

# **The Changing Face of Coastal South Carolina: Building a Resilient Future**

**South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium**  
FY18-20 Biennial Sea Grant Request for Proposals

---

**Biennial Sea Grant Program**  
**February 1, 2018 to January 31, 2020**

**Sea Grant Request for Proposals**

Concept Letters Due at S.C. Sea Grant Consortium Office  
March 20, 2017

Invited Full Proposals Due at S.C. Sea Grant Consortium Office  
June 19, 2017



South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium  
287 Meeting Street  
Charleston, South Carolina 29401  
(843) 953-2078  
Fax (843) 953-2080



February 13, 2017



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**OVERVIEW OF FY18-20 SEA GRANT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS..... 3**  
**INTRODUCTION ..... 3**  
**IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PROSPECTIVE PIs..... 4**  
**THE PROPOSAL PROCESS IN A NUTSHELL ..... 6**

**SECTION I: FY18-20 PROGRAM AREA PRIORITY NEEDS ..... 9**  
**HEALTHY COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS ..... 9**  
Sound Scientific Information in Support of Ecosystem-based Management ..... 9  
Functions and Productivity of Ecosystem Restoration Efforts..... 10  
**SUSTAINABLE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT and ECONOMY ..... 10**  
Working Waterfronts, Recreation and Tourism, and Public Access..... 10  
Population Change, land use and Variations in Climate and Weather ..... 11  
Coastal Ocean (Offshore) Resource Use and Management..... 12  
**WEATHER and CLIMATE RESILIENCE ..... 12**  
Understanding Risks Due to Changing Weather and Climate Strategies ..... 12  
Shoreline Change and Beach, Marsh, and Dune Systems ..... 14  
**SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES and AQUACULTURE ..... 14**  
Innovative Fisheries and Aquaculture Strategies ..... 14  
Healthy Domestic Seafood Industry ..... 15  
**SCIENTIFIC LITERACY and WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ..... 16**  
K-12 STEM-based Educational Programs..... 16  
Diverse and Scientifically Trained Workforce ..... 17  
Enhanced Public Understanding ..... 17

**SECTION II: CONCEPT LETTERS - INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION  
and SUBMISSION ..... 18**

**SECTION III: FULL PROPOSALS - INSTRUCTION FOR PREPARATION  
and SUBMISSION..... 21**

**SECTION IV: CONCEPT LETTER and FULL PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA... 29**

**SECTION V: FUNDED PROJECTS – RESPONSIBILITIES and  
REPORTING ..... 31**

**APPENDIX A: CONTACT PERSONS – CONSORTIUM STAFF and  
INSTITUTIONAL LIAISON OFFICERS..... 37**

**APPENDIX B: PREPARING THE SEA GRANT PROJECT SUMMARY FORM..... 39**

**APPENDIX C: NOAA GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING BUDGETS AND  
JUSTIFICATIONS ..... 41**



## **S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

### **OVERVIEW OF FY18-20 SEA GRANT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

The South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium (Consortium), moving into its 37th year of administering the NOAA National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) for the state, is now soliciting proposals for consideration and possible inclusion in the Consortium's Biennial Program Plan for fiscal years 2018-19 and 2019-20. Included in this Overview is a summary of the following topics:

Introduction to the Consortium's Sea Grant Proposal Process  
Important Updates/Considerations for Prospective PIs  
An Overview of the Proposal Process

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Consortium is requesting Sea Grant **Concept Letters** on innovative research, education, and extension activities which seek to both understand and directly address major issues, problems, and opportunities related to the use, management and conservation of marine and coastal resources by the citizens of the state and region.

Consortium program priorities fall within the context of the NOAA NSGCP Strategic Plan and the Consortium's final draft FY18-21 Strategic Plan [http://www.scseagrant.org/pdf\\_files/SCSGC-FY18-21-Strategic-Plan-02-08-17.pdf](http://www.scseagrant.org/pdf_files/SCSGC-FY18-21-Strategic-Plan-02-08-17.pdf), and focus on critical marine and coastal resource needs and opportunities for South Carolina and the region. Section I of this RFP includes a listing of the Consortium's priority research needs. *PIs are strongly encouraged to submit Concept Letters that directly address one or more of these priorities.* Concept letters that address other topics may be submitted; however, the burden of justifying the need for the effort proposed lies entirely with the investigator(s).

Interdisciplinary projects involving the natural, physical, and social sciences are appropriate and strongly encouraged. Multi-institutional and regional efforts are also encouraged, as are collaborations with colleagues in business, industry, and government agencies. Formal engagement of targeted stakeholders (e.g., resource management entities, local communities, business and industry, etc.) in both the development of proposals and in the projects, if funded, is strongly encouraged. Project results must provide environmental, economic, and/or social benefits to an identified and engaged target constituency. In addition, PIs are expected to publish their findings in peer-reviewed journals.

Consortium research, extension, and education staff are available to assist prospective submitters in suggesting potential linkages with cooperators and stakeholders in the public and private sectors (see Appendix A for Consortium staff listing).

### **Available Funding**

The Consortium anticipates having up to \$500,000 available for new project starts in FY18. Because our program proposal will cover two years, new projects may be scheduled to begin February 1 in either 2018 or 2019. A separate invitation for proposals for 2019 starts will not be issued, since this invitation covers the two-year period.



## **Program Priorities and Proposal Guidelines**

The Consortium's FY18-20 Sea Grant Omnibus RFP consists of the following sections outlined below; prospective PIs are strongly encouraged to read through all sections of the RFP before preparing materials for submission, as many sections have been modified or updated since the last RFP was issued two years ago.

<u>Section I</u> -	Program Area Priority Needs
<u>Section II</u> -	Concept Letters – Instructions for Preparation and Submission
<u>Section III</u> -	Full Proposals – Instructions for Preparation and Submission, which includes proposal content and submission requirements, formatting instructions, and forms
<u>Section IV</u> -	Concept Letter and Full Proposal Review Criteria
<u>Section V</u> -	Funded Projects – Grant Responsibilities and Reporting Requirements
<u>Appendix A</u> -	Listing of Consortium Staff Contact Persons and Institutional Liaison Officers located at the Consortium's member institutions
<u>Appendix B</u> -	Preparing the Sea Grant Project Summary Form
<u>Appendix C</u> -	NOAA Guidance for Completing Budgets and Justifications

### **Concept Letters**

The first step in the proposal process is the preparation and submission of a Concept Letter for each project proposal being submitted; see Section II for instructions.

All Concept Letters must be submitted to the Consortium in both a Microsoft Word document and a PDF file.

*All concept letters are due at the Consortium by COB on March 20, 2017.*

### **Concept Letter Review**

Concept letters will be reviewed and evaluated by an external advisory panel, the Consortium management team, and S.C. Sea Grant program specialists. This process will result in the selection of Concept Letters which merit development into Full Proposals. Prospective investigators with successful Concept Letters will be notified on or before April 14, 2017 and will be invited to prepare and submit Full Proposals according to guidelines provided in Section III.

### **IMPORTANT NOTICES TO PROSPECTIVE PIs**

With the increasing emphasis on project accomplishments, performance measures and metrics, and outcomes by the NOAA National Sea Grant Office, we are placing greater emphasis during the review of FY18-20 Sea Grant Concept Letters and subsequent Full Proposals on the following elements. Therefore, please read the following information before you submit a Concept Letter. Concept Letters which do not address Sea Grant priorities as outlined below will be reviewed less favorably.

### **Proposed Work Must Address Needs of Identified Target Audiences**

Federal program accountability requirements now call for Sea Grant competitive research and outreach projects to be outcome-oriented, address societal problems/issues/opportunities, engage users from the outset, support economic gains and/or savings, and result in the application of science-based information to foster decision-making.

Therefore, the Consortium is placing a higher level of emphasis on how well prospective PIs



engage targeted stakeholders and describe how the proposed project addresses documented problems, issues, and opportunities related to the use and management of coastal and ocean resources as identified in this document. Prospective PIs are thus expected to:

1. Identify and engage target audiences in developing their research questions,
2. Describe how results from the proposed efforts will be translated into information/tools,
3. Outline how project results will be extended, and
4. Indicate what portion of the proposed budget/effort will be devoted to target audience engagement and information outreach efforts.

Concept Letter and Full Proposal Review Panels are now populated with outreach specialists and social scientists as well as technical experts to ensure that these elements are addressed. Failure to provide this documentation will lead to a lower rating of the Concept Letter and, if solicited, the Full Proposal.

*Prospective PIs are expected to contact the Consortium's Sea Grant Extension, Education, and/or Communications Programs for assistance and guidance with user/stakeholder and for desired participation by Consortium program staff in the proposed work.*

**Statement of Expected Outcomes**

The Consortium requires prospective PIs to explicitly list the **Expected Outcomes** to be achieved for each year of the proposed project and potential practical implications and applications of the proposed work to the economy, environment, and society. We are particularly interested in cost savings, revenue generation, jobs created, new products/tools developed, workforce development results, and similar outcomes. The instructions found later in Section II for Concept Letters and Section III for Full Proposals define this requirement in more detail.

**Data Sharing Plan**

All environmental data and information collected and/or created under NOAA grants and cooperative agreements must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users, free of charge or at minimal cost, and in a timely manner (typically no later than two years after the data are collected or created), except where limited by law, regulation, policy, or by security requirements. This requirement has two parts: (1) environmental data generated by a research project must be made available after a reasonable period of exclusive use, and (2) the grant proposal must describe the plan to make the data available.

To comply with this new requirement, prospective Principal Investigator(s) must include a "Data Sharing Plan" in the Full Proposal stage, explaining how data and metadata will be offered and shared. Funds may be budgeted in the Full Proposal for this task. *Data Sharing Plans are not required at the Concept Letter stage; however, prospective PIs should indicate their willingness to include such a plan in their Full Proposals.* More details about the requirements for these plans will be sent to Principal Investigators along with the letters of invitation to submit Full Proposals.

**Electronic Submission of Concept Letters and Full Proposals**

The Consortium will require electronic submission of both Concept Letters and Full Proposals. . Concept Letters should be prepared and electronically submitted as Word and PDF documents; this year the Consortium will also be requesting that a complete version of the Full Proposal be submitted as a PDF file.



**Indirect Costs on Sea Grant-funded Projects**

In the spirit of cooperation among Consortium member institutions, and in order to get the maximum benefit from funds available for its programs, it is the long-standing policy of the Consortium Board of Directors not to use Sea Grant funds to pay indirect costs to its member institutions; however, indirect costs may be used to satisfy the National Sea Grant College Program’s 50% matching fund requirement.

**Funding Levels**

Successful major projects through the Consortium are generally supported in the range of \$20,000 to \$80,000 per year (higher for multi-investigator and/or multi-institutional proposals) and provide at least the required 50% non-federal match (that is, non-federal match of at least \$1 is required for every \$2 requested from Sea Grant).

**THE PROPOSAL PROCESS IN A NUTSHELL**

Nearly one year is required from the conceptualization of a proposal idea to the formal award of Sea Grant funds (Table 1). This is necessary for several reasons. First, the conceptual merit of Concept Letters and the technical and scientific merit and utility of Full Proposals are rigorously reviewed by peer groups from academia, government, and stakeholders to ensure that proposed objectives are relevant, timely, achievable, and of high priority. Secondly, Concept Letters and Full Proposals are judged based on the probability of producing results that have practical applications, whether on a short-term or long-term basis, for specified target audiences. Finally, the proposal process involves not only the review of Concept Letters and Full Proposals, but also a national evaluation of the state’s Sea Grant program as a whole. The year before formal awards are made involves direct and continuous interaction among prospective investigators and Consortium staff.

The Consortium’s Sea Grant Program operates on a biennial cycle that reduces the burden of both proposal preparation for investigators and proposal review for the Consortium staff. However, funding of Sea Grant projects, and requisite project reporting, remains an annual process. The start date of some approved projects submitted by investigators in response to the Consortium’s Sea Grant RFP may be deferred to the second year of a biennium.

**Personal or telephone contact** with Consortium management, research, extension, education, or communications staff is advantageous during the Concept Letter development process (see Appendix A for a listing of Consortium staff and contact information). Projects being considered for Concept Letter development could be discussed with respect to merit and likelihood for funding support.

A **Request for Proposals (RFP)** at the beginning of each biennial cycle solicits Concept Letters outlining proposed research, education, and extension activities in priority areas identified by the Consortium. Input as to what problems and opportunities warrant investigation is provided by members of the Consortium’s Program Advisory Board, and Sea Grant extension and education program advisory committees, representatives of state and federal resource agencies, the results of Web-based constituent surveys, and the State Legislature. This input is informed through the Consortium’s Strategic Planning process, guidance from the NSGCP Strategic Plan, and consults with the NSGCP Office staff. The Consortium Executive Director and staff then develop the Request for Proposals which outlines priority needs.

**Table 1. PROPOSAL PREPARATION SCHEDULE**



(E-)Mail Sea Grant FY16-18 RFP Pre-announcement	January 20, 2017
Disseminate Consortium FY16-18 RFP and Guidelines	February 13, 2017
Concept Letters Due COB* at Consortium Office	March 20, 2017
Review of Concept Letters	March 20-April 10, 2017
Notification of Successful Proposers and Invitation for Full Proposals	April 14, 2017
Successful Proposers Prepare Full Proposals	April 14-June 16, 2017
Full Proposals Due at Consortium Office, Signed and Endorsed	June 19, 2017
Written Reviews of Full Proposals (Written & External Panel)	June 26-Aug 7, 2017
Panel Review of Full Proposals	Week of Aug 14, 2017
Selection of Final Set of Proposals to be included in FY16-18 Sea Grant Program Plan	Aug 21-Sept11, 2017
Notification of Successful Proposers	Sept 15, 2017
Successful Proposers Prepare Written Responses to Peer Reviews	Sept 15-Oct 6, 2017
Discussion of Omnibus Program Plan between Consortium Executive Director & NSGCP Program Officer	Oct 6-Oct 27, 2017
Publication of FY16-18 Sea Grant Program Plan	November 2017
Omnibus Program Plan Due at NSGCP Office	December 1, 2017
Start Date for FY18 Projects*	February 1, 2018

*\*Projected*

The Consortium **Request for Proposals (RFP)** is disseminated in early February. The RFP solicits **Concept Letters** as a precursor to the submission of Full Proposals. It is at the Concept Letter stage where a practical problem to be resolved and/or an opportunity to be explored must be explicitly stated and the beneficiaries of the work specifically identified and engaged. Concept Letters are due at the Consortium office March 20, 2017.

The Concept Letter submission and review process constitutes the first major step in the proposal cycle for prospective PIs. Investigators whose Concept Letters are highly rated and address Consortium priorities will be invited to submit **Full Proposals** for consideration. Investigators will be notified about the status of their Concept Letters by April 14, 2017.

Approximately nine weeks are provided for the preparation of Full Proposals; they are due at the Consortium office on June 19, 2017. All Full Proposals are subjected to a rigorous written peer review and external panel review process during August. Comments received from outside reviewers and review panelists are summarized and provided to the investigators.

Proposals determined to address Consortium program priorities and meet constituent needs, formally engage target stakeholders/users, have a strong technical/scientific/methodological approach, and fit within the available budget, will be included in the Consortium's proposed program plan. Investigators will be asked to prepare and submit a letter addressing reviewers' comments during early September. The proposals themselves cannot be revised.

During late September-mid October, the Consortium staff prepares the agency's **final biennial Sea Grant program plan** for electronic submission to the NOAA National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) office through grants.gov. Final editing and word processing is



completed and proposals are linked into program area components.

Also during this time, the Consortium Executive Director meets with our NSGCP Program Officer to discuss the package and provide additional information on ongoing program activities. The final program plan contains the required fiscal and administrative documentation (prepared by the Consortium) and is due on November 1, 2017 for processing by NSGCP, NOAA, and the U.S. Department of Commerce. This process takes from four-to-twelve weeks prior to the beginning of the Consortium's Sea Grant fiscal year and the announcement of awards in late January for project start-ups on February 1, 2018.



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**SECTION I: PROGRAM AREA PRIORITY NEEDS**

**STRATEGIC AREA I. HEALTHY COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS**

**Goal 1:** Sound scientific information is available to support ecosystem-based approaches to land use and resource management decision-making throughout the coastal environment.

**Objective 1.1:** Generate and deliver information on changes to ecosystem condition and health due to natural and anthropogenic forces and communicate this information to coastal decision-makers.

**Priorities:**

Examine and document the importance of the ecological interrelationships between coastal terrestrial (riverine) ecosystems (including shallow water aquifers) and estuarine productivity, with a focus on the effects of changes in freshwater flow due to land use, drought, and sea level rise on estuarine ecosystem dynamics.

Identify the most vulnerable and valuable keystone species and places (habitats or specific locations) under changing climate and development scenarios (including the interaction of physical chemical, and biological forces that influence resource utilization of coastal wetland and estuarine habitats by marine species) and predict the impacts on these species and environments.

**Objective 1.2:** Generate and deliver science-based information on the effects of changes in water quality and quantity on coastal ecosystems and communities to support land, water, and living resources management decision-making.

**Priorities:**

Determine the economic, social, and cultural value of declining/improving water quality within communities, including the importance of water used to support aesthetic values, cultural and spiritual activities, production of food, learning activities, and tourism and recreational activities.

Prepare a synthesis/state-of-the-science on the ecological and societal value of low-salinity environments, including tidal freshwater wetlands, and the potential impacts of changes in water quality, quantity, and chemistry.

**Objective 1.3:** Integrate baseline data, standards, and key indicators to support ecosystem management decision-making affecting land, water, and coastal and ocean resources.

**Priorities:**

Conduct economic and social valuation research on coastal resources and ecosystem services provided by beaches, barrier islands, sea islands, salt marshes, coastal freshwater wetlands, and other ecologically important natural features of the South Carolina coastal environment.



Determine the effects of physical changes (e.g., in temperature, salinity, turbidity, hydrology, freshwater delivery) on South Carolina's coastal ecosystems and resources due to increased variability in coastal hydrology and projected sea level rise, and identification of recommended strategies to address the effects.

Identify significant cumulative effects, if any, on keystone marine organisms of exposure to Contaminants of Emerging Concern (e.g., antibiotics, pharmaceuticals, endocrine disruptors, nanomaterials, microplastics, personal care products) in salt marsh-tidal creek complexes and stormwater pond systems.

Synthesize current data and develop predictive models on coastal ecosystem changes and associated risks due to the effects of changing weather and climate patterns.

**Goal 2:** Restored and enhanced function and productivity of coastal and ocean ecosystems

**Objective 2.1:** Support enhancement and restoration of oyster and salt marsh ecosystems.

**Priorities:**

South Carolina has a long history of oyster reef restoration which can serve as a foundation for studies to determine the functional trajectory and maturity of created versus natural reefs in terms of ecosystem services and social and economic benefits. Research is needed for:

- Determine the factors which regulate if and when restored intertidal oyster reefs reach full functional maturity. Although literature is available that defines functional maturity of restored *Spartina* populations, little exists in parallel for intertidal oysters.
- Compare restored oyster reef systems with natural oyster reef systems, through ecological, social, and/or economic assessment techniques, in terms of services and value provided to the environment and to society.

Study and document the natural processes, functions, and features which regulate oyster reef formation (reformation), development, and persistence in various geographies in order to determine what factors affect oyster reef presence/absence, resilience to damage, and rate of recovery.

**Objective 2.2:** Develop and provide new information, methods, and technologies that help minimize the introduction, spread, and negative impacts of coastal and ocean invasive species.

**Priority:**

Develop new methods and technologies to minimize impacts of coastal invasive species (e.g. apple snail, *Phragmites*) on ecosystem services, native species and habitats, environmental health, and socio-economic well-being.

**STRATEGIC AREA II. SUSTAINABLE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMY**

**Goal 1:** Healthy and viable coastal communities and economies include robust working waterfronts, abundant recreation and tourism opportunities, and coastal access.



**Objective 1.1:** Provide information and tools to coastal communities to enhance waterfront-related economic opportunities (e.g., commercial and recreational fishing, aquaculture, and energy and port development) without diminishing the long-term health of the coastal environment.

**Priorities:**

Develop conceptual model(s) of South Carolina’s working waterfront communities which allows for multiple-use access and accounts for compatible and competing uses to assist local government decision-making in land-use planning and policy-making

Conduct a policy analysis of waterfront ordinances and related best management practices, and planning tools, and identify economic incentives and policy alternatives that could be implemented to preserve waterfront access for traditional commercial (e.g., commercial fishing, aquaculture, small maritime businesses) and recreational (e.g., beach and water access) uses, in South Carolina.

**Objective 1.2:** Inform and assist coastal tourism and recreation businesses to foster a balance between the vitality and abundance of South Carolina’s coastal and marine resources and the economic health of the tourism industry that depends on them.

**Priorities:**

Litter is a significant 21<sup>st</sup> century pollution problem with the potential to degrade the natural attractions and environments which appeal to visitors and tourists. Research is needed to examine, assess, and evaluate the socio-economic impacts of litter (marine debris/beach litter from storms and human activities) on the recreation and tourism sectors (e.g., hotels, food, recreation, boating, fishing) in South Carolina’s coastal communities.

Develop and evaluate options for local communities to consider as they seek to identify and provide natural resource-based coastal and ocean recreation and tourism opportunities which are economically, environmentally, and culturally sustainable.

**Objective 1.3:** Support local, state, regional, and national efforts to preserve and increase public access to South Carolina’s beaches, waterfronts, and waterways.

**Priority:**

Assess changes in the degree of access to coastal resources available to the public, determine public attitudes regarding the present availability of public access sites with respect to effects on coastal identity, culture, and heritage, and identify potential options to address coastal access challenges based on the above.

**Goal 2:** Coastal communities manage and conserve the resources needed to sustain their quality of life in light of rapid population growth, land-use change, and variations in climate and weather.

**Objective 2.1:** Work with federal, state, and local partners to develop and disseminate assessment tools, model plans and ordinances, best management practices, alternative development approaches, and other techniques that will enable communities to develop



in environmentally-sound ways.

**Priority:**

Assess, refine, and update, if necessary, integrated land use-coastal ecosystem models that predict and quantitatively forecast the impacts of land-use change and associated practices on coastal watersheds and the resources therein. Models should include consideration of changes in weather and climate and sea level rise.

**Objective 2.2:** Communicate research and information related to the effects of land-use change, population growth, and climate and weather patterns on coastal and ocean ecosystems to coastal communities to support decision-making.

**Priorities:**

Identify and examine successful regional (i.e., multiple local jurisdictions within the state) approaches to land-use planning and develop a toolkit of potential practices, policies, successful case studies, and other resources for communities to use in their decision-making processes as they look to accommodate rapid population growth, demographic diversification, and economic expansion.

Evaluate, analyze, update, and refine the extensive suite of existing visualization maps/tools which illustrate future changes in coastal population growth, land use, and land cover, including projections of environmental, economic, and demographic effects, especially in light of the re-emerging economy, rapid population growth, and rising sea levels at the local level.

Evaluate existing stormwater quality models with efficiency and efficacy data based upon coastal hydrology and hydrodynamics and standardized protocols for monitoring and assessing the life-cycle costs, functions, and performance of Low Impact Development (LID) management practices in South Carolina.

**Goal 3:** State and local decision-makers possess the knowledge about the complex inter-relationships among the social, economic, and environmental characteristics of the coastal ocean (offshore) environment of the state and southeast region, and the tools necessary to manage emerging uses and optimize economic and environmental sustainability.

**Objective 3.1:** Document the ecological, economic, policy, and societal implications of offshore energy development (e.g., oil, gas, and wind) on the South Carolina coastal landscape.

**Priority:**

Assess existing and potential public and private sector uses of the coastal and ocean resources which exist within South Carolina's territorial sea to document and describe current – and the potential for future – multiple use conflicts.

### **STRATEGIC AREA III. WEATHER AND CLIMATE RESILIENCE**

**Goal 1:** Widespread community understanding of the risks associated with living, working, and doing business along the South Carolina coast encourages public and private decision-makers to create and adopt policies, plans, and ordinances to reduce risks, manage weather and climate events, and speed recovery.



**Objective 1.1:** Increase the base of scientific knowledge regarding weather and climate and the associated risks and impacts for citizens, industries, and decision-makers in coastal communities in South Carolina.

**Priorities:**

Socio-economic and physical risk (vulnerability) analyses of changes in weather, climate, and sea level rise on the natural (e.g., beaches and salt marshes) and built (e.g., dwellings, infrastructure, public facilities) environment along South Carolina's coastal shorelines, which examine social, economic, and environmental factors, and identify challenges facing the state and local communities as they plan for and adapt to continued growth and development.

Assess the potential economic impacts, implications, value, costs, and benefits of weather and climate adaptation strategies related to public and private drinking water, waste water, and storm water infrastructure as well as ecosystem services. In particular,

- Develop cost-effective and structurally sound hazard mitigation strategies, tools, and techniques related to building design, construction methods, building code standards, and land use that can be applied by communities to reduce coastal hazard risks.
- Conduct an integrated assessment of economic, social, and physical impacts of short-term climate variability (droughts, floods) and of long-term changes in climate, focusing on impacts of repeated and/or prolonged periods of heavy precipitation and drought and/or variations in water temperatures, pH, and salinity, on water quality and the resulting effects on the health of commercially valuable seafood species.

Examine and project the effects of changing weather and climate events, and in particular, more frequent and/or severe heavy precipitation coupled with changes in sea level rise, on the functionality and effectiveness of existing, and siting and construction of new, stormwater ponds.

- Assess the cause-and-effect relationships between the influences of changes in weather and climate patterns on the occurrences of acute and chronic public health impacts.

**Objective 1.2:** Provide science-based information to improve community capacity to prepare for, adapt to, mitigate, and recover from weather and climate hazards.

**Priorities:**

Generate and assess effective communication strategies to enhance community understanding of how short-term and long term weather and climate can impact public health, particularly in vulnerable communities.

Identify and analyze opportunities and barriers that state and local decision-makers face in using information about climate variability in planning and/or undertaking adaptation options, including initiating adaptation planning and mainstreaming adaptation to climate variability and change into decision-making processes (e.g., local comprehensive plans, hazard mitigation plans, beachfront management plans).



**Objective 1.3:** Facilitate the use of science-based research outcomes in the implementation of adaptive weather and climate management at varying governmental levels.

**Priorities:**

No priorities this cycle.

**Goal 2:** Generate and distribute information, management tools and technologies on beach, marsh, and dune systems that can help communities prepare for and mitigate the impacts of shoreline changes.

**Objective 2.1:** Evaluate the effects of hazards on beachfront and estuarine and tidal marsh shorelines, including the impacts from hardened structures.

**Priorities:**

Generate scenarios of the physical impacts under a variety of sea level rise rates on shoreline (oceanfront and estuarine) erosion rates, and describe the policy implications of such changes.

Develop and test models of tide- and wind-forced nearshore currents and sediment transport, apply such models to sediment transport and erosion “hot-spots” in South Carolina, and generate information that supports the development of regional sediment budgets/management in South Carolina.

Calculate the economic value and impact (in dollars and ecosystem services) of beaches in South Carolina.

Determine/model the physical and economic effectiveness and efficacy of beach nourishment programs as influenced by both short-term (e.g., coastal storms) and long-term (e.g., sea level rise) events, including analyses and forecasts of dredging frequency, costs, affordability, environmental sustainability, and material recovery feasibility.

Examine and document trends related to beachfront and estuarine shoreline change and develop and assess alternative salt marsh bank erosion mitigation techniques (e.g., living shorelines), including through a synthesis of gray and green stabilization techniques and effectiveness.

Model and develop visualizations of future inland transgression of coastal marshes under various sea level scenarios, taking into account existing and future land use change, infrastructure development, and estuarine shoreline armoring.

## **STRATEGIC AREA IV. SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE**

**Goal 1:** Sustainable fisheries and aquaculture that balance the ecological needs of the resource and socioeconomic needs of communities.

**Objective 1.1:** Support the identification and development of innovative management strategies and other approaches through applied research to maximize the long-term



sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture enterprises in South Carolina.

**Priorities:**

Collaborative research, with colleagues in North Carolina and Georgia, on the dynamics of black gill disease in the southeast, including its presence and prevalence in South Carolina shrimp populations, effects on the species and the fishery, and methods/means by which it can be contained/controlled.

Determine and project the potential impacts of climate variability on marine fishery resources, including changes in marsh migration routes, potential loss of critical habitat, changes in primary and secondary biological productivity, and impacts to physiological processes.

Develop and evaluate best harvesting practices for emerging fisheries aimed at minimizing environmental impacts.

**Objective 1.2:** Enhance the seafood industry through translational research and technology transfer aimed at increasing sustainability, production, and profitability.

**Priorities:**

Evaluate the feasibility of new, native species for aquaculture production in South Carolina (i.e., Sunray Venus clam) in partnership with the shellfish mariculture industry.

Generate and evaluate recommendations for modified regulatory frameworks for aquaculture producers seeking to incorporate novel gear types and/or new species in their businesses.

Examine the effectiveness and success, long-term potential, and ecological effects of existing stock enhancement programs as fisheries management tools to augment wild finfish populations.

Determine the “social carrying capacity” of fisheries and aquaculture operations in state waters, and develop an assessment technique/tool for use in determining public expectations and concerns regarding increased use of coastal waters for aquaculture.

**Objective 1.3:** Foster enhanced communications among the fisheries and aquaculture industry, resource management agencies, and the public regarding living marine resource management and policy in South Carolina.

**Priority:**

Develop the means by which multiple user viewpoints of how management actions affect the structure of the fishery and fishing communities can be assessed.

**Goal 2:** A healthy domestic seafood industry that harvests, produces, processes, and markets seafood responsibly and sustainably.

**Objective 2.1:** Seafood businesses adopt socially and economically viable and sustainable production practices.



**Priorities:**

Document and assess changes in the demographic and socio-economic dynamics of the State's commercial and recreational fisheries, including examination of (a) shifts in the average age of fishermen, (b) changes in operational expenses and regulations, (c) how the fisheries will change relative to offshore vs. inshore fishing, increased shore-based fishing, targeting different species, etc., and (d) economic incentives and policy alternatives that could be implemented to preserve waterfront access for such uses.

Examine the seafood supply chain, with a focus on distribution channels, in the Southeast U.S. and analyze alternatives for how various South Carolina seafood products could be efficiently delivered to inland markets in major regional centers such as Atlanta and Nashville.

**STRATEGIC AREA V. SCIENTIFIC LITERACY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

**Goal 1:** Coastal and ocean K-12 education programs foster scientific literacy, stewardship, and exposure to STEM-based careers in both formal and informal settings.

**Objective 1.1:** Design, implement, and enhance K-12 student (formal and informal) marine education programs which focus on STEM disciplines, align with Ocean Literacy Essential Principles and South Carolina Science Standards, and emphasize community stewardship.

**Priorities:**

Develop educational methodologies and identification of barriers to improve technical skills of pre-service and in-service teachers in the marine and ocean sciences.

Develop and evaluate pilot recruitment strategies that successfully invite underrepresented and underserved (UR/US) in-service and/or pre-service teachers to participate in field-based professional development programs.

**Objective 1.2:** Design, implement, and enhance professional development opportunities for educators that provide content and resources for incorporating ocean sciences concepts.

**Priorities:**

Conduct a needs assessment of how ocean and coastal information can be packaged for diverse audiences (for each audience consider cultural sensitivity, education-level, gender, etc.)

Identify best practices for educators to recruit minorities into the marine and ocean sciences at the college/university level (e.g., minority mentoring programs on the internet).

Develop novel pilot programs that incorporate training, experience, and the development of technical skills for educators to enable them to enhance careers, entrepreneurship opportunities, and advanced academic study in the marine and



ocean sciences.

**Objective 1.3:** Design, implement, and/or enhance stewardship-focused programs, including student-action and community action projects.

**Priorities:**

No priorities

**Goal 2:** Coastal and ocean education programs foster the development of a diverse scientifically trained workforce.

**Objective 2.1:** Undergraduate and graduate students are trained to meet workforce needs in ocean sciences fields.

**Priorities:**

Develop innovative academic programs based on current research methodology, including direct access to instrumentation and data analysis common to multi-disciplinary natural and social science fields, for practical use by and training of undergraduate and graduate students.

Create research experiences for undergraduate students in coastal and marine fields through collaborative partnership models

Examine and assess workforce development strategies which include technical, community, and trade schools that foster careers in STEM-related coastal fields.

**Objective 2.2:** Support the development of a diverse workforce.

**Priorities:**

Explore novel approaches to the recruitment of undergraduate and graduate students interested in STEM-related coastal and ocean employment opportunities.

**Goal 3:** Improve public understanding about the coastal and marine environment and related community issues.

**Objective 3.1:** Provide engagement opportunities for the general public.

**Priorities:**

No priorities

**Objective 3.2:** Ensure that Consortium communications and education programs are effective in providing the necessary science-based information and that this information is delivered to target audiences in a timely fashion and in appropriate formats.

**Priorities:**

No priorities



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**SECTION II: CONCEPT LETTERS –  
INSTRUCTIONS for PREPARATION and SUBMISSION**

Concept Letters are due in the S.C. Sea Grant Consortium office COB on **March 20, 2017**

**Structure of Concept Letters**

Concept Letters should present a synopsis of the proposed effort, and should include the following elements:

**Problem Statement:** Describe in concise terms the problem and/or opportunity to be examined, identify the targeted stakeholders and constituencies which are involved in the issue and will be involved in the project, and specifically reference the S.C. Sea Grant Consortium program priority(ies) it addresses.

**Objectives:** Clearly list the overall objectives and hypotheses for the proposed project, and list specific objectives by year if proposing a two-year project. (Projects may require more than two years to complete; if so, PIs will be expected to submit a Concept Letter (and Full Proposal) for the two-year period beyond the initial biennium for review and processing.

**Methods:** Concisely describe the proposed methods - reviewers should be able to make a preliminary determination about the appropriateness and innovativeness of the proposed approach for achieving the stated objectives. PIs must indicate their willingness to include a data sharing plan in their Full Proposals.

**Expected Outcomes:** The PI should outline planned outcomes and the timeframes (on an annual basis, for each year of the proposed effort) in which they will be achieved. Expected Outcome statements should address how the proposed project is expected to contribute to the economic, environmental, social, and educational sectors of South Carolina and the region. The following list provides some examples of the types of statements the Consortium is seeking:

- New tools/technologies to be developed
- Number of jobs to be created/saved
- Changes in community/government/industry “behavior;” e.g., passage of new ordinances, adoption of new policies, etc., that may result
- Economic value (e.g., revenues and/or savings) of expected benefits to target audiences
- Number of new curricula developed and used in schools
- Number of patent applications to be filed

In addition, PIs are strongly encouraged to support the careers of undergraduate and graduate students, and to publish project results in scholarly journals. Therefore, PIs should outline their expectations for both in this section.

Please note that all PIs will be expected to report on and document their Outcomes in their annual and final reports (See Section V).

**Targeted Audiences/Outreach/Education:** Identify the users, organizations, and



groups which will be involved in the project and benefit from the work. Briefly identify the information products to be generated and the mechanisms that will be used to deliver resulting information to the target audiences. PIs are strongly encouraged to make contact with their target audiences prior to submission of Concept Letters to solicit their interest and seek their involvement in the proposed project. To increase the chance of Concept Letter success, *user involvement during the preparation of Concept Letters and Full Proposals, as well as throughout the project itself, is strongly encouraged*. Consortium outreach staff can be helpful in identifying key stakeholders (see [Appendix A](#) for Consortium staff listing).

**Anticipated Results/Benefits:** Outline the anticipated results and their potential application/implications to the Consortium's priorities and the target audiences that have been identified in [Section I](#).

**Personnel, Collaborators, and Stakeholders:** The Consortium strongly encourages PIs to include support for undergraduate and/or graduate students in their work, involve targeted stakeholders throughout the project, and include outreach specialists to assist with information exchange and delivery with stakeholders. PIs are encouraged to contact any one of the Consortium's program outreach specialists for their assistance; the involvement of outreach specialists from other state institutions is also welcome.

List the names and affiliations of all investigators, cooperators, senior staff, and students (if appropriate), and briefly describe their roles in the proposed effort. Also describe all stakeholder partners, user interactions, extension and/or education program staff involvement, and other details on those individuals who will contribute to the project.

**Budget/Duration:** Include a rough budget estimate (broken down into salaries, wages, fringe benefits, travel, equipment [value of \$5,000 or higher], supplies, and other costs) for each year of the project. Indicate the length of the proposed effort (in years).

### **Preparation of Concept Letters**

Please prepare your Concept Letter using the following guidelines:

1. The Concept Letter should be no longer than four (4) 8.5" x 11" pages.
2. Do not include any attachments to the Concept Letter.
3. Do not use a type face (font) smaller than 11 point.

### **Submission of Concept Letters**

All concept letters must be submitted to the Consortium **by COB on March 20, 2017** as both a Microsoft Word file and a PDF file, attached to an e-mail sent to [conceptletters@scseagrant.org](mailto:conceptletters@scseagrant.org).

### **Review of Concept Letters**

Concept Letters will be reviewed by members of the Consortium staff and an external review panel consisting of public and private marine and coastal resource and management representatives. Concept Letters should be succinct but sufficiently detailed so that reviewers can make an informed evaluation of the proposal's relevance to Consortium priorities and the capabilities of the PIs. Concept Letters will be evaluated based on the same criteria by which Full Proposals are judged. These criteria can be found in [Section IV](#).

Principal Investigators whose Concept Letters pass the initial review will be invited to submit **Full Proposals**. These investigators should prepare Full Proposals according to the guidelines found in [Section III](#).



**INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY16-18 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**SECTION III: FULL PROPOSALS –  
INSTRUCTIONS for PREPARATION and SUBMISSION**

Full Proposals are due in the S.C. Sea Grant Consortium office COB on **June 19, 2017**

If a Concept Letter has been selected by the Consortium for development into a Full Proposal, the following guidelines should be followed. Full Proposals should be prepared carefully with respect to style, clarity, manner of presentation, and conciseness. It is particularly important to fully indicate the nature of the problem or opportunity being examined, the Consortium priority(ies) being addressed, the relationship of the work to problems or opportunities of interest to the state and region, the nature of the results and products of the study, how the results will be of benefit (impacts) and to whom (target audiences), how targeted audiences will be involved in the project, and how the results will be delivered to those targeted audiences through specified outreach approaches. In addition, sufficient detail should be given on the methodological approach to be used in conducting the study. Each of these factors, along with the evaluation criteria listed in Section IV, will be evaluated during the peer and panel review processes.

This section is organized as follows:

- Proposal Forms and Instructions
- Instructions for Preparing Full Proposals
- Word Processing and Format Instructions
- Proposal Submission Requirements

**Proposal Forms and Instructions**

The following forms, in Microsoft Word, can be found and downloaded from the Consortium's website at [www.scseagrant.org/funding](http://www.scseagrant.org/funding) for use in preparing a Sea Grant Full Proposal.

- Proposal Endorsement Form
- Project Summary Form
- Budget Summary Form
- Milestone Chart - Proposed Year of Funding
- Milestone Chart - Multi-Year Projects
- Vitae Form

**Instructions for Preparing Full Proposals**

The Full Proposal should be assembled according to this **outline**:

1. Proposal Endorsement (Consortium form)
2. Project Summary (Consortium form)
3. Narrative, to include the following sections:
  - a. Proposal Title
  - b. Investigator Names and Affiliations
  - c. Introduction/Background/Rationale
  - d. Objectives
  - e. Detailed Methods
  - f. Targeted Audiences/Engagement/Outreach/Education
  - g. Information Products

- 
- h. Expected Outcomes
  - i. Anticipated Benefits
  - j. Related Work
  - k. Data Sharing Plan
  - l. References
4. Annual and Multi-year Milestone Charts (Consortium forms)
  5. Vitae (Consortium form)
  6. Budget (Consortium form) (as a separate Excel document)
  7. Detailed Budget Justification (as a separate Word document)

In addition to the Full Proposal, the PI(s) should provide as a separate Word file the names and contact information (including institution, address, phone number, e-mail address) for up to five Suggested Peer Reviewers. The Consortium may request a written peer review from one or more of them.

The **PROPOSAL ENDORSEMENT** serves as the official cover sheet for the proposal. This page includes the project title, principal investigator's name and affiliation, and the TOTAL amount requested for the duration of the proposed effort. It also serves as the signature page for institutional endorsements; all Full Proposals should be reviewed by and endorsed, on the Proposal Endorsement page, by the Sponsored Programs office at your institution for accurate budget and matching funds commitment. Investigators are encouraged to submit their Full Proposals to their institution's research/business office for review and signatures at least one week before they are due at the Consortium office.

Page 2 of the proposal should be completed using the **PROJECT SUMMARY FORM**; note that some items will be completed by Consortium staff. The Project Summary Form is very important in the review process and is of great concern to various federal monitors. It is suggested that it be completed as the final step in preparing the proposal in order to concisely summarize what is presented in the text. Some reviewers get their first and only impression of the proposed project from this form. Appendix B includes detailed guidance on completing the Project Summary Form.

The body of the proposal begins with the **TITLE** at the top of the page. The title should accurately reflect the nature of the proposal project and be free of technical jargon. Choose words to which the designated users of the project can relate. The name(s) and affiliation(s) of the key project investigator(s) should follow underneath the title.

The **INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND** section immediately follows the title on the same page; subsequent sections begin immediately afterward. A well-developed rationale for the proposed effort must be presented and should emphasize the importance of the work to the target audience(s). The problem or need should be stated succinctly and should clearly define the audience who desires the solution or will benefit from the work, and briefly describe how the audience will be engaged. If the proposed research and/or outreach effort has economic importance, state the nature of the potential economic payoff in an objective fashion. This section should also provide a summary of the current literature as it relates to the project; a demonstrated knowledge of the literature is a key component of a successful Sea Grant proposal. Finally, the Consortium priority(ies) that the proposal addresses should be identified.

The **OBJECTIVES** section should begin with a statement of the overall goal of the project. The goal should be followed by a succinct set of measurable objectives and, for quantitative



research proposals, one or more testable hypotheses. For two-year project proposals, a set of concisely stated, measurable objectives for each year should be listed. Objectives clearly state what the project hopes to accomplish, and realistically identify the proposed outcome and application of project results. For example, “increase our knowledge of ...” is not measurable language; rather “to determine the role of X in such-and-such a system” is much more appropriate, and allows for the determination of whether or not the project, in fact, has done so. A short paragraph should follow each objective to support its rationale.

Technical procedures and the development and analyses of data should be fully detailed in the **METHODS** section. Use the objectives as subheadings and describe the procedures and methods to be used to meet each. Cite relevant literature. For quantitative research proposals, delineate how the hypothesis (hypotheses) will be tested and identify the controls to be used. *(Note that the Consortium office must be notified before survey forms or questionnaires are sent to target audiences.)* Provide, in general terms, a timetable that identifies the sequence and duration by which objectives will be completed (e.g., “field studies will be completed by x and data analysis will begin...”); refer to the guidance on milestone charts below.

The Consortium will be focusing more of its evaluation on the extent to which a proposal specifically identifies and involves its **TARGET AUDIENCES** and what **OUTREACH/EDUCATION** efforts will be used to convey project results to them. Therefore, PIs must identify the users, organizations, stakeholders, and other groups who will benefit from the work, and engage them directly as much as possible in the development of the proposal and in implementation of the proposed effort. In addition, information products to be generated must be identified and *the mechanisms, including outreach personnel, which will be used to deliver* resulting information to the target audience should be outlined. Finally, PIs should identify how much of the proposed budget will be used for engaging target audiences. Prospective PIs should make contact with their target audiences as early as possible to gauge interest and involvement in the proposed effort prior to submitting Concept Letters; staff at the Consortium can provide assistance if desired (see [Appendix A](#) for contact information).

In a brief section, the **INFORMATION PRODUCTS** to result from the proposed project should be described. These products will depend on the audiences to be reached as identified in the introduction. Journal articles and technical reports are geared to the professional community and are clearly expected to be generated by Sea Grant PIs; Sea Grant extension booklets and brochures are geared to marine and coastal resource users. If Consortium Extension, Education, or Communications staff will (or should) play a role in the proposed effort in terms of disseminating resultant information, please contact the appropriate staff member(s) to formalize their involvement in the project (See [Appendix A](#)). Note: the Consortium also requires annual and final reports on all projects; refer to [Section V](#) for more details.

The PI should identify specific **EXPECTED OUTCOME(S)** for each year of the proposed work. The PI should outline planned outcomes and the timeframes (on an annual basis, for each year of the proposed effort) in which they will be achieved. Expected Outcome statements should address how the proposed project is expected to contribute to the economic, environmental, social, and/or educational sectors of South Carolina and the region. The following list provides some examples of the types of statements the Consortium is seeking:

- New tools/technologies to be developed
- Number of jobs created/saved
- Changes in community/government/industry “behavior;” e.g., passage of new ordinances, adoption of new policies, etc.



Economic value (e.g., revenues and/or savings) of benefits to target audiences  
Number of new curricula developed and used in schools  
Number of patent applications to be filed

In addition, *PIs are strongly encouraged to support the careers of undergraduate and graduate students, and to publish project results in scholarly journals.* Therefore, PIs should outline their expectations for both in this section.

Please note that all PIs will be expected to report on and document their Outcomes in their annual and final reports. The Consortium will collectively use these statements in order to: (1) report on progress in achieving its performance targets as outlined in its FY18-21 strategic plan as required by the National Sea Grant College Program, and (2) evaluate the progress of each Sea Grant project on an annual basis based on, among other things, success in achieving outcomes.

The **ANTICIPATED BENEFITS** section should concisely state how the results of the proposed project would improve or change the current situation based upon the information and products produced. How will the target audience(s) and stakeholders benefit from the work, and to what degree? What economic benefits might result from the successful completion of the proposed work? The Consortium and NSGCP will determine whether the proposed effort is conceptually sound based on the arguments made in this section.

Relationships to other studies and programs being performed both by the PIs and others related to the proposed work should be described in a brief **RELATED WORK** section. This section should identify other ongoing and related work in the proposed area of study and state how the proposal complements and/or augments this other work.

Prospective PIs must prepare a **DATA SHARING PLAN** as part of their Full Proposal narrative. This should be a maximum of two pages, and does not count against the proposal's 15-page maximum length. The NOAA Data Documentation Procedural Directive is available [here](#) for guidance in developing the data sharing plan. Please keep in mind the following when drafting your plan:

The Data/Information Sharing Plan (and any subsequent revisions or updates) will be made publicly available at time of award and, thereafter, may be posted with the published data.

Environmental data and information produced under this award and which are made public must be accompanied by the following statement: *These environmental data and related items of information have not been formally disseminated by NOAA and do not represent and should not be construed to represent any agency determination, view, or policy.*

NOAA may at its own discretion, use information from the Data/Information Sharing Plan to produce a formal metadata record and include that metadata in a catalogue to indicate the pending availability of new data.

Failing to share environmental data and information in accordance with the submitted Data/Information Sharing Plan may lead to disallowed costs and be considered by NOAA when making future award decisions.

**REFERENCES** should be listed according to the standards established in the field of study.

Annual and multi-year **MILESTONE CHARTS** must be completed to illustrate the timetable



for the completion of all tasks necessary to meet the proposed objectives. This will allow the Consortium to track progress of the project. This schedule should include a mechanism for interacting with users, such as the engagement of an advisory committee or presentations at appropriate professional meetings. Time for preparing the final report must also be included. Annual progress reports are due on February 28 for all projects continuing into the second year.

Biographical data should be provided on the **VITAE FORM** (two pages maximum) for each principal and associate investigator. Please be sure to include your phone number and email address as part of your professional address. Long resumes in lieu of this form are not acceptable as substitutes.

The **BUDGET FORM** should detail and accurately reflect the actual annual costs of carrying out the project. Although the amount requested on the title page reflects the total costs of the project, the budget form should only itemize the costs for the proposed year of effort. Therefore, **an individual budget form must be completed for each year** of proposed funding. An inadequate budget causes just as many problems as one that is inflated; please plan the budget request carefully. There are several federal provisions to be aware of - these are presented in the budget justification section below. The budgets (in Microsoft Excel) should be submitted as separate documents from the main body of the proposal.

The **BUDGET JUSTIFICATION** should justify the need for Sea Grant funds for each and all line items, and outline matching fund use. It must explain the major duties of personnel and percentages of time for all participants, including undergraduate and graduate students. All capital and permanent equipment requests must be itemized along with the cost and specific justification of need. Permanent equipment requests of more than \$5,000 should be made on a 50-50 match basis. Funding for construction and the purchase of vessels and vehicles are not eligible for Sea Grant funding. Requests for travel funds must be described via the formula used for calculation (e.g., number of miles at cost per mile for so many trips to some destination). If you are requesting travel funds for a national meeting, indicate the importance of the meeting to the proposed work. In the same regard, provide a detailed list of the types of supplies to be purchased. It is important that the funds requested truly reflect the costs of the project and be thoroughly justified. A budget justification must be completed for each budget year of proposed work, and submitted as separate documents from the main body of the proposal. See Appendix C for additional guidance.

Finally, include, **in a separate Word document**, the names, institutional affiliations, addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses of five or more prospective peer REVIEWERS from outside the state of South Carolina you feel are highly qualified to make substantive comments on the technical and conceptual merits of the proposal. They may or may not be requested to provide reviews.

### **Word Processing and Format Instructions**

The content of any proposal is critical to its ultimate success; however, consistency of format is important as well. Proposals initially accepted at the state level by the Consortium are packaged and submitted to NSGCP. Requiring that all proposals adhere to a common style significantly reduces the need for editing and additional word processing as the package is being assembled. The following instructions must be observed.

**Length of Proposal** – the text of the proposal (Introduction through Related Work) should not exceed 15 pages. Excessively long proposals will be returned.



**Spacing** – Lines within paragraphs should be single-spaced; double-space between paragraphs.

**Margins** – Top, bottom, and side margins should all be one (1) inch from the edge of page.

**Typing Style** – Use a word processor with Times New Roman - 11 point (minimum).

**Headings** – All headings (INTRODUCTION, OBJECTIVES, etc.) must be capitalized, underlined, and left-justified.

**Figures and Tables** – All figures and tables must fit within an 8 1/2" x 11" format and must be electronically reproducible.

**Title Page of Text** – Page 33 provides an example of how the first page of the proposal should be structured.

### **Proposal Submission Requirements (for Full Proposals)**

Prior to initial submission, all Proposals MUST be reviewed by the Institutional Liaison and endorsed (on the Proposal Endorsement form) by the designated signatory authority at your institution for accurate budget and matching funds commitment. We strongly suggest that the Proposal be sent to your institution's research/business office for endorsement and signatures at least one week before it is due at the Consortium (see Appendix A for the name of your institutional liaison officer).

All Full Proposals are due at the Consortium by COB on June 19, 2017 as both a Microsoft Word file for the Full Proposal text, a Microsoft Excel file for the budget request, a Microsoft Word file for the budget justification and a PDF file which integrates all files, attached to an e-mail sent to [proposals@scseagrant.org](mailto:proposals@scseagrant.org).

All Proposals will be reviewed by Consortium professional staff, Sea Grant Extension staff with expertise in the area of the proposed effort, and outside technical experts and independent business/industry/user professionals (the experts and professionals are chosen by the Executive Director) through a written peer and external panel review process. The standard professional **REVIEW FORM** provides a listing of the criteria used in the review process (see Section IV), covering both conceptual content appropriate to Sea Grant and technical merit of the plan of work. The reviews are then evaluated and proposals are either accepted or rejected. Prospective investigators whose proposals are accepted will be asked to address reviewers' comments by preparing a statement that will be attached to the original proposal; no revisions to the proposal itself will be allowed. Any subsequent revisions in the budget MUST be endorsed by the investigator's institutional signatory official.



## Sample Format for the Title/Introduction Page

### GENETIC IMPROVEMENT OF HARD CLAM, , COMMERCIAL MARICULTURE STOCK DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Principal Investigator: John J. Malone\*  
Associate Marine Scientist  
SCDNR-Marine Resources Research Institute  
Charleston, SC 29422

Associate Investigators: A.G. Evernham\*  
Associate Professor  
Department of Aquaculture, Fisheries & Wildlife  
Clemson University  
Clemson, SC 29634

Robert T. Wilson, Jr.\*  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Biology  
College of Charleston  
Charleston, SC 29424

Cooperating Investigators: R. K. Knight\*  
Professor, Department of Biology  
State University of NY  
Stony Brook, NY 11794

G. F. Newton\*  
Associate Professor  
Biology Department  
Dalhousie University  
Halifax, Nova Scotia, CANADA  
B3H 4R2

L. S. Adam\*  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Biology  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA 22030

## INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

\*Fictitious names



**INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**SECTION IV: CONCEPT LETTER and FULL PROPOSAL  
REVIEW CRITERIA**

The following criteria and rating scales will be used to rate Concept Letters and Full Proposals:

**A. Programmatic Justification** – The degree to which the proposed project addresses the priorities outlined in the guidance provided by the S.C. Sea Grant Consortium in its Request for Proposals and other program information.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (12)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (9)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (3)
---	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**B. Rationale** – The degree to which the proposed project addresses an important state and/or regional issue, problem, or opportunity in the development, use, and/or conservation of marine or coastal resources.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (10)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (8)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (2)
---	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**C. Clarity of Objectives** – The degree to which the proposed objectives address the problem or opportunity identified in the Rationale and Programmatic Justification sections and, in the case of research proposals, the relevance of the hypotheses upon which the objectives are based.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (10)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (8)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (2)
---	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**D. Scientific/Outreach Methods** – The degree to which (1) the feasibility of the proposed methods and design of the proposed project will address stated objectives, (2) the use and extension of innovative, state-of-the-art methods to be used in the proposed project will advance the scientific or outreach discipline, and (3) the data sharing plan will meet the needs of the public.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (12)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (9)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (3)
---	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**E. Expected Outcomes** – The degree to which the planned outcomes are clearly defined, in terms of interim and final measurable results and products, and with a reasonable timeframe for completion and delivery. Outcomes should be identified for each year, be measurable, and have a positive impact on the systems, technology, or management practices under study (e.g., cost savings, revenue generation, jobs created, new products/tools developed, workforce development).

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (10)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (8)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (2)
---	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**F. User Engagement** – The degree to which targeted users of the results of the proposed activity have been brought into the planning of the activity, will be brought into the execution of the activity, and will be kept apprised of progress and results, the adequacy of the methods to be used to engage the users, and whether resources have been allotted for stakeholder engagement.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (12)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (9)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (3)
---	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**G. Dissemination of Results** – The degree to which the proposed project includes specific strategies for information delivery to and product development for identified targeted users (e.g., through the scientific literature, Sea Grant Extension and Communications products, educational efforts, etc.).

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (12)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (9)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (3)
---	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**H. Investigator’s Knowledge of Field** – The degree to which the investigator(s) is (are) experienced, proficient, and recognized in their respective fields.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (5)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (1)
--	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**I. Adequacy of Budget** – The degree to which the proposed budget will adequately support the proposed work and provide the necessary and appropriate amount and distribution of funding across budget categories.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (5)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Good (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (1)
--	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------



**INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**SECTION V: FUNDED PROJECTS – RESPONSIBILITIES & REPORTING**

The principal investigator of a Sea Grant project is responsible for all technical reporting and, in conjunction with the institutional business office, all fiscal reporting to the Consortium. In turn, the Consortium is responsible for technical and fiscal reporting to the NOAA National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP). Consortium professional staff frequently communicate with Sea Grant PIs to discuss project progress and needs. Questions regarding budgetary matters should be directed to the Consortium’s Assistant to the Director for Administration (see [Appendix A](#)). Formal requests for budget changes and changes in project scope must be submitted to the Consortium Executive Director, through the institution’s Office of Sponsored Programs (or related office).

This Section includes information on the following policies and procedures:

- Formal Award Agreements
- Changes in Project Scope, Duration, or Budget
- Disposition of Permanent Equipment
- Patent Policy
- Prior Approval of Survey Instruments and Brochures
- Reimbursement Conditions
- Fiscal Reporting
- Project Reporting
- Submission of Publications
- Citation and Acknowledgement Requirements

These and other conditions of the grant award are stipulated in the formal award announcements and agreements sent to the PI and institutions; please read through these documents carefully.

**Formal Award Agreements**

The Sea Grant fiscal year begins February 1 with **formal award announcements** sent to the investigators and their respective institution’s business office. The announcements include two copies of the Consortium Award Agreement signed by the Consortium Executive Director. The Award Agreements must be read and endorsed by both the appropriate signatory authority and the Principal Investigator of the Sea Grant project. The institution must then forward one copy of the signed original back to the Consortium for its records, and the project can formally begin.

**Changes in Project Scope, Duration, or Budget**

Among the provisions of the Agreements is a set of special conditions of which the investigators should be aware. Significant changes in projects subsequent to the formal awards, whether budgetary or programmatic, require prior formal approval by the Consortium Executive Director and, in some cases, the NSGCP as well. If you are unsure, please call the Sea Grant liaison in your Sponsored Programs office (see [Appendix A](#)) or the Consortium’s Assistant to the Director for Administration for clarification.

Any proposed changes affecting the following categories require prior written approval:

- 
1. Any budget changes across line items that exceed ten (10) percent of the total federal budget amount.
  2. The purchase of any item of permanent equipment (any single item costing \$5,000 or more) not specifically identified, justified, and approved in the proposal and budget.
  3. Any foreign travel not previously identified, justified, and approved in the proposal and budget.
  4. A change in the Principal Investigator.
  5. Significant changes in time devoted to a project by a PI.
  6. Any change in the scope of objectives of the approved project.

Principal Investigators must obtain such approval before making any substantive changes in project objectives, methods, budget, or schedule. Requests for changes must be submitted in writing through the institution's Sponsored Programs office to the Consortium. Recipients are not authorized to proceed with any changes until final written approval is received from the Consortium.

All formal requests for rebudgeting actions and subsequent approval must be submitted in writing. **A REQUEST FOR TRANSFER** form is available on the Consortium website for this purpose.

Requests for no-cost time extensions, along with a strong justification for such a request, must be submitted at least 30 days prior to the end of the grant year, along with a budget for all remaining funds to be expended. Such extensions may be approved when any one of the following applies:

1. Additional time beyond the established expiration date is required to ensure completion of the original approved project scope or objectives; or
2. Continuity of Sea Grant support is required while a competing application is under review; or
3. The extension is necessary to permit an orderly phase-out of a project that will not receive continued support.

Approval of no-cost time extensions by the Consortium Executive Director or NSGCP is based on an adequate reason for not meeting the project deadline. Unexpended funds are not, by themselves, justification for an extension.

In addition, all projects supported with federal funds must comply with the following:

The recipient is subject to the provisions of the Fly America Act and must comply with the Act when scheduling transportation for travel paid for with federal funds. The recipient is encouraged, to the greatest extent practicable, to purchase American-made equipment and products with funding provided under a Sea Grant award. The Consortium must have on file a copy of each institution's approved indirect cost rate (IDC) agreement for proposals submitted for funding that include IDC costs as match (per Consortium policy).

### **Purchase and Disposition of Permanent Equipment**

The Consortium strongly encourages joint funding support for the purchase of **Permanent Equipment**. Thus, any PI who is requesting one or more items of permanent equipment (defined as any single object costing \$5,000 or more) should seek to match such purchase with



an equal amount of funding from his/her institution.

Permanent equipment purchased under a Consortium project is and remains the property of the Consortium, but can remain with the investigator's institution pending approval from NSGO. The Consortium does reserve the right to transfer use of this equipment upon completion of the project. However, if the investigator and/or institution desires to obtain title to equipment purchased under an existing agreement, a formal written request must be made to the Consortium Executive Director at the end of the project. Final disposition of the equipment will then be determined under existing statutes.

### **Patent Policy**

The policy and procedures set forth in the U.S. Department of Commerce regulations (37 CFR 401), "Rights to Inventions made by Nonprofit Organizations and Small Business Firms Under Government Grants, Contracts, and Cooperative Agreements," published in the Federal Register on March 18, 1987, shall apply to all grants and cooperative agreements made for which the purpose is experimental, developmental, or research work. The Consortium's Assistant to the Director for Administration should also receive with the final expenditure report a completed **FINAL INVENTION STATEMENT** if anything patentable was developed during the course of the project. Three copies of the statement should be submitted within six months after conception or first actual reduction to practice during the course of work. These forms are available from your institutional research/business office.

### **Prior Approval of Survey Instruments and Brochures**

In addition to any approval an investigator must receive per the policies of his/her home institution, prior approval of the use of all **survey instruments and brochures** to be used as part of any research effort must be received from the Consortium Executive Director. Suggestions and assistance can be provided, if requested, by the Consortium staff at that time.

### **Reimbursement Conditions**

Final reimbursement to institutions for expenses incurred under a Sea Grant project award may not be made until the Annual/Final Project Report is received from the PI and accepted by the Consortium office. The final invoice or at least ten (10) percent of the funds of any project will be held until the Annual or Final Report (whichever applies) is received and deemed complete.

### **Fiscal Reporting**

In addition to the official Award Agreement, fiscal documents that reflect the approved budgets are mailed to the respective institutional fiscal officers. The **FEDERAL AND MATCH EXPENDITURE REPORT** should be provided upon submission of every reimbursement request or quarterly (if no such requests have been submitted) and accurately reflect expenditures. Reports must be sent to the Consortium's Assistant to the Director for Administration by the institutional business office, with the appropriate endorsement. The table below outlines the quarterly deadlines for the receipt of these reports. All payments by the Consortium are handled on a reimbursement basis. Future funding to the institution and/or investigator may be withheld if annual or final project reports are not received on a timely basis. If any problems concerning expenditure reporting arise, call the Consortium's Assistant to the Director for Administration as soon as possible.



### Deadlines - Submission of Quarterly Expenditure Reports

QUARTER	REPORTING PERIOD	REPORT DUE DATE
1	Feb 1 – Apr 31	May 31
2	May 1 – Jul 31	Aug 31
3	Aug 1 – Oct 31	Nov 30
4	Nov 1 – Jan 31	Feb 28

Final Fiscal Reports are due 60 days after the close of the project.

### Project Reporting

There are two categories of **project reports** that are required by the Consortium:

1. **Annual Reports**, prepared by the principal investigator, summarizing annual progress of a project which is proposed for continuation; and
2. **Final Reports**, prepared by the principal investigator at the end of a project, providing a concise summary of results of the entire project.

The **PROJECT REPORTING FORM** (and accompanying instructions), available on the Consortium’s website, should be used by PIs for completing Annual and Final Reports. A project report “reminder” is sent to all PIs 30 days prior to the due dates of the reports, which are as follows:

**Annual Reports** are due 30 days after the end of the current grant year (typically on February 28<sup>th</sup>).

**Final Project Reports** are due 60 days after the close of the project grant period (typically on March 31<sup>st</sup>).

If a Principal Investigator requests and receives a no-cost time extension for his/her project, (s)he must submit an Annual Report 30 days after the original end date of that project year. A Final Report will then be required 60 days after the last day of the extension period at the end of the project.

### Submission of Publications

Principal Investigators must furnish to the Consortium five (5) hard copies and a PDF copy (if available) of all publications, technical reports, all thesis and dissertation abstracts, and other formal documents that are based on information generated through Sea Grant projects and intended for publication and/or public distribution. Complete electronic PDF copies of any theses or dissertations should be submitted along with the other materials.

### Citation and Acknowledgement Requirements

All PIs must note and adhere to the following:

The financial assistance award number (provided in the Award Package) will be acknowledged in writing as the basis for funding the publication.

For journal publications and videos that are produced based in whole or in part on the work funded by the Award Agreement, the PIs should ensure that the publication (including internet sites) bears the following notation:



[to be provided].

[to be provided]

All non-journal article publications or reports shall bear the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and S.C. Sea Grant Consortium logos on the cover of the first page, and include the following: “A publication (or report) sponsored by the South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium pursuant to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Award [to be provided].

These requirements do not apply to routine reports submitted to the Consortium and which are not intended for public distribution, such as project progress reports and financial reports.



**INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**APPENDIX A:  
CONTACT PERSONS –  
CONSORTIUM STAFF and INSTITUTIONAL LIAISON OFFICERS**

**Consortium Contact Persons**

If you need assistance or require further information about the SCSGC Request for Proposals for FY16-18, please contact the appropriate person, listed below, via e-mail or at 843-953-2078:

Rick DeVoe – Executive Director  
[rick.devoe@scseagrant.org](mailto:rick.devoe@scseagrant.org)

Susannah Sheldon – Research and Fellowships Manager  
[susannah.sheldon@scseagrant.org](mailto:susannah.sheldon@scseagrant.org)

Susannah Sheldon – Research and Fellowships Manager  
[susannah.sheldon@scseagrant.org](mailto:susannah.sheldon@scseagrant.org)

Ryan Bradley – Assistant to the Director for Administration  
[ryan.bradley@scseagrant.org](mailto:ryan.bradley@scseagrant.org)

Susan Ferris Hill – Communications Director  
[susan.ferris.hill@scseagrant.org](mailto:susan.ferris.hill@scseagrant.org)

Susan Lovelace, Ph.D. – Assistant Director for Development and Extension  
[susan.lovelace@scseagrant.org](mailto:susan.lovelace@scseagrant.org)

Elizabeth Vernon Bell – S.C. Sea Grant Education Specialist  
[ev.bell@scseagrant.org](mailto:ev.bell@scseagrant.org)



## Consortium Liaison Officers

All Full Proposals require a formal institutional endorsement before they can be submitted to the Consortium. Your university's Consortium liaison official, listed below, can assist you with this and with other questions you may have.

Colonel Joseph L. Garcia  
Vice President for Finance

**The Citadel**  
171 Moultrie Street  
Charleston, SC 29409  
843-953-5533  
[jgarcia6@citadel.edu](mailto:jgarcia6@citadel.edu)

Dr. Tanju Karanfil  
Vice President for Research

**Clemson University**  
Strom Thurmond Institute  
230 Kappa Street  
Suite 200  
Clemson, SC 29634  
864-656-7701  
[tkaranf@clemson.edu](mailto:tkaranf@clemson.edu)

Ms. Stephanie J. Cassavaugh  
Director and IRB Administrator  
Office of Grants & Sponsored Research  
**Coastal Carolina University**  
Conway, SC 29528  
843-349-5030  
[scassavau@coastal.edu](mailto:scassavau@coastal.edu)

Ms. Susan Anderson  
Assistant VP for Research & Director  
Office of Research & Grants Administration  
**College of Charleston**  
66 George Street  
Charleston, SC 29424  
843-953-4973  
[andersons@cofc.edu](mailto:andersons@cofc.edu)

R. Darren McCants  
Director  
Office of Research & Sponsored Programs  
**Medical University of South Carolina**  
19 Hagood Avenue, Suite 606  
Charleston, SC 29425  
843-792-3832  
[mccantsd@musc.edu](mailto:mccantsd@musc.edu)

Mr. Robert Boyles  
Deputy Director  
**SC Department of Natural Resources**  
Marine Resources Division  
PO Box 12559  
Charleston, SC 29422  
843-953-9304  
[boylesr@dnr.sc.gov](mailto:boylesr@dnr.sc.gov)

Mr. Elbert R. Malone  
Interim Associate Provost  
Office of Sponsored Programs  
**South Carolina State University**  
PO Box 7461  
300 College Street, NE  
Orangeburg, SC 29117  
803-536-8213  
[malone@scsu.edu](mailto:malone@scsu.edu)

Mr. Thomas Coggins  
Director  
Sponsored Awards Management  
**University of South Carolina**  
91600 Hampton Street, Suite 414  
Columbia, SC 29208  
803-777-4456  
[tcoggins@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:tcoggins@mailbox.sc.edu)



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**APPENDIX B:  
PREPARING THE SEA GRANT PROJECT SUMMARY FORM**

The project summary is intended to present a concise description of the funded activity in a form useful to a variety of readers not necessarily requiring detailed information. Project summaries are not substitutes for proposals or reports but should permit judgments as to whether such proposals or reports merit reading for a particular purpose. The summary contains the following information:

(1) **TITLE:** Project titles should be carefully constructed to give as much information as possible about the project in not more than two lines (about 16 words)—preferably less. Consider always that there will be people (perhaps influential) who will judge the content of a program from scanning a list of titles—or titles plus funding numbers.

(2) **PROJECT NUMBER:** Assigned by the Consortium. Leave blank.

(3) **GRANT NUMBER:** Assigned by NSGCP. Leave blank.

(4) **SUB PROGRAM:** Assigned by Consortium. Leave blank.

(5) **REVISION DATE:** The date on which the Project Summary form is completed.

(6) **INITIATION DATE:** The date on which Sea Grant support for the project is to be initiated (typically February 1 of the biennium year).

(7) **COMPLETION DATE:** The date on which Sea Grant support for the project is to be completed (typically January 31 at the end of the biennium).

(8) **PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S):** The name of the P.I. as, i.e., “Maris, H.O. (5.00 mm), “ indicating in parentheses the time in man-months the P.I. will devote to the project for the duration of the entire project.

(9) **DEPARTMENT AND INSTITUTION:** The academic affiliation of the P.I., i.e., Animal Science Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

(10) **ASSOCIATE INVESTIGATOR:** Names and man-months of Associates whose efforts are significant to the success of the project, as Cancus, A.M. (6.00 mm).

(11) **AFFILIATION:** As for each P.I., i.e., Biology Department, Tufts University.

(12) **GRANT FUNDS TO DATE (MATCH FUNDS TO DATE):** Total federal (and match) funding awarded (committed) to the project up to the beginning of the grant year for which the proposal is prepared.

(13) **CURRENT GRANT FUNDS (CURRENT MATCH FUNDS):** The grant funds committed to the project for the current year, if applicable.



(14) PROPOSED SEA GRANT FUNDS (PROPOSED MATCH FUNDS): The grant funds requested for the project for the proposal year, if applicable.

(15) RELATED PROJECTS: Assigned by the Consortium. Leave blank.

(16) SEA GRANT CLASSIFICATION NUMBER: Assigned by the Consortium. Leave blank.

(17) KEYWORDS: Assigned by the Consortium. Leave blank.

(18) PARENT PROJECTS: Assigned by the Consortium. Leave blank.

(19) OBJECTIVES: This section should describe what the investigator intends to accomplish. Preferably it should be stated so that, at a later date, it can be determined whether he/she has, in fact, done it. The heading "Objective" should be interpreted as "The Objectives of this task are." Objectives should be numbered and listed, and should begin with the word "To" followed by a verb. In keeping with Sea Grant's mission, such appropriate verbs are, for example: test (the hypothesis), develop, provide, determine, isolate, characterize, identify, restore, implement. Less desirable but sometimes appropriate are: promote, conduct, analyze, apply, investigate, examine, and describe. Some, such as: study, consider, continue, etc. should not be used since failure to do these is not determinable.

(20) TASKS and METHODOLOGY: This section should concisely state the methods to be used or show sub-objectives that indicate the approach to be taken, including the data sharing plan. Specific questions that an interested person would ask should be answered under objectives or methods, like which heavy metals, which pollutants, which pathogens, what species of seaweed or shellfish, what kind of a model? This information should be no longer than ten lines.

(21) RATIONALE: This section should make a concise statement of why this is an appropriate Sea Grant project; i.e., what problem or opportunity is being addressed. The project need not promise to fully solve a problem but it should be shown that it is a logical step towards solution. Long involved background statements should be avoided. Potential users (of the information to be developed) should be identified. This information should be no longer than ten lines.

(22) ANTICIPATED ACCOMPLISHMENTS/BENEFITS: This section should contain concise statements of progress towards the stated objectives and an accounting of benefits that flow to society from the effort. Where possible these are to be quantified.. Publications resulting from the project should be reported. When the PROJECT SUMMARY is prepared for a new project, enter: "To be updated."

(23) DATA SHARING PLAN: This section should be completed per the guidance above and within the framework of the NOAA Data Documentation Directive (The NOAA Data Documentation Procedural Directive is available [here](#) for guidance).



**S.C. SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM  
FY18-20 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**APPENDIX C:  
NOAA GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING BUDGETS AND JUSTIFICATIONS**

**Matching Funds**

A 50 percent match of the federal funds (i.e., one dollar of match for every two dollars of federal money received) is required on all Sea Grant proposals unless otherwise specified. Note that it is important to specify match contributions carefully to be able to demonstrate sources and amounts. Any match contributions identified by investigators are subject to federal audit that may result in additional costs to the institution.

Match may be in the form of selected “in-kind” services or additional funds from a specified institution, agency, industry, or nonfederal program. No funds from federal entities can be used as match.

*For Matching Funds, NOAA Grants Management Division (GMD) expects you to consider the following questions:*

- Is a match (non-federal share) required for this program?
- If yes, does the application meet the matching requirements?
- Are the sources of match clearly identified? (i.e. cash or in-kind)
- Does the application provide adequate documentation to support in-kind contributions?
- Does the application exclude matching contributions, cash or in-kind, used for other programs?
- Does the application exclude federal funds used as match?
- Are all matching contributions necessary for accomplishing the project?
- Are all matching contributions in compliance with federal cost principles?

**A. SALARIES AND WAGES**

**Budget**

Assign personnel to the various categories according to the explanations provided which conform to NOAA/Sea Grant usage (these definitions do not necessarily conform to usage in your institution). Identify project personnel by position title as indicated on the form. Use accurate current salaries as the basis for calculating salaries and wages for each individual (do not use percentages). If funds are being requested to support a vacant position, so indicate (vac. pos.) and use a salary rate appropriate to the position. Enter months of effort as full-time equivalents, regardless of how many calendar months the individual will work on the project for both Sea Grant and matching funds. Entries must be done in separate columns as indicated on the form. Note: The number 1 audit finding is failure to keep good time and attendance records.

**Budget Justification**

For Salaries and Wages, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

- Is each individual identified by position?
- Are time commitments such as hours/weeks/months per year for each position?
- Are the total charges for each person listed along with an explanation of how the costs were calculated?
- Do the combined charges for all activities of any individual exceed 100% of their time including match?

- 
- Do the time commitments and charges appear reasonable?
  - Are all individuals employees of the applicant organization? (If not, explain)
  - Is a cost of living increase built into the budget?
  - Are salary increases justified for the grant period?
  - Are any salary/personnel costs unallowable (i.e., Federal Employees or legislative personnel)

## **B. FRINGE BENEFITS**

### **Budget**

Fringe benefits are those customarily paid by the grantee institution, following its usual practices in the payment of such benefits.

### **Budget Justification**

For Fringe Benefits, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

- Are fringe benefits identified as a separate item?
- Are all the elements that comprise fringe benefits indicated?
- Do the fringe benefits and charges appear reasonable?
- Are the total charges for each person listed along with an explanation of how the charges were calculated?
- Are fringe benefits charged to federal and matching categories in the same proportion as salaries?
- Statement to the effect "Approved institutional rates"

## **C. PERMANENT EQUIPMENT**

### **Budget Justification**

For any item(s) of equipment that has a useful life of more than one year and costing \$5,000 per unit or more, a description of the item and associated costs is required. For Permanent Equipment, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

- Is each item of equipment listed?
- If over \$5,000 is there a description of how it will be used in the project?
- If over \$5,000 has a lease vs. purchase analysis been completed? Note: Often a lease versus buy analysis cannot be completed because no one leases it. In this case, the recipient should submit a statement of non-availability stating at least three sources that were contacted about leasing.
- For each item of equipment, is the number of units, cost per unit and total cost specified?
- Is each item of equipment necessary for the successful completion of the project?
- Are the charges for each item reasonable and realistic?
- Are disallowed costs excluded?
- Contingencies charges must be excluded!
- Reasonable miscellaneous can be allowed, but must be justified.

## **D. EXPENDABLE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT**

### **Budget Justification**

Expendable supplies and equipment must be described according to major categories, e.g., chemical reagents, computer paper and supplies, glassware, lumber, etc. Fuel for boats should be budgeted here rather than under travel. Fuel for vehicles should be budgeted under E. Travel. The justification may be based on historical costs (note as such). For Expendable



Supplies and Equipment, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

- Are supplies itemized by type of material or nature of expense?
- For general office or business supplies, is the total charge listed along with the basis for the charge (i.e. historical use rates)?
- For other specific supply categories, is the number of units, cost per unit and total cost specified?
- Are the charges necessary for the successful completion of the project?
- Are the charges reasonable and realistic?
- Are disallowed costs (e.g. liquor, entertainment) excluded?
- Contingencies or miscellaneous charges must be excluded!

## **E. TRAVEL**

### **Budget Justification**

A detailed budget narrative is required for all travel. For Travel, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

- For foreign and domestic travel, is each trip listed along with the destination, estimated mileage, method of travel, cost per mile and duration, number of travelers, per diem rate for meals and lodging?
- If actual trip details are unknown, what is the basis for the proposed travel charges?
- Is the requested travel directly relevant to the successful completion of the project?
- Are the travel charges reasonable and realistic?
- Note: Funding for unknown foreign travel may be approved but the travel itself is not authorized until an award action request is submitted and approved.

## **G. OTHER COSTS**

### **Budget Justification**

For Other Costs, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

- Are items listed by type of material or nature of expense?
- For each charge, is the number of units, cost per unit and total cost specified?
- Are the charges necessary for the successful completion of the project?
- Are the same charges listed elsewhere?
- Are the charges reasonable?
- Are disallowed costs (e.g. liquor, entertainment) excluded?
- Are charges which duplicate indirect cost items excluded?

For G.6., Subaward, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

- Is each sub award listed as a separate item? (Separate budgets are required for sub awards regardless of the dollar value.)
- Are the products/services to be acquired described along with the applicability of each to the project?
- Do the costs appear reasonable and realistic?
- Are any sole source contracts contemplated?
- If yes, is a sole source justification included with the application which describes why the proposed sole source entity is the only source capable of meeting the applicant's project needs?
- Are disallowed costs excluded?
- Contingencies or miscellaneous charges must be excluded!
- Are there contracts with non-US organizations?



Do you have a CD-512 on file for each of your sub grants or subcontracts?

## **H. INDIRECT COSTS**

### **Budget**

Indirect Cost is the institution's negotiated Facilities and Administrative (Indirect) cost rate and its relation to those elements of the proposed grant budget to which that rate is to be applied. It is Consortium policy that Indirect Costs will not be allowed on Sea Grant funded programs; however, they can be used to meet the 50% matching fund requirement. An institution will identify the direct costs to which indirect costs can be applied. An explanation of for all indirect costs must be included in the budget justification.

Note: The recipient must use the indirect rate submitted with the application or upon award for the entire award period unless approved by the Grants Officer. Thus, if the grantee receives a new NICRA, the grantee must submit an AAR requesting to use it and be approved to use this, before it can be used.

### **Budget Justification**

For Indirect Costs, NOAA Grants Management Division expects the budget justification to address the following questions:

Are indirect costs included in the budget?

Is the correct rate being used? (If a lower rate than is authorized in the indirect cost rate agreement is being proposed you must explain why your organization is deviating from the approved rate.)

Is the rate applied to the correct base?

Are charges which duplicate direct costs excluded? (If no, explain/revise.)

Include a copy of the institution's most-current federally approved indirect rate agreement (IDC)