

Valuing Resources – Adapting to Change

South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium
FY10-12 Biennial Sea Grant Request for Proposals

Biennial Sea Grant Program
February 1, 2010 to January 31, 2012

Sea Grant Request for Proposals

Biennial Program for
February 1, 2010 to January 31, 2012

Concept Letters Due at S.C. Sea Grant Consortium Office
April 6, 2009

Invited Full Proposals Due at S.C. Sea Grant Consortium Office
June 22, 2009

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



March 2, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION	3
OVERVIEW OF FY10-12 SEA GRANT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS	3
IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PIs	4
THE PROPOSAL PROCESS: AN OVERVIEW	5
SECTION II: FY10-12 PROGRAM AREA PRIORITY NEEDS	9
HUMANS and the COASTAL LANDSCAPE	9
Function of South Carolina’s coastal and ocean ecosystems	9
Effects of population growth and land use change on coastal and ocean ecosystems.	10
HUMANS and the RISKS of COASTAL HAZARDS	11
Natural forces of climate and weather effects on the human and built environment.	11
Prepare for and mitigate the impacts from coastal hazards.	12
SOUTH CAROLINA’S COASTAL-DEPENDENT ECONOMY	13
Sustainable fisheries, aquaculture, and related industries.	13
Traditional and emerging coastal-dependent business and industry	14
SCIENTIFIC LITERACY and WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT	15
K-12 educational programs for teachers.	15
Diverse and scientifically trained workforce.....	15
SECTION III: INSTRUCTIONS for PREPARING and SUBMITTING CONCEPT LETTERS	17
SECTION IV: INSTRUCTIONS for PREPARING and SUBMITTING PROPOSALS	19
SECTION V: PROPOSAL CONTENT and SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS (FOR FULL AND CONTINUING PROPOSALS)	26
SECTION VI: INSTRUCTIONS and FORMS for PROPOSALS	27
SECTION VII: CONCEPT LETTER and PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA	31
SECTION VIII: FUNDED PROJECTS – RESPONSIBILITIES and REPORTING	32
APPENDIX I: THE SOUTH CAROLINA SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM	35
APPENDIX II: CONTACT PERSONS - INSTITUTIONAL LIAISON OFFICERS	37

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF FY10-12 SEA GRANT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium (Consortium), moving into its twenty-ninth year of administering the 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 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

The Consortium is requesting Sea Grant **Concept Letters** on innovative research, education, and extension activities which seek to address major issues, problems, and opportunities and, at the same time, increase the knowledge and understanding 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, with a focus on the marine and coastal resource needs and opportunities of South Carolina and the region. Included herein is a listing of priority proposal topics (see Section II). The listing is not inclusive—other topics proposed which meet Sea Grant interests and standards will also be considered; however, the burden of justifying the need for the effort proposed lies entirely with the investigator(s).

Interdisciplinary projects involving the professional and natural, physical, and social sciences are appropriate and strongly encouraged. Multi-institutional and regional proposals are also encouraged, as are collaborations with colleagues in business, industry, and government agencies. Engagement of targeted stakeholders (e.g., resource management entities, local communities, business and industry, etc.) in the development of proposals and in the projects, if funded, is strongly encouraged. Consortium, S.C. Sea Grant Extension Program, and Sea Grant Education staff are available to assist prospective submitters in suggesting potential linkages with cooperators and stakeholders in the public and private sectors.

Available Funding

The Consortium anticipates having about \$550,000 available for new project starts in FY10. Because our program proposal will cover two years, new projects may be scheduled to begin February 1 in either 2010 or 2011. Prospective investigators should carefully consider possible 2011 start-ups, since additional funds may be available that year for meritorious projects that cannot be funded in 2010. A separate invitation for proposals for 2011 starts will not be issued next year, since this invitation covers the two-year period.

Proposal Guidelines

Included in the main section of this document are eight sections:

1. Introduction,
2. Program priority needs,
3. Instructions for preparing and submitting Sea Grant Concept Letters,
4. Instructions for preparing and submitting Sea Grant Full and Continuing Proposals,
5. Proposal content and submission requirements,
6. Information on formatting instructions and forms,
7. Proposal review criteria, and
8. Grant responsibilities and reporting requirements for funded proposals.

The appendices contain an overview of the S.C. Sea Grant Consortium and a listing of Consortium contact persons and phone numbers in case you have any questions, and of the names and addresses of the Consortium's institutional liaison officers located at the Consortium's member institutions.

Concept Letters

The first step in the proposal process is the submission of a concept letter for all new projects (see Section III); investigators with continuing projects need NOT submit a Concept Letter for the continuation of their previously approved efforts. However, investigators with continuing projects must submit continuing full proposals according to the schedule provided in Section I and format described in Section IV.

All Concept Letters must be submitted to the Consortium in the following formats:

- 1. An electronic file attached to an e-mail, in Microsoft Word, sent to conceptletters@scseagrant.org, and**
- 2. The signed original and twelve (12) hard copies of each Concept Letter mailed to the Consortium address.**

All concept letters are due at the Consortium by COB on April 6, 2009.

Concept Letter Review

Concept letters will be reviewed and evaluated by an external advisory panel, the Consortium management team, and Sea Grant Extension 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 May 4, 2009 and invited to prepare and submit Full Proposals according to guidelines provided in Section IV.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PIs

With the increasing emphasis on project accomplishments, performance measures, and outcomes by the NOAA National Sea Grant Office, we are placing greater emphasis in our FY10-12 Sea Grant Concept Letter and Proposal preparation and submission process on the following elements. Therefore, please review the following information before you submit a Concept Letter.

Target Audiences/Outreach/Education

Federal program accountability requirements now call for Sea Grant competitive research and outreach projects to be outcome oriented, address societal problems/issues, engage users, and result in the application of science-based information to their resolution. Therefore, the Consortium is placing a high level of emphasis on how well prospective PIs describe how the proposed project addresses documented problems and issues related to the use and management of coastal natural resources. Prospective PIs are expected to (a) identify and engage target audiences in developing their research questions, (b) describe how results from the proposed efforts will be translated into information/tools, (c) how the project results will be extended and (d) 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 will now also be populated with outreach specialists to provide reviews on this element. Failure to provide this documentation will lead to a lower rating of the Concept Letter and, if solicited, the Proposal.

Prospective PIs are encouraged to contact the Consortium's Sea Grant Extension Program for assistance and guidance, and for possible participation of Sea Grant Extension Specialists in the proposed work.

Statement of Expected Outcomes

The Consortium announced a new requirement for both Concept Letters and Proposals that started in 2006 which requires the prospective PI 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 (e.g., cost savings, revenue generation, jobs created, new products/tools developed, workforce development). The instructions found later in this document for both Concept Letters and Proposals define this requirement in more detail.

Electronic Submission of Concept Letters and Proposals

Again for this cycle, the Consortium will require electronic submission of both Concept Letters and Proposals. Hard copies will also be required this year as in the past, but the Consortium is in the process of adopting a completely electronic process for implementation in the FY12-14 biennium. Concept Letters and Proposals should be prepared and electronically submitted as Word documents; this year the Consortium is also requesting that a complete version of the Proposal be submitted as a PDF file.

Indirect Costs on Sea Grant-funded Projects

Please note that 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 50% non-federal matching requirement.

THE PROPOSAL PROCESS: AN OVERVIEW

Successful major projects through the Consortium are generally supported in the range of \$20,000 to \$70,000 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). Also, 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 50% matching requirement.**

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 the results of Web-based constituent surveys, Program Area Advisors, the Sea Grant Extension Program, state and federal natural resource agencies, and the State Legislature, through the Consortium's Strategic Planning process, with guidance from the NSGCP Strategic Plan, and in consultation with the NSGCP Office staff. The Consortium Executive Director then develops the Request for Proposals which outlines priority needs. The Consortium will consider Concept Letters which focus on resource problems or opportunities not identified in the RFP; however, the burden of justifying the need for the effort proposed lies entirely with the investigator.

Personal or telephone contact with Consortium staff may be advantageous to an investigator during the Concept Letter development process (see Appendix II for a listing of contacts). For example, projects being considered for Concept Letter development could be discussed with respect to merit and likelihood for funding support. When appropriate, Consortium staff will visit with investigators to discuss proposal ideas.

For all new projects, prospective investigators should submit a Concept Letter outlining their proposed project; investigators with previously approved continuing projects need NOT submit concept letters. However, investigators with previously approved continuing projects must submit full proposals according to the schedule and format described herein. Please contact John Dwyer if you need further clarification.

Submission of a Concept Letter constitutes the first major step in the proposal cycle. Investigators whose conceptual ideas appear to address contemporary needs and Consortium priorities will be encouraged to submit Full Proposals for Consortium consideration. In this way, the Consortium can assemble a program plan for federal review without falsely raising the hopes of many investigators.

Concept Letters must be innovative and address current needs or opportunities as outlined in Section II with scientific vigor. Project ideas submitted to the Consortium for consideration undergo several levels of review and revision.

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 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 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 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 schedule of events described below does not occur every year since most projects require at least two years to complete. 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. Proposed projects that require more than two years to complete will be subjected to a Continuing Proposal submission and review process in the next biennial cycle. 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.

The RFP cycle begins with investigator-Consortium staff discussions in the spring through on-campus visits and phone and electronic communication. At the same time, priority research and outreach topics, based on the Consortium's strategic planning and stakeholder engagement processes, are being identified. These discussions center on matching the concepts and ideas of interested faculty with identified stakeholder needs and priorities, both state and regional, for that particular biennium. This process is also governed by the anticipated level of funding available for initiating new efforts.

A pre-announcement of the RFP is prepared, posted on the Consortium's Web site, and sent to Consortium institutions, faculty, and staff in early February.

The Consortium **Request for Proposals (RFP)**, which includes a listing of priority research, education, and extension topics, is disseminated in early March. The RFP solicits **Concept Letters** as a precursor to the submission of Full Proposals. Concept Letters prepared by prospective PIs for Consortium consideration should address one or more of the

Consortium's priority topics. Innovative approaches to marine and coastal resource needs not identified in the RFP will be considered if the Concept Letter is well-written, innovative, technically sound, relevant to user needs, and specific in application. It is at this stage where a practical problem to be resolved and/or an opportunity to be explored must be explicitly stated and the beneficiaries of the research and/or outreach specifically identified and engaged. Concept Letters are due at the Consortium office April 6, 2009.

The Concept Letter submission and review process constitutes the first major step in the proposal cycle for prospective PIs. Investigators whose conceptual ideas appear to address contemporary needs and Consortium priorities will be invited to submit **Full Proposals** for consideration. In this way, the Consortium can assemble a proposal package for review without falsely raising the hopes of many investigators. Investigators are notified of the status of their Concept Letter by May 4, 2009.

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

Proposals that are judged to have technical and conceptual merit, address Consortium program priorities, meet constituent needs, and fit within the available budget will be included in the Consortium's proposed program plan. Investigators may be asked to prepare and submit a letter addressing reviewers' comments during late August to early September. **The proposals themselves cannot be revised.**

During the month of September, the Consortium staff prepares its **final biennial Sea Grant program plan** for electronic submission to the NOAA National Sea Grant College Program office (NSGO) through grants.gov. Final editing and word processing is completed and proposals are linked into program area components.

During September, the Consortium Executive Director meets with the NSGO Program Monitor 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 in Washington, D.C. by October 16, 2009 for processing by NSGO, 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, 2010.

Table 1. PROPOSAL PREPARATION SCHEDULE

(E-)Mail Sea Grant FY10-12 RFP Pre-announcement	February 9, 2009
Disseminate Consortium FY10-12 RFP and Guidelines	March 2, 2009
Concept Letters Due COB at Consortium Office	April 6, 2009
Review of Concept Letters	April 6-April 24, 2009
Notification of Successful Proposers and Invitation for Full Proposals	May 4, 2009
Successful Proposers Prepare Full Proposals	May 4-June 22, 2009
Full Proposals Due COB at Consortium Office, Signed and Endorsed	June 22, 2009
Review of Full Proposals (Written & External Panel)	June 22-August 17, 2009
Selection of Final Set of Proposals to be included in FY10-12 Sea Grant Program Plan	August 17-28, 2009
Notification of Successful Proposers	August 28, 2009
Successful Proposers Prepare Written Responses to Peer Reviews	August 28-Sept. 11, 2009
Discussion of Omnibus Program Plan between Consortium Executive Director & NSGO Monitor	September 11-25, 2009
Publication of FY10-12 Sea Grant Program Plan	Sept. 25-Oct. 16, 2009
Omnibus Program Plan Due at NSGO	October 16, 2009
Start Date for FY10 Projects	February 1, 2010

Note: COB = Close of Business

SECTION II: FY10-12 PROGRAM AREA PRIORITY NEEDS

The Consortium is interested in receiving **Concept Letters** on innovative research, education, and extension activities that seek to address major issues, problems, and/or opportunities, or increase the knowledge and understanding of ocean and coastal resources and their management and use. Ideally, each Concept Letter should address a well-defined problem or opportunity with which society is currently faced or will have to face in the future. It is important that (a) the issue being addressed by the proposal is adequately described, (b) the information to be generated will improve the current situation, (c) there is a clear and well-thought out plan for formally engaging targeted stakeholders and delivering project results to targeted audiences.

Thus, Concept Letters should have the support of the targeted audience(s) by means of a commitment to collaborate, formal involvement in proposal writing, participation on advisory panels, and/or in-kind or financial support. Finally, the proposed activity must have sufficient intellectual content to make it an appropriate university (research, extension, and/or education) function.

Consortium program priorities for FY10-12 were developed and refined through an intensive strategic planning process (SC Sea Grant Consortium 2006-2010 Strategic Plan - (http://www.scseagrant.org/pdf_files/SCSGC06_10StrategicPlan.pdf)). These priorities have been updated through continual contact with these groups, as well as from formal input received from stakeholders directly and through the Consortium's Sea Grant Extension Program advisory committees.

The following research and outreach priorities focus on problems and opportunities associated with coastal and estuarine resources, especially with respect to increasing pressures due to rapid growth occurring in coastal South Carolina. While the following needs reflect the Consortium's current research and outreach priorities, they do not preclude rigorously conceived projects that fall outside these guidelines. **All interested investigators are encouraged to contact the Consortium office about their ideas before submitting a Concept Letter.**

The following research and outreach priority areas contain within them a diversity of natural and social science elements that represent a variety of opportunities for faculty and staff from a wide range of disciplines. Prospective investigators are encouraged to peruse each of the priority areas for possible areas of interest. Concept Letters may address one or more of the priorities identified below.

STRATEGIC AREA ONE – HUMANS and the COASTAL LANDSCAPE

Goal #1 – *The ecological and economic value of coastal and ocean ecosystem processes are documented, the effects of coastal growth on these ecosystem processes are assessed, and state and local decision-makers, resource managers, and interested public have the information and tools to ameliorate these effects.*

Objective #1 – Generate information about the function of South Carolina's coastal and ocean ecosystems, and communicate this information to decision-makers and the public.

Priorities

- Examination and documentation of the importance of the ecological interrelationships between coastal terrestrial (riverine) ecosystems and estuarine productivity.

- Innovative studies of boundary dynamics and biogeochemical processes (including atmospheric inputs) that influence the source, transport, fate, exposure, and effects of materials, such as nutrients, on ecosystems and the condition of South Carolina’s coast.
- Examinations of the relationships between living marine resource production in estuaries and salt marsh-tidal creek complexes and the quality of critical habitat areas. Particular emphasis should be placed on the relationships between the availability and utilization of food and vegetative cover and subsequent growth and mortality of living marine resources, including the interaction of physical (e.g., currents, tides, weather, and circulation patterns), chemical, and biological forces that determine resource utilization of wetland and estuarine habitats.
- 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.

Objective #2 – Conduct investigations and outreach activities that document and mitigate the effects of population growth and land use change on coastal and ocean ecosystems.

Priorities

Land-Use Change Impacts

- Investigations of significant **cumulative** effects on **key** marine organisms of low level, sub-chronic exposure to chemical contamination (from mixes of metals, organics, nutrients, antibiotics, pharmaceuticals) and/or physical changes (temperature, turbidity, hydrology) to the marine ecosystem due to increasing human activities, and identification of recommended strategies to address the effects.
- Assessment, refinement, and development, if necessary, of practical and realistic models that predict and forecast the impacts of land-use change and practices on coastal watersheds (rivers, estuaries, salt marsh, tidal creeks) and the resources therein.
- Development of visualization tools that illustrate future changes in population growth, land use, and land cover, including projections of environmental, economic, and demographic effects.
- Develop new or enhance existing hydrological and hydrodynamic tools for use in land use issues in the southeastern US.

Stormwater Management

- Examination of the long-term efficiency and effectiveness of **stormwater ponds**, and offer technical suggestions for improving pond performance and long-term maintenance strategies (through restoration and renovation efforts). Some 8,000 (or more) stormwater detention and retention ponds have been constructed over the last three-to-four decades in coastal South Carolina to minimize the effects of non-point source runoff on adjacent coastal waters. While many of these ponds have been designed to retain/detain a variety of chemical and biological constituents, there is little science-based information on their long-term effectiveness and efficiency in removing these materials, nor is there a requirement that they be regularly monitored and maintained.
- Validation of existing and development of new **stormwater quality models** based upon standardized protocols for monitoring and assessing the life-cycle costs, functions, and

performance of structural **stormwater pond** management practices in South Carolina. In particular, research is needed to validate the models with efficiency and efficacy data.

- Development and/or enhancement of management strategies to ameliorate impacts on water quality from specific non-point sources, such as agriculture, golf courses, urban runoff, residential landscapes, and water-dependent industries (marinas, docks, boat yards, etc.). The use of demonstration projects to test realistic solutions is encouraged.
- Assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of new, **innovative** stormwater management **techniques** in coastal South Carolina systems.

Development Approaches

- Determination/assessment of the **fiscal benefits and deficits** associated with conventional and alternative/compact development concepts in coastal South Carolina. A handful of studies have been done across the country, yet few focus on the Southeast region. With the cost of growth central to the national debate about how cities, counties, and regions should plan, the development of sustainable, compact, mixed-use neighborhoods has emerged as an important trend in contemporary planning. Programming to address the issues related to sprawl and the economic costs associated with this type of development is warranted. Research conducted on a local and/or regional basis may foster support from coastal communities to promote development that is more ecologically and economically sound if economic costs associated with conventional versus alternative compact mixed-use developments were available for South Carolina.
- An economic impact assessment for land-use planners and government officials to evaluate the economic and social impacts of future growth is needed. Of specific interest is the determination of the “physical and biological carrying capacities” of coastal areas, the current and projected demands for the state’s coastal and marine resources, and an evaluation of potential use conflicts.
- Evaluation of innovative approaches (e.g., low-impact development, quality growth, neo-traditional) to coastal development with particular emphasis on sustainability, resource management, resilience, “social carrying capacity,” and quantifiable economic benefits. Specific needs for proposals include the development of innovative approaches for use in locating, identifying, and characterizing natural/cultural resource areas according to their environmental sensitivity and suitability for use as resource attractions.

STRATEGIC AREA TWO - HUMANS and the RISKS of COASTAL HAZARDS

Goal #2 – *Coastal residents, communities, and businesses understand the risks and vulnerabilities associated with both chronic and episodic coastal natural hazard events; and are prepared for and able to recover from them with minimal disruption to social and economic systems.*

Objective #1 – Generate and deliver information on the natural forces of climate (e.g., sea level rise) and weather (e.g., hurricanes and coastal storms) and their effect on the human and built environment.

Priorities

- Continuing studies that build on previous work on tidal and wind-induced currents to (a) quantify the relative contributions of winds, waves, and tides to longshore and cross-

shore currents, (b) determine the vertical structure of velocity within wave and current boundary layers, (c) develop models of tide and wind-forced nearshore current and sediment transport, (d) test and apply the models to sediment transport and erosion “hot-spots” in South Carolina, and (e) generate information that supports the development of regional sediment budgets/management in South Carolina.

- Establishment and evaluation of model criteria necessary to determine 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.
- Examination and documentation of the trends related to estuarine shoreline change and to develop and test alternative salt marsh bank erosion mitigation techniques, including an analysis of current mitigation alternatives. Estuarine (non-beachfront) shoreline changes as affected by a multitude of anthropogenic (e.g., boat wakes) and natural processes (e.g., tidal currents) are poorly understood.
- A physical and socio-economic risk analysis of climate change and sea level rise on the natural (e.g., beaches and salt marshes) and built (e.g., dwellings, infrastructure, public facilities) environment of coastal South Carolina (examining social, economic, and environmental factors) to identify the challenges facing the state and its local communities as they plan for and adapt to continued growth and development.
- Development of visualization and decision-support tools to identify and predict the impacts of future short- and long-term hazard scenarios and effectively communicate results to state and local governments for improved planning and preparedness.

Objective #2 – Develop technology and extend information to at-risk homeowners, businesses, and government agencies to prepare for and mitigate the impacts from chronic and episodic coastal hazards.

Priorities

- Development of cost-effective and structurally sound hazard mitigation strategies, tools, and techniques related to building design, construction methods, building code standards, infrastructure resiliency, and land use that can be applied to reduce coastal hazard risks.
- Development and testing of tools for hazards identification and assessment for use at the state and local levels to improve understanding of public risk and vulnerability to coastal hazards, and to support state and local hazards policy, planning, response, and recovery processes.
- Economic analysis of hazard mitigation incentives, including market, insurance, and tax and regulatory incentives, as motivators for public and private mitigation measures is needed. Again, the issue is the cost of implementing hazard mitigation strategies versus their benefits in the near and long-term. These studies should consider market, insurance, and tax incentives as well as regulatory approaches. Can incentives be developed to encourage mitigation in the public and private sectors?
- Outreach efforts based-on sound science to develop and deliver public information materials that address coastal storm planning and preparedness, coastal construction techniques, coastal hazard mitigation, and beach safety.

STRATEGIC AREA THREE - SOUTH CAROLINA'S COASTAL-DEPENDENT ECONOMY

Goal #3– *Sustainable economic development in the coastal region that is compatible with changing demographics, business development, regulatory environments, and long-term conservation of natural and cultural resources.*

Objective #1 – Support research and technology transfer efforts to enhance viable and sustainable fisheries, aquaculture, and related industries.

Priorities

Aquaculture and Stock Enhancement

- Determination of the environmental and economic feasibility of single diploid and triploid oyster culture in state waters and private ponds with a focus on techniques and approaches feasible for traditional watermen. Efforts should examine viable culture and grow-out techniques that can meet the state's environmental, regulatory, and public health objectives. Research should target problems that inhibit productivity in both hatchery and field grow-out of SC single oysters (*Crassostrea virginica*). Researchers should partner with commercial oystermen and focus their research on one or more of the following industry needs:
 - (1) Management of single oyster fouling during grow-out by natural wildstock oyster spat and barnacles,
 - (2) Reduction of impacts of boring sponge (*Cliona* spp.),
 - (3) Determination of methods for growing oysters with thicker, more aesthetically pleasing shells,
 - (4) Reduction or elimination of impacts of *Polydora* worms and calcareous worm tubes,
 - (5) Selection of oysters with optimum hinges for half shell market shucking,
 - (6) Development of "branding" and marketing techniques to increase wholesale and retail prices of locally grown single oysters, and
 - (7) Development of a fast growing, robust triploid oyster suitable for propagation in SC estuaries.
- Examination of the efficacy of bait shrimp aquaculture to supply the needs of this ever-growing recreational past-time. Studies should include an assessment of alternative culture methods and the environmental and economic impacts of the methods being tested.
- Examination of the long-term potential and success of stock enhancement programs to augment natural finfish production. The Consortium is currently completing a red drum enhancement project, but additional species are of interest (e.g., spotted sea trout, cobia, black sea bass, flounder). In particular, research on the biology of parentage, best life stage to stock, best area within an estuary to stock, optimum number to stock, genetic manipulation of the existing wild population, and economic benefits of such stock enhancement efforts are all questions that are of interest.

Fisheries

- Examination of the ecological impacts of baitfish and forage fish species (e.g., *Fundulus*) harvesting for bait, including the identification of impacts, if any, on predatory fish species populations.
- Assessment of the likely impacts and ramifications of Individual Fishing Quotas (IFQs)

as a fisheries management tool in South Carolina.

- Development of models for “ecosystem-based” fisheries management, especially for the snapper-grouper complex fisheries. Proposals are sought that would, in particular, identify optimum snapper-grouper habitat and environmental and habitat conditions that limit snapper-grouper production, determine the relationship between juvenile snapper-grouper and estuarine habitat, and quantify the relationships between snapper-grouper production and habitat.
- Determination of the ecological services of oyster beds in permanently closed areas in comparison to similar reefs in open, harvested areas (culture permits and state shellfish grounds), how dependent intertidal oysters are, if at all, on cultivation/husbandry for propagation and survival, and whether habitat restoration projects should include some sort of periodic cultivation to remain fully functional as habitat.
- Determination of the “full functional maturity” for restored intertidal oyster reefs is needed. Although literature is available that defines functional maturity of restored *Spartina* populations, none exists in parallel for intertidal oysters. South Carolina has a long history of large-scale oyster reef restoration which can serve as a foundation for studies that address the following information needs:
 - (1) What is the time to full functional maturity of these reefs?
 - (2) What is the shape of maturity curve (normally we assume linear maturity function)?
 - (3) What is the lifespan of such reefs (e.g., how long will the reef last and provide services)?
 - (4) Do we need to account for relative function of the created reef to the natural reef? (For salt marsh, we assume a created marsh doesn’t ever function at the same level as a natural marsh—is this something we need to address with oyster restoration?)
- Documentation of the changing demographics of the state’s commercial and recreational fisheries. This study should examine the effects of (a) the increasing mean age of commercial fishermen and low recruitment rates of new fishermen, (b) the effects of increasing fuel and vessel costs for both commercial and recreational fishermen, and (c) how the fisheries will change relative to offshore vs. inshore fishing, increased shore-based fishing, targeting different species, etc.

Objective #2 – Identify sustainable community-based economic development and management strategies to support traditional and emerging coastal-dependent business and industry.

Priorities

- Socio-economic and development research to both document the apparent decline in South Carolina’s traditional coastal economic activities and identify options for sustaining these uses. Traditional forms of fishing, boat building, and indigenous ways of gathering one’s sustenance and livelihood from the land (e.g., sweetgrass basket-making) are disappearing along the South Carolina coast. Maintaining these diverse cultural forms of economic activity represents a major challenge for South Carolina.
- Identification of economic incentives and policy alternatives that could be implemented to preserve waterfront access for traditional uses (e.g., commercial fishing, aquaculture), public access, and other public uses.
- Socio-economic research and outreach that involves (1) development and implementation of activities to help small coastal and marine businesses cope with changing demographic, economic, and regulatory environments, and (2) assistance to

small coastal- and water-dependent businesses that operate in a manner consistent with maintaining environmental quality and sustainability of natural resources, while creating a diverse economic base. Topics and activities include but are not limited to the following examples:

Small business development. Research and outreach to assist the state's natural resource-dependent businesses develop and implement innovative product lines, technologies, and services that foster a healthy local economy and sustainable resource base, and to assist businesses and governments with planning, developing, and marketing of natural resource-related products to local and statewide markets that contribute to the overall growth of local community economies.

Natural resource-based recreation and tourism. Assistance to local communities that provides nature-based recreation/tourism opportunities which are economically and environmentally sustainable.

- Evaluation of the ecological, economic, and policy implications of offshore energy development (oil, gas, and wind) on the South Carolina coastal landscape (i.e., shoreline development of facilities and upland infrastructure to support offshore enterprises).
- Identification and evaluation of the potential environmental, economic, and policy issues and concerns or consequences from offshore energy development (oil, gas, and wind) off the South Carolina coast.

STRATEGIC AREA FOUR - SCIENTIFIC LITERACY and WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Goal #4 – *Coastal and ocean education programs foster scientific literacy, public awareness, resource stewardship, and a scientifically trained workforce.*

Objective #1 - Design and implement a K-12 educational program for teachers that increases proficiency in science and knowledge of coastal and ocean ecosystems.

Priorities

- Develop, evaluate, and integrate, based on recent and previous work, novel and standards-based marine- and coastal-resource education and training programs into South Carolina K-12 curricula.
- Development of educational methodologies for improving preparation of technical skill development of pre-service and in-service teachers in the marine and ocean sciences.
- Develop and test 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 #2 - Support the development of a diverse and scientifically trained workforce.

Priorities

- Development of novel pilot programs that incorporate training, experience, and the development of technical skills of underrepresented students to enable them to pursue careers, entrepreneurship opportunities, and advanced academic study in the marine and ocean sciences.

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

SECTION III: INSTRUCTIONS for PREPARING and SUBMITTING CONCEPT LETTERS

*Concept Letters are due in the S.C. Sea Grant Consortium office by close of business on **April 6, 2009**.*

Structure of Concept Letters

The Concept Letter 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 addressed, and discuss its relationship to S.C. Sea Grant Consortium program priorities.

Objectives: Clearly list the overall objectives (including hypotheses) of your proposed effort, and list specific objectives by year if proposing a multi-year project. (Projects may be proposed for more than two years; however, the investigator(s) will be expected to submit a Continuing Proposal for each 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 of the appropriateness and innovativeness of the proposed approach for achieving the stated objectives.

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/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 of benefits to target audiences
- Number of schools adopting new curricula
- Number of patent applications to be filed
- Number of peer-reviewed publications
- Number of students (undergraduate/graduate) that will be trained under the proposed project

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

Targeted Audiences/Outreach/Education: Identify the users, organizations, and groups who will 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. Prospective PIs should make contact with their target audiences prior to submission of Concept Letters to solicit their interest and possible involvement in the proposed effort. 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.

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 the previous section.

Personnel and Collaborators: 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 any industrial and commercial 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 and supplies, and other costs) for each year of the project. Indicate the length of the proposed effort (in years).

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 April 6, 2009* in the following formats:

1. **An electronic file, in Microsoft Word, attached to an e-mail sent to conceptletters@scseagrant.org, and**
2. **The signed original and twelve (12) hard copies of each Concept Letter mailed to the Consortium address:**

Concept Letter Desk
S.C. Sea Grant Consortium
287 Meeting Street
Charleston, SC 29401-1514

Review of Concept Letters

Your Concept Letter should be succinct but sufficiently detailed so that Consortium staff and external panel reviewers can make an informed evaluation of the proposal's relevance and your capabilities.

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 will be evaluated based on the same criteria by which Full Proposals are judged. These criteria can be found in Section VII.

Principal Investigators who's 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 IV.

SECTION IV: INSTRUCTIONS for PREPARING and SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

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 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 and to whom (target audiences), and how the results will be delivered to the targeted audiences identified (outreach). 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 criteria listed in Section VII, will be evaluated during the peer and panel review processes.

Microsoft Word Forms

The following forms can be found and downloaded from the Consortium's Web site (<http://www.scseagrant.org/funding>) for your use.

- Title/Signature Cover Page
- Project Summary Form
- Budget Summary Form
- Milestone Chart - Proposed Year of Funding
- Milestone Chart - Multi-Year Projects ONLY
- Vitae Form

Instructions for Preparing Full Proposals

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

1. Title/Signature Page (Consortium form)
2. Project Summary (Consortium form)
3. Narrative, to include the following sections:
 - a. Title, with Investigator Names & Affiliations
 - b. Introduction/Background/Rationale
 - c. Objectives
 - d. Methods
 - e. Expected Outcomes
 - f. Targeted Audiences/Engagement/Outreach/Education
 - g. Information Products
 - h. Anticipated Benefits
 - i. Related Work
 - j. References
4. Milestone Charts (Consortium form)
5. Vitae (Consortium form)
6. Budget (Consortium form) (as a separate Word document)
7. Budget Justification (as a separate Word document)
8. Suggested Reviewers (listed on a separate page)

The **TITLE/SIGNATURE PAGE** form serves as the 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 (see below).

Page 2 of the proposal should be completed using the [PROJECT SUMMARY FORM](#); note that some items will be completed by Consortium staff (see instructions for completing this form in Section VI). 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.

The body of the proposal begins with the **TITLE** at the top of the page (see example, Section VI). The title should accurately reflect the nature of the proposal project and be free of technical jargon. Choose words to which the designated user of the research project can relate. The name(s) and affiliation(s) of the 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. If the research and/or outreach solution 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 ingredient in a successful Sea Grant proposal.

The **OBJECTIVES** section should begin with a statement of the overall goal of the project. The goal should be stated as one or more testable hypotheses. For multi-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 the proper 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. Delineate how the hypothesis (hypotheses) will be tested and identify the controls to be used. (Note that the Consortium office should be notified before survey forms or questionnaires are sent to target audiences.) Provide, in general terms, a timetable which 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 PI should state 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 of benefits to target audiences
- Number of schools adopting new curricula
- Number of patent applications to be filed
- Number of peer-reviewed publications
- Number of students (undergraduate/graduate) that will be trained under the proposed project

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) document its annual implementation plan for each of the two years (2010-11 and 2011-12) covered by this program 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 Consortium will be evaluating the extent to which a proposal specifically identifies its **TARGET AUDIENCES** and what **OUTREACH/EDUCATION** efforts will be used to convey project results to them. Therefore, PIs must identify the users, organizations, and 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, if funded. In addition, the information products to be generated must be identified and *the mechanisms that will be used to deliver* resultant information to the target audiences 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 Full Proposals, and preferably during the preparation of Concept Letters.

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 or the user groups 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 II). Note: the Consortium also requires progress and final reports on all projects; refer to Section VIII for more details.

The **ANTICIPATED BENEFITS** section should state concisely 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) 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. Another factor considered in the review process is how a proposed effort relates to other recent and ongoing research and/or outreach programs, projects, or proposals.

Relationships to other efforts 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.

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 reviewer and program monitor 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 December 31** for all projects continuing into the next year.

Biographical data should be provided on the [VITAE FORM](#) (two pages maximum) for all principal and associate investigators. 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, **a completed budget form must be completed for each year** covered by the years 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 must be provided 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 must be itemized along with the cost and specific justification of need. 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 must be provided as separate documents from the main body of the proposal.**

Finally, include, **on a separate sheet of paper attached to your transmittal letter**, the names, addresses, and phone numbers of four or more peer **REVIEWERS** 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.

Instructions for Preparing Continuing Proposals

Continuing Proposals are required for projects that will extend beyond the current biennium, but have already gone through the rigorous technical review process and received initial funding. The emphasis for a successful continuing proposal is placed on the demonstration of significant progress towards the project's objectives and extension of its results. However, proposal content remains important during the review process and all review criteria (Section VII) will be applied.

For continuing proposals, the following **outline** should be followed:

1. Title/Signature Page (Consortium form)
2. Project Summary (Consortium form - updated)
3. Narrative, to include the following sections:
 - a. Title
 - b. Introduction/Background/Rationale
 - c. Objectives
 - d. Procedures/Methods (Detailed)
 - e. Expected Outcomes
 - f. Targeted Audiences/Outreach/Education
 - g. Technical Progress and Outcomes (detailed)
 - h. Benefits-to-Date
 - i. References
4. Milestone Charts (Consortium form)
5. Vitae (Consortium form)
6. Budget (Consortium form) (as a separate Word document)
7. Budget Justification (as a separate Word document)

The **TITLE/SIGNATURE PAGE** must be completed and endorsed by the submitting institution.

The **PROJECT SUMMARY FORM** should be updated to include accomplishments and benefits to date; remember that this information sets the first impression for the project. All other pertinent information should be updated as directed in the instructions, which can be found at the end of Section VI.

The **TITLE AND INTRODUCTION** sections should be a repeat of those used in the initial proposal; updated information should be included.

The **OBJECTIVES** of the project should be restated, along with the hypotheses being tested, immediately following the introduction. Also list the objectives to be met in each of the upcoming and subsequent years.

Detail the technical (experimental) procedures and the methods proposed for analyses of data in the **METHODS** section, using the objectives as subheadings. (Refer back to the discussion of **METHODS** under the "Full Proposal Instructions" for more details.) Particular attention should be paid to the methods and procedures to be used in the upcoming year(s).

The PI should state specific **EXPECTED OUTCOME(S)** for each upcoming year of the proposed work. Generally, an outcome is the result of a process. 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 of benefits to target audiences
- Number of schools adopting new curricula
- Number of patent applications to be filed
- Number of peer-reviewed publications
- Number of students (undergraduate/graduate) that will be trained under the proposed project

Please note that all PIs will be expected to report on and document Outcomes in their annual and final reports. The Consortium will collectively use these statements in order to: (1) document its annual implementation plan for each of the two years (2010-11 and 2011-12) covered by this program 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 Consortium will be evaluating the extent to which a proposal specifically identifies its **TARGET AUDIENCES** and what **OUTREACH/EDUCATION** efforts will be used to convey project results to them. Therefore, PIs must identify the users, organizations, and groups who will benefit from the work. Briefly identify the information products to be generated and *the mechanisms that have been and will be used to deliver* resultant information to the target audiences.

TECHNICAL PROGRESS should be provided in sufficient detail to provide a reviewer enough information for evaluating progress made toward the stated objectives. Use each objective originally proposed as a subheading and describe the progress made in terms of the milestones originally set. Any departure from the original work plan must be explained. For each objective provide, in a series of paragraphs, the following information:

1. Statement of the original objective;
2. An indication of the progress made, by quantitative means (i.e., 100% complete, 75% complete, etc.);
3. Concise statement of the methods used;
4. Detailed summary of results, **outcomes**, and benefits to date; and
5. Level of involvement of targeted audiences, along with progress on dissemination of results.

An example of this might be “Objective 2. To evaluate bulkhead structures that will alleviate adjacent shoreline erosion. (20% completed.) Five designs from other states were evaluated. Design #1 reduced adjacent erosion by 5% in experimental tests...” Further, any planned publications, conferences, or meetings should be discussed. Interactions with personnel from the Sea Grant Extension or Communications programs for dissemination of results, or with targeted user groups directly, should be noted as well.

BENEFITS-TO-DATE should convey to the reader any changes that have occurred in the problem situation based upon the results of the project. Have resource management decisions been affected? What commercial impacts have resulted? What new information has been developed? What has been the reaction of the target audience? For example, “Bulkhead design #1 developed under this project has been adopted by the City of Megalopolis with a resultant reduction of adjacent property erosion by 10%. This has resulted in the savings of approximately X dollars in beach renourishment and bulkhead construction costs for the year 2012.” In addition, published articles, approved theses, seminar/conference abstracts, patents, etc., should be listed.

The **REFERENCES**, [VITAE](#) AND **REVIEWERS** sections should be completed as in a new proposal. The [annual](#) and [multi-year](#) **MILESTONE CHARTS** should be included for reference and evaluation of the timely progress of the project. Refer to the section “Instructions for New Proposals” for details and guidance in preparing these sections.

The [BUDGET FORM](#) for the upcoming year should be reviewed and modified if necessary; changes in the budget from original budget projections should be highlighted. All budget items must again be supported in the Budget Justification section of the text. **The budget forms must be submitted as a separate document 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 must be itemized along with the cost and specific justification of need. 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 must be provided as separate documents from the main body of the proposal.**

SECTION V: PROPOSAL CONTENT and SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS (FOR FULL AND CONTINUING PROPOSALS)

The content of any proposal is critical to its ultimate success; however, **consistency of format** is also important. 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 word processing as the program plan is being assembled. Detailed instructions on proposal format are included in Section VI.

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

All Proposals must be submitted as follows:

1. **Three electronic files - (1) main proposal, (2) completed budget forms, and (3) budget justifications - in Microsoft Word and a PDF file of the complete proposal (organized as outlined above) attached to an e-mail sent to proposals@scseagrant.org, **and****
2. **The signed original and fifteen (15) hard copies of each Proposal mailed to the Consortium address:**

Proposal Desk
South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium
287 Meeting Street
Charleston, SC 29401-1514

*All Proposals, electronic and hard copies, are due at the Consortium
by COB on **June 22, 2009**.*

All Proposals are reviewed by Consortium professional staff, Sea Grant Extension staff with expertise in the area of the proposed effort, and outside technical experts and appropriate 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 (also see Section VII), 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 may 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.

SECTION VI: INSTRUCTIONS and FORMS for PROPOSALS

Word Processing and Format Instructions

The content of any proposal is critical to its ultimate success; however, consistency of format is just as important. 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 Budget Justification) 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. **Do not send PDF files of individual figures or tables.**

Title Page of Text—The example below provides an example of how the first page of the proposal should be structured.

Before Submitting Your Proposal...

Prior to initial submission, all Proposals should be reviewed by the Institutional Liaison and endorsed, on the Title/Signature page, by the Sponsored Programs office for accurate budget and matching funds commitment. Investigators are encouraged to submit their Proposals to their institution's research/business office for signatures one week before they are due at the Consortium office (see Appendix II for the names of your institutional research/business officers).

Sample format for the Title/Introduction page of the proposal.

**GENETIC IMPROVEMENT OF HARD CLAM, *Mercenaria mercenaria*,
POPULATIONS FOR COMMERCIAL MARICULTURE STOCK DEVELOPMENT IN
SOUTH CAROLINA**

Principal Investigator:	John J. Malone Associate Marine Scientist Marine Resources Research Institute
Associate Investigators:	A.G. Evernham Associate Professor Dept. of Aquaculture, Fisheries & Wildlife Clemson University
	Robert T. Wilson, Jr. Assistant Professor Department of Biology College of Charleston
Cooperating Investigators:	R.K. Knight, Chairman Department of Biology State University of NY Stony Brook, NY
	G.F. Newton Associate Professor Biology Department Dalhousie University
	L.S. Adam Assistant Professor Department of Biology George Mason University

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Instructions for 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 summary is compiled. Each time the computer file is changed in any way, this date will be changed.

(6) **INITIATION DATE:** The date on which Sea Grant support for the project was initiated or is to be initiated. Leave blank if summary is for a project proposed but not yet agreed upon.

(7) **COMPLETION DATE:** The date on which it is estimated that this particular project will be completed. Leave blank if summary is for a project proposed but not yet agreed upon.

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

(9) **DEPARTMENT AND INSTITUTION:** The academic affiliation of the PI, 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 PI, i.e., Biology Department, Tufts University.

(12) **SEA 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 SEA 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) PARENT PROJECTS: Assigned by the Consortium. Leave blank.

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

(18) KEYWORDS: 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) METHODS: This is an optional section of no more than six lines to indicate the methods or show sub-objectives that indicate the approach to be taken. Specific questions that an interested person would ask should be answered under objectives or methods, such as which heavy metals, which pollutants, which pathogens, what species of seaweed or shellfish, what kind of a model?

(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 a solution. Long involved background statements should be avoided. Where the potential users (of the information to be developed) have been identified this should be conveyed. This information should be no longer than six lines.

(22) ACCOMPLISHMENTS: This section is generally applicable to an ongoing project and should contain concise statements of progress towards the stated objectives. Publications resulting from the project should be reported. When the PROJECT SUMMARY is prepared for a proposed project, enter: "To be updated."

(23) BENEFITS: This section is not strictly a part of the Project Summary but an after-the-fact accounting of benefits that flow to society from the effort. Where possible these are to be quantified. Instructions for uniform reporting of BENEFITS have yet to be developed. This is an important section of the permanent record to be updated regularly.

SECTION VII: CONCEPT LETTER and PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA

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

A. 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)
---	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

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

D. Scientific/Outreach Methods – The degree to which the feasibility of the proposed methods and design of the proposed project will address the stated objectives, as well as the degree to which 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.

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

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

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)
--	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

SECTION VIII: FUNDED PROJECTS – RESPONSIBILITIES and 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 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 Assistant Director. Formal requests for budget changes, time extensions, and changes in project scope must be submitted to the Consortium Director, through the institution's Office of Sponsored Programs (or related office), **at least 60 days prior** to the end of the grant period.

The Sea Grant fiscal year begins February 1 with the **formal award announcements** mailed to the investigators. Under separate notification, the respective institution's business office is provided with two copies of the Consortium Award Agreement signed by the Consortium Executive Director, which must be read, agreed to, and endorsed by the appropriate signatory authority and the PI. 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 Direction, Duration, or Budget

Among the provisions of the Agreement is a set of **special conditions** of which the investigator should be aware. **Changes in projects** subsequent to the formal awards, whether budgetary or programmatic, may require prior formal approval by the Consortium Executive Director and/or NSGCP. The recipient will be required to obtain approval before making any substantive changes in the project objectives, methods, budget, or schedule. Requests for changes shall be submitted in writing to the Consortium. Recipients are not authorized to proceed with any changes until final written approval is received from Sea Grant. Also, any budget changes affecting the following categories require prior approval:

1. Any item of equipment not specifically identified and justified in the proposal and approved budget.
2. Change in the principal investigator.
3. Any change in the scope of objectives of the approved project.
4. Any request to increase by more than \$500.00 per trip or 25% (whichever is greater) the amount allotted for domestic travel.
5. In addition to the changes described above that require approval, key personnel changes in PIs or co-PIs must be approved. Significant changes in time devoted to a project by a PI must likewise be approved.
6. Request for no-cost extensions must be submitted at least 60 days prior to the end of the grant year, along with a budget for all remaining funds to be expended. Such extensions may be made when any one of the following applies:
 - a. Additional time beyond the established expiration date is required to ensure completion of the original approved project scope or objectives; or
 - b. Continuity of Sea Grant support is required while a competing application is under review; or

- c. The extension is necessary to permit an orderly phase-out of a project that will not receive continued support.

Approval of 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 award.
- The Consortium must have on file a copy of each institution's approved indirect cost rate for projects submitted for funding.

All formal requests for budgeting actions and subsequent approval must be in writing.

A REQUEST FOR TRANSFER form is available for this purpose.

Disposition of Permanent Equipment

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

Patent Policy

The policy and procedures set forth in the DOC 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 Director 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 the use of **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.

Fiscal Reporting

In addition to the Agreement, fiscal reporting forms that reflect the approved budgets are mailed to investigators and their respective institutional fiscal officers. The **FEDERAL AND MATCH EXPENDITURE REPORT** should accurately reflect expenditures and must be sent quarterly to the Consortium's Assistant Director by the institutional business office, with the appropriate endorsement. The table below illustrates 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 Director as soon as possible.

Quarterly Deadlines - Submission of 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 Report**, prepared by the principal investigator, summarizing annual progress of a project which is proposed for continuation; and
2. **Final Report**, 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 Web site, is used by PIs for completing Annual and Final Reports. A project report "reminder" is sent to all PIs 30 days prior to the due date of the report, as follows:

- **Annual Reports** are due **30 days prior** to the end of the current grant year.
- **Final Project Reports** are due **60 days after** the close of the project grant period.

Reimbursement Conditions

Final reimbursement to the institutions for expenses incurred under a Sea Grant project award may not be made until the requisite Project Report is received from the PI and accepted by the Consortium office. **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.**

APPENDIX I: THE SOUTH CAROLINA SEA GRANT CONSORTIUM - A PARTNERSHIP AMONG UNIVERSITIES, GOVERNMENT, and the PUBLIC and PRIVATE SECTORS

The South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium (Consortium) was created by the State Legislature in 1978, under Act No. 643, to:

1. Provide a mechanism for the development and management of the Sea Grant Program for the State and adjacent regions that share a common environment and resource heritage;
2. Support, improve, and share research, education, training and advisory services in fields related to ocean and coastal resources; and
3. Encourage and follow a regional approach to solving problems or meeting needs relating to ocean and coastal resources in cooperation with appropriate colleges, programs and persons in the region.

The Consortium is a unique statewide program committed to enhancing the practical use and conservation of South Carolina's coastal and marine resources to foster a sustainable economy and environment. The Consortium partnership of public universities, colleges, and state natural resource agencies generates knowledge and information upon which these potentials can be realized. Consortium members are The Citadel, Clemson University, College of Charleston, Coastal Carolina University, Medical University of South Carolina, South Carolina State University, S.C. Department of Natural Resources and the University of South Carolina.

Operating from its office in Charleston, the Consortium links academic and agency faculty and staff engaged in research and education with extension professionals in the state's eight coastal counties as well as counties inland. This relationship enables faculty, professional staff, and graduate students to focus their talents and expertise on the needs of a variety of coastal and marine resource users.

The Consortium acts as an **information broker**. User needs are identified and form the basis for research and outreach projects, the results of which are communicated back to those users through technical assistance, educational activities, publications, and other products and tools.

The Consortium began formal operations in 1980 with the submission of its first Sea Grant **program proposal** to the National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP). This proposal consisted of a package of research, education, and extension projects that were broad in nature, short-term in application, and reflective of the diversity of the coastal and marine environment and economy that typifies South Carolina. With improved internal and external capabilities to address the resource needs of South Carolina, the Consortium, in 1984, initiated a shift from broad, short-term projects to focused, long-term program areas. This transition to objective-oriented, integrated efforts enhanced Consortium visibility throughout the state and nation as an institution that enhances the conservation, development, and management of coastal and marine resources through the exchange of reliable information and the provision of technical assistance.

The Consortium has identified three **major objectives** that provide the foundation for meeting this goal:

1. To develop an integrated Sea Grant Program for South Carolina that seeks to provide future economic opportunities, improve the social well-being of its citizens, and ensure the wise use and development of its marine and coastal natural resources.
2. To create and refine an effective and efficient Sea Grant communications and extension network among academia, business, government, and the general public to ensure that Consortium activities are responsive to marine and coastal users and that information generated is delivered in a timely fashion.
3. To be an integral component of the National Sea Grant College Program where Consortium activities are responsive to regional and national needs, as well as to those of South Carolina.

The Consortium works to achieve these objectives by delivering programs which bridge the gap between science and policy; where effective management of resources, both physical and human, requires resolution of diverse scientific, economic, social, and environmental questions.

Sea Grant Program Plan

As noted in Section I, final versions of all approved new and continuing proposals are incorporated into the Consortium **Program Plan** for submission to NSGCP. The Consortium Executive Director is the PI for the total package and thus has the authority and responsibility for any funding which results. In order to strengthen the package, the Executive Director and staff integrate the individual proposals into related program areas as they address an overall problem situation as stated in the RFP. Although each proposal must stand on its own merit, it benefits by being integrated into a program area with a somewhat larger focus and a successful past track record. It is important that the individual investigators address these relationships; contact with the Consortium and Sea Grant Extension staff can facilitate this process.

The Consortium's Program Plan will be evaluated to ensure that the proposed activities meet national and state priorities, and that the Sea Grant Program is being managed effectively. To this end, two levels of review will be conducted: individual proposals will be evaluated on their technical and conceptual merits (see Section VI), and the package of proposals will be reviewed as a whole to determine the degree to which the entire program addresses state and national priorities.

Consortium staff will contact each investigator to convey the acceptance or rejection of their proposal. Proposals which require technical adjustments will be sent back to investigators to prepare revision statements. Proposals which require budget revisions must be reprocessed at the institutional level and resubmitted to SCSGC for incorporation into the final Program Plan. This document is then resubmitted through NSGCP to NOAA and the Department of Commerce where it is handled as a formal budget request for approved programs. After several weeks of processing, the Department of Commerce will release funds to support the work proposed.

APPENDIX II: CONTACT PERSONS - INSTITUTIONAL LIAISON OFFICERS

Consortium Contact Persons

If you need assistance or require further information about the SCSGC Request for Proposals for FY10-12, please contact the appropriate person, listed below, at 843-953-2078:

Program Area Priorities

Rick DeVoe – Executive Director

rick.devoe@scseagrant.org

Denise Sanger – Assistant Director for Research and Planning

denise.sanger@scseagrant.org

Proposal Submission and Review Information

John Dwyer – Assistant to the Director for Program Management

john.dwyer@scseagrant.org

Fiscal and Budgetary Information

Elaine Knight – Assistant Director

elaine.knight@scseagrant.org

Communications and Information Products

Susan Ferris Hill – Communications Director

susan.ferris.hill@scseagrant.org

Sea Grant Extension Program

Bob Bacon – Sea Grant Extension Program Leader

robert.bacon@scseagrant.org

Sea Grant Education Program

Elizabeth Vernon Bell – S.C. Sea Grant Education Specialist

elizabeth.vernon@scseagrant.org

Consortium Liaison Officers

Mr. Curtis E. Holland
Vice President – Finance & Business Affairs
The Citadel
Charleston, SC 29409
843-953-5002
curt.holland@citadel.edu

Mr. Darren McCants
Office of Research & Sponsored Programs
Medical University of South Carolina
19 Hagood Avenue – Ste 606
Charleston, SC 29425
843-792-3832
mccantsd@musc.edu

Mr. Christian E.G. Przirembel
Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs
Office of University Research
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634
864-656-7701
cprzmb1@clemson.edu

Mr. Robert Boyles
SC Department of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
PO Box 12559
Charleston, SC 29422
843-953-9048
boylesr@dnr.sc.gov

Ms. Bruxanne Hein
Grants & Sponsored Research
Coastal Carolina University
PO Box 1954
Conway, SC 29526
843-349-2918
bruxanne@coastal.edu

Mr. Elbert R. Malone, Director
Office of Sponsored Programs
South Carolina State University
PO Box 7461
300 College Street, NE
Orangeburg, SC 29117
803-536-8213
malone@scsu.edu

Ms. Laurie Chamness
Office of Research & Grants Administration
College of Charleston
Charleston, SC 29424
843-953-5673
chamnessl@cofc.edu

Mr. Steven Etheredge
Director, Pre-Award Services Contracts & Grants
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
803-777-7093
steven@gwm.sc.edu