

QUESTIONS FROM POTENTIAL APPLICANTS & EPA’S RESPONSES
in regard to Research Solicitation NCEA-01-01:

“A Request for Applications for Cooperative Agreements to
Provide Assistance to State/Tribal/Other Local Environmental Protection Agencies to
Conduct Location-Specific Assessments of the Impacts of Climate Change & Variability on
Aquatic Ecosystems and Water Quality.”

It is ORD policy to insure that all competitors have equal access to information, so Section 5.5 of the solicitation (NCEA-01-01) provides that questions that are asked by potential applicants shall be posted along with EPA responses on the NCEA and Global Change Research Program websites. (Please email additional questions to Dave Kelley at kelley.dave@epa.gov.)

1. Question from potential applicant: Is there an assumption of global change and therefore we, as investigators, just look at local impacts of the change; or is it the reverse: look at local change and try to project the global impacts?

EPA’s Response: As stated in section 3.1, “The *primary purpose* of the research solicited by this document is to build **local capacity** for location-specific assessments of the impacts of global change on aquatic ecosystems and water quality... The *secondary purpose* is to generate insights at the local scale that can be used to inform larger-scale assessments.”

Thus, investigators shall assess the potential **local impacts** of climate change. An understanding of local impacts may also inform assessments of **impacts** at larger spatial scales. There is no mention in the solicitation of assessment of the effects of local actions on global climate; thus, proposals to look at the effects of local actions on climate would not be responsive to the solicitation.

2. Question from potential applicant: Is the grant program really about empowerment? To give the local people data and tools to help them influence decisions? From that, is there the ability to do training as part of the proposal?

EPA’s Response: See section 3.0 and section 5.2. Section 3.0 describes what the solicitation is “really about.” Section 5.2 describes the detailed review criteria that will be used by the review panel to evaluate the merit of the applications. A training component could be included in a research proposal. The review panel will evaluate the proposal’s overall quality and responsiveness to the solicitation in determining whether that training component is appropriate and valuable.

3. Question from potential applicant: Does the maximum specific award (the way it is worded in the memo) total up to \$300,000 per year? Or is it intended to be \$100,000 per year for three years?

EPA’s Response: As stated in section 1.0 and section 4.2, the value of **each** cooperative agreement award is estimated to range from \$25,000 to \$100,000 spread out over a period of one to three years. [Note: there is no minimum, but EPA does not expect to receive many applications for less than \$25,000.] Depending upon the availability of funds, the total amount available for **all** awards for the **entire** period (up to three years) is approximately \$300,000.

A project may last between one and three years. Regardless of the proposed project duration, a project could receive up to \$100,000.

4. Question from potential applicant: Could you please elaborate on the nature of the collaboration with EPA? How involved will EPA become in the research, field work, etc.?

EPA’s Response: Applicants propose the extent and nature of collaboration that they desire in the proposal. Please review section 3.2 for a description of EPA’s potential collaboration. The list does not specifically include field work, and it is unlikely that EPA will be involved in fieldwork. EPA is more likely to supply expertise in written and verbal form. For example, EPA might work with recipients to refine the research plan, identify feasible methods and approaches, advise recipients on methods for engaging stakeholders, provide references, synthesize scientific information, assist in model and data interpretation, develop conclusions, and present information (e.g., reports, papers, presentations, decision tools).

The Review Panel will evaluate the appropriateness of the applicants’ proposal for collaborating with EPA. (See Review Criterion 5.2.2.D.) The technical assistance that the applicant proposes to receive from EPA should be appropriate to NCEA/Global’s mission, its technical capabilities, and the expertise of its staff. Please note that the criterion for evaluation is appropriateness, not extent, of involvement. A substantive role must be proposed to meet the criteria for cooperative agreements (see section 3.2, first paragraph), but the collaboration proposed could be extensive or limited.