel ratings, and/or by applying the project selection factors listed below; (b) determine the total duration of funding for each proposal; and (c) determine the amount of funds available for each proposal subject to the availability of fiscal year funds. Awards may not necessarily be made in rank order. In addition, proposals rated by the panel as either ``Excellent,'' ``Very Good,'' or ``Good'' that are not funded in the current fiscal period, may be considered for funding in another fiscal period without having to repeat the competitive, review process.

Recommendations for funding are then forwarded to the selecting official, the Director of NCCOS/CSCOR/COP, for the final funding decision. In making the final selections, the Director will award in rank order unless the proposal is justified to be selected out of rank order based on the selection factors listed below in C.

Investigators may be asked to modify objectives, work plans or budgets, and provide supplemental information required by the agency prior to the award. When a decision has been made (whether an award or declination), verbatim anonymous copies of reviews and summaries of review panel deliberations, if any, will be made available to the proposer. Declined applications will be held in the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP for the required 3 years in accordance with the current retention requirements, and then destroyed.

### C. Selection Factors

The merit review ratings shall provide a rank order to the Selecting Official for final funding recommendations. A program officer may first make recommendations to the Selecting Official applying the selection factors below. The Selecting Official shall award in the rank order unless the proposal is justified to

be selected out of rank order based upon one or more of the following factors:

1. Availability of funding
  2. Balance/distribution of funds
    - a. Geographically
    - b. By type of institutions
    - c. By type of partners
    - d. By research areas
    - e. By project types
  3. Whether this project duplicates other projects funded or considered for funding by NOAA or other federal agencies.
  4. Program priorities and policy factors.
  5. Applicants prior award performance.
  6. Partnerships and/or participation of targeted groups.
- D. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

Subject to the availability of funds, review of proposals will begin in October 2004. May 1, 2005 should be used as the proposed start date on proposals, unless otherwise directed by the Program Officer.

## VI. Award Administration Information

### A. Award Notices

The notice of award is signed by the NOAA Grants Officer and is the authorizing document. It is provided by postal mail to the appropriate business office of the recipient organization.

### B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

#### The Department of Commerce Pre-Award Notification Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements

The Department of Commerce Pre-Award Notification Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements contained in the Federal Register notice of October 1, 2001 (66 FR 49917), as amended by the Federal Register notice published on October 30, 2002 (67 FR 66109), are applicable to this solicitation.

#### Limitation of Liability

In no event will NOAA or the Department of Commerce be responsible for proposal preparation costs if these programs fail to receive funding or are cancelled because of other agency priorities. Publication of this announcement does not oblige

NOAA to award any specific project or to obligate any available funds.

#### National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

OAA must analyze the potential environmental impacts, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), for applicant projects or proposals which are seeking NOAA federal funding opportunities. Detailed information on NOAA compliance with NEPA can be found at the following NOAA NEPA website: <http://www.nepa.noaa.gov/>, including our NOAA Administrative Order 216-6 for NEPA, [http://www.nepa.noaa.gov/NAO216\\_6\\_TOC.pdf](http://www.nepa.noaa.gov/NAO216_6_TOC.pdf), and the Council on Environmental Quality implementation regulations, [http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ceq/toc\\_ceq.htm](http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ceq/toc_ceq.htm)). Consequently, as part of an applicant's package, and under their description of their program activities, applicants are required to provide detailed information on the activities to be conducted, locations, sites, species and habitat to be affected, possible construction activities, and any environmental concerns that may exist (e.g., the use and disposal of hazardous or toxic chemicals, introduction of non-indigenous species, impacts to endangered and threatened species, aquaculture projects, and impacts to coral reef systems).

In addition to providing specific information that will serve as the basis for any required impact analyses, applicants may also be requested to assist NOAA in drafting of an environmental assessment, if NOAA determines an assessment is required. Applicants will also be required to cooperate with NOAA in identifying and implementing feasible measures to reduce or avoid any identified adverse environmental impacts of their proposal. The failure to do so shall be grounds for the denial of an application.

Any data collected in projects supported by NCCOS/CSCOR/COP should be delivered to a National Data Center (NDC), such as the National Oceanographic Data Center (NODC), in a format to be determined by the institution, the NODC, and the Program Officer. It is the responsibility of the institution for the delivery of these data; the DOC will not provide additional support for delivery beyond the award. Additionally, all biological cultures established, molecular probes developed, genetic sequences identified, mathematical models constructed, or other resulting information products established through support provided by NCCOS/CSCOR/COP are encouraged to be made available to the general research community at no or modest handling charge (to be determined by the institution, Program Officer, and DOC).

Please note that NOAA is developing a policy on internal overhead charges, NOAA scientists considering submission of

proposals should contact the appropriate NCCOS/CSCOR/COP Program Manager for the latest information.

### C. Reporting

All financial and progress reports shall be submitted in triplicate (one original and two copies). Financial reports are to be submitted to the NOAA Grants Officer and Performance (technical) reports are to be submitted to the NOAA program officer. Financial reports are semi-annual and Performance reports are annual.

### VII. Agency Contact(s)

Technical Information. Carol Auer, SLR2005 Program Manager, NCCOS/CSCOR/COP, 301-713-3338ext.164, Internet: carol.auer@noaa.gov

Business Management Information. Leslie McDonald, NCCOS/CSCOR/COP Grants Administrator, 301-713-3338/ext.155, Internet: Leslie.McDonald@noaa.gov

### VIII. Other Information

Collection of information requirements:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection displays a currently valid OMB control number.

This notification involves collection-of-information requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act. The use of Standard Forms 424, 424A, 424B, and SF-LLL has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under control numbers 0348-0043, 0348-0044, 0348-0040 and 0348-0046.

The following requirements have been approved by OMB under control number 0648-0384; a Summary Proposal Budget Form (30 minutes per response), a Project Summary Form (30 minutes per response), a standardized format for the annual Performance Report (5 hours per response), a standardized format for the Final Report (10 hours per response), and the submission of up to 20 copies of proposals (10 minutes per response). The response estimates include the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding these requirements and the burden estimate, or any other aspect of this collection of information, including

suggestions for reducing this burden, to  
leslie.mcdonald@noaa.gov. Copies of these forms and formats can  
be found on the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP home page under Grants  
Information sections, Parts D and F.