

## 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:** Monitoring and Event Response for Harmful Algal Blooms (MERHAB)
- **Announcement Type:** Initial Announcement
- **Funding Opportunity Number:** MERHAB 2005
- **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:** 11.478, Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research, Coastal Ocean Program
- **Program Authorities:** 16 U.S.C. 1442 and Pub.L. 105-383, title VI, Nov. 13, 1998, 112 Stat. 3447
- **Dates:** The deadline for receipt of proposals at the COP office is 3 p.m., local time December 1, 2004.
- **Funding Opportunity Description:** The purpose of this document is to advise the public that NCCOS/CSCOR is soliciting proposals for two types of research projects: MERHAB-targeted and MERHAB-regional. MERHAB-targeted proposals will incorporate tools, approaches and technologies from HAB research programs into existing harmful algal bloom (HAB) monitoring programs. MERHAB-regional proposals will create partnerships to enhance and sustain routine HAB monitoring capabilities and provide managers with timely information needed to mitigate HAB impacts on coastal communities. 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 August 1, 2005, start date.
- **Electronic Access:** The following web sites furnish supplementary information from reports dealing with harmful algal blooms: Boesch et.al, Feb 1997, Harmful Algal Blooms

in Coastal Waters: Options for Prevention, Control and Mitigation, Silver Spring, MD at <http://www.cop.noaa.gov/pubs/das/das10.html>; and Anderson et.al., Sept 2000, Estimated Annual Economic Impact from Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) in the U.S. WHOI at <http://www.redtide.whoi.edu/hab/pertinentinfo/EconomicsReport.pdf>.

Information on the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act and the 2000 National Assessment of HABs in U.S. Waters, National Science and Technology Council Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR), Washington, DC, can be located at

<http://www.habhrca.noaa.gov>.

Examples of prototype forecasts for harmful algal blooms can be considered in a collection of papers that document progress in the emerging enterprise of ecological forecasting available at

<http://www.nccos.noaa.gov/documents/ecoforecast.pdf> . The citation for this report is N.J. Valette-Silver and D. Scavia. 2003. Ecological Forecasting: New Tools for Coastal and Ecosystem Management. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 1. The NOAA Ocean Service perspective on ecological forecasting can be found at

<http://www.noaaneews.noaa.gov/magazine/stories/mag65.htm>

Details about ongoing MERHAB projects currently funded by the NCCOS/CSCOR/COP MERHAB Program are found at

<http://www.cop.noaa.gov/FactSheets/MERHAB.htm>. Hard copies of all resources can be obtained from the CSCOR/COP office.

## FULL ANNOUNCEMENT TEXT

### I. Funding Opportunity Description

<http://www.nbii.gov/about/pubs/efbrochure/>.

#### A. Program Objective:

Harmful algal blooms (HABs) are one of the most scientifically complex and economically significant coastal issues facing the nation today. In the past, only a few regions of the U.S. were affected by HABs, but now virtually every coastal state has reported major blooms. A single HAB event can cost tens of millions of dollars to local economies and the total economic losses associated with HABs is conservatively estimated to be \$49 million annually (Anderson et.al. 2000). HABs have direct and indirect impacts on fisheries resources, local coastal economies, as well as public health and perception. HABs can cause human illness and death, alter marine

habitats, adversely impact fish and other marine organisms, as well as close many coastal businesses.

The research community has responded to this issue mainly through the multi-agency Ecology and Oceanography of Harmful Algal Bloom (ECOHAB) program administered by the Coastal Ocean Program (COP) within the Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research (CSCOR). Over the last decade the ECOHAB program has built a better understanding of the linkages between the biology, ecology, physiology, and behavior of harmful species and the physics, chemistry, bathymetry, and meteorology of the surrounding environment. ECOHAB research has produced many new capabilities to evaluate and detect HAB toxins and cells, identify and monitor the environmental conditions conducive to HABs, to predict bloom landfall and develop rudimentary HAB forecasts

Through the MERHAB program, CSCOR intends to transition products from ECOHAB and other HAB-related research into regionally and locally tested tools that can be used to mitigate the impact of HABs. Currently, the most effective way to mitigate HAB impacts is with enhanced monitoring combined with rapid response to HAB events (CENR 2000). Therefore, the principal focus of MERHAB is to build capabilities of local, state, tribal, and private sector for regular and intensive measurement of HAB parameters. This will make existing monitoring programs more efficient while providing for better coverage in time and space. MERHAB will enable rigorous field testing of state-of-the-art technology through targeted projects and will incorporate the new methods of detecting, tracking, and predicting HABs into existing monitoring programs through regional, intensive monitoring projects. MERHAB will also develop event-response capabilities within affected regions to ensure trained and equipped personnel are able to mobilize quickly, conduct appropriate sampling and testing, and communicate effectively during HAB events.

The ability to provide early warning of HAB events is one focus of current NOAA Ocean Service (NOS) efforts in ecological forecasting (N.J. Valette-Silver and D. Scavia. 2003). The MERHAB program can assist in these efforts by aiding in the development of components necessary to create HAB forecasts in impacted coastal regions. Key components include; the establishment of routine data collection for monitoring and bloom identification; development of technologies for coastal ocean observation and the rapid/sensitive detection of HABs in estuarine and coastal systems; transfer to operations of models that predict bloom development, persistence, toxicity and movement; and establishment of sustainable science-management

partnerships among key regional institutions for the maintenance of developed forecast products.

MERHAB will result in faster, less expensive, and more reliable detection methods for HAB cells and toxins, instruments for low-cost, long-term observation of coastal ocean conditions, reliable models that predict bloom development, persistence, toxicity and movement, and stronger mechanisms in place to respond to outbreaks. With these advances, State programs will be better able to take preventative actions (e.g. increase monitoring efforts, close shellfish beds, warn affected communities) to safeguard the public health, local economies, and fisheries. MERHAB will also provide important data allowing for better measurement and comparison of the socio-economic costs of HABs and benefits to coastal communities from mitigation strategies. As a result of MERHAB, managers able to mitigate the expanding HAB problems in their coastal regions and be better positioned, especially during difficult state fiscal climates, to request long-term support from local, state, regional or Federal funding sources.

## B. Program Priorities

The primary goal of the MERHAB program is to mitigate HAB impacts by incorporating products generated from past or ongoing HAB research programs into operational components of existing monitoring programs in HAB-impacted coastal regions. MERHAB is not intended to provide long-term support for routine monitoring efforts, but to help build sustainable regional partnerships that provide managers with crucial information in time for critical decisions needed to mitigate HAB impacts.

### 1) MERHAB-Targeted Research Projects

#### (a) Objectives:

(i) Develop a technology that will enhance HAB monitoring activities in U.S. coastal waters; (ii) incorporate that technology into existing HAB monitoring programs.

#### (b) Characteristics:

(i) Should rigorously field-test new technologies to detect algal species, toxin, or toxicity and/or monitor the environmental conditions that support HABs. Technologies may include, but are not limited to, rapid field assays for shellfish, improved diagnostic techniques for in situ detection of HAB cells, remote sensing technology to help target

sampling efforts, instruments to observe coastal ocean conditions and models useful in predicting or forecasting HABs; (ii) should include efforts specified in work plans to build support for the incorporation of technology into one or more existing state or regional HAB monitoring program, (iii) may be conducted either by an individual or small investigative team; and (iv) must address specified research needs of the HAB community.

(c) Expected Products and Outcomes:

(i) Development and testing of new tools to rapidly detect HABs and their toxins; to monitor and track HABs and key HAB-related ecosystem conditions; and to predict or forecast HABs; (ii) demonstration of effective application of technology in an existing monitoring program; and (iii) comprehensive data analysis and integration that advances the state of science and management (i.e. tools and instruments for HAB forecasting including, but not limited to numerical and conceptual models; regional economic valuation of direct and indirect costs associated with HAB events; and region-specific management recommendations based on study results, technical reports, peer-reviewed publications, and databases).

2) MERHAB-regional, intensive HAB monitoring Projects

(a) Objectives

(i) Develop new or increase existing regional capabilities for HAB monitoring; (ii) incorporate new tools for HAB measurement into existing monitoring efforts; (iii) include local, state, regional, Federal, or non-governmental entities as active partners in identifying environmental measurements and their importance to managing coastal resources and protecting human health (i.e. generating public advisories) in the area; (iv) determine and work to secure long-term local, state, regional, or other funding that will support enhancements in HAB monitoring that result from MERHAB project funding; (v) develop local and/or regional capabilities to respond to HAB events; and (vi) develop a capability to predict or forecast HABs.

(b) Characteristics

(i) Include a suite of annual studies and involve a multi-disciplinary, collaborative team of investigators. The team should represent groups with strong interests in mitigating the impacts of HABs, including, but not limited to, the natural and social science research community, existing monitoring programs, communities dependent upon affected resources, business and industry associations, and non-profit organizations; (ii) provide evidence that local, state, tribal, regional, and Federal representatives were consulted in the development of the proposal to ensure appropriate economic, regulatory, and management issues are addressed; (iii) include a plan for continued consultation with these representatives to facilitate the incorporation of research results into existing monitoring programs and to identify means to continue HAB monitoring efforts after MERHAB project funding has ended; and (iv) form a management team with a designated chairperson serving as the main point of contact with the MERHAB Program Manager.

(c) Expected Outcomes and Deliverables

(i) Include regional stakeholder input and participation through means that may include, but are not limited to, annual workshops, management and technical advisory committees that involve a broad spectrum of regional interests and training in use of new technology; (ii) provide recommendations to management of the parameters to be measured in a region and the types of instruments that should be developed or adapted into existing monitoring programs; (iii) deploy new HAB monitoring tools in existing monitoring programs; (iv) conduct comprehensive data analysis and integration that advances the state of science and management. (i.e. operational HAB forecasting, numerical and conceptual models; regional case studies with explicit applications to important management issues; risk analysis of management scenarios; regional economic valuation of direct and indirect costs associated with HAB events; and region-specific management recommendations based on study results); (v) accept commitments from one or more local, state, tribal, regional, or Federal organizations for continued, long-term support of expanding HAB monitoring capabilities; (vi) develop real-time, scientific

response capability during HAB outbreaks for the region that includes, but is not limited to, the use of local experts, establishing local academic-government- NGO-private partnerships for providing immediate analytical and sampling capacities, and expanding local abilities for transferring samples to analytical services outside the region; and (vii) conduct outreach to improve awareness of HAB outbreaks and their environmental and societal costs, and to mitigate their impact on vital natural resources, public health and local/regional economies.

### 3) Shared Characteristics of Targeted and Regional, Intensive Projects

Project results will be distributed to stakeholders via scientific, peer-reviewed articles, synthesis documents, briefings, electronic web sites, and any other means defined by the proposers. Project proposals should also clearly identify a timetable of accomplishments and major program elements that will lead to specific interim and final assessments of applicability and effectiveness of a number of monitoring approaches.

C. Program Authorities: 16 U.S.C. 1442 and Pub.L. 105-383, title VI, Nov. 13, 1998, 112 Stat. 3447

## 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 not to exceed \$100,000. per project per year with project durations from 1-3 years for targeted research projects and \$600,000. per project per year with projects duration from 3-5 years for regional research projects. It is anticipated that 2 to 12 total projects will be funded with no more than two being regional intensive projects. 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 one's 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 may cover a project/award period of up to 5 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 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. 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 year's 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

They are project grants and cooperative agreements.

(1) Research Project Grants: A research project grant is one in which substantial programmatic involvement by NOAA is not anticipated by the recipient during the project period. Applicants for grants must demonstrate an ability to conduct the proposed research with minimal assistance, other than financial support, from NOAA.

(2) Cooperative Agreements: A cooperative agreement implies that NOAA will assist recipients in conducting the proposed research. The application should be presented in a manner that demonstrates the applicant's ability to address the research problem in a collaborative manner with NOAA. 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.

(3) Determination of which instrument to use: Applicants must specify the type of award for which they are applying, either a grant or a cooperative agreement. The funding agency will review the applications in accordance with the evaluation criteria. Before issuing awards, NOAA will determine whether a grant or cooperative agreement is the appropriate instrument based upon the need for substantial NOAA involvement in the project.

(4) 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 project grant or 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 NCCOS/CSCOR/COP or partnered with other Federal offices and agencies.

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

#### D. Permits and Approvals

It is the applicant's 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 analysis 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 grants 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 Submit Application Package

Submit the original and 15 copies of your proposal to Attn. MERHAB 2005, 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. Marc Suddleson MERHAB 2005 Program Manager, NCCOS/CSCOR/COP, 301-713-3338/ext 162, Internet: [marc.suddleson@noaa.gov](mailto:marc.suddleson@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 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: MERHAB 2005, 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 MERHAB 2005 program goals, and its scientific priorities. For MERHAB-targeted project proposals, the project description (including relevant results from prior support) should not exceed 15 pages. For MERHAB-regional project proposals, the project description (including relevant results from prior support) should not exceed 20 pages. Both 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.

(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.

(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. The SF-424A, Budget Information (Non-Construction) Form, will be requested only from those applicants subsequently recommended for award.

Any 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 individual's 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

The deadline for receipt of proposals at the COP office is 3 p.m., local time December 1, 2004. (Note that late-arriving applications provided to a delivery service on or before December 1, 2004 with delivery guaranteed before 3 p.m., local

time on December 1, 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, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs." It has been determined that this notice is not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(a) (2), an opportunity for public notice and comment is not required for this notice relating to grants, benefits and contracts. Because this notice is exempt from the notice and comment provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required, and none has been prepared. It has been determined that this notice does not contain policies with Federalism implications as that term is defined in Executive Order 13132.

#### 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

1. Importance and/or relevance and applicability of proposed project to the program goals (30 percent): Likelihood that the research will make substantial contributions or develop products leading to improved management of coastal resources.

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.

3. Overall qualifications of applicants (20 percent): 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 this competition, this refers to 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 focused and effective education and outreach strategy regarding NOAA's mission to protect the Nation's natural resources. For this competition, this refers to 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) select the proposals to be recommended for funding by average panel ratings, and/or by applying the project funding priorities 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 selecting official may choose a proposal out of rank order based upon:

1. Availability of funding
2. Balance across national regions,
3. Duplication of other projects funded by NOAA or other federal agencies
4. Program priorities and policy factors, as stated above in section I.B.
5. Applicant's prior award performance: Unsatisfactory prior performance may be a basis for not funding an applicant
6. Evidence of clear partnerships with management groups

#### D. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

Subject to the availability of funds, review of proposals will begin in December, 2004. August 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

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. Marc Suddleson, MERHAB 2005 Program Manager, NCCOS/CSCOR/COP, 301-703-3338/ext 162, Internet: marc.suddleson@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.