

FY2022 FPMS Interagency Nonstructural Proposals: Call for Proposals

A portion of FY22 Flood Plain Management Services (FPMS) funding is apportioned to interagency nonstructural work. Interagency work promotes participation by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) staff in small efforts undertaken in conjunction with other partners in order to achieve flood risk management benefits that could not be achieved by any one party alone. This Call for Proposals invites proposals for that purpose, with a focus on approaches that utilize the agency's expertise in engineering to provide local communities and States with technical and planning assistance regarding the development and implementation of nonstructural approaches to manage and reduce flood risks.

Authorized by Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960, as amended (33 U.S. Code § 709a), the FPMS program addresses the need of people who live and work in floodplains to know about flood hazards, and the actions they can take to reduce property damage and prevent the loss of life caused by flooding. The FPMS program provides a full range of technical services and planning guidance that is needed to support effective floodplain management. Proposals may address any or all portions of the flood risk management life cycle (prepare, respond, recover, and mitigate.) Proposals may address floods and flood hazards in riverine and coastal areas.

Information Regarding Proposals:

- **This call for proposals is not a grant program.** Funds enable USACE involvement using FPMS authority, such as providing technical service to local, county, State, Tribal or other partners in support of their taking action with that information to reduce flood risk. USACE labor is a typical use of funds; proposal partners also bring their expertise and/or resources to further desired outcomes. Except under unusual circumstances, funds may not be subsequently transferred to other governmental entities. The USACE District takes the lead in coordinating and submitting a proposal for USACE funding.
- **All proposals must be interagency and must leverage resources invested by others (monetary or in-kind).** Proposals should be developed with partners, and funded work should be carried out collaboratively in conjunction with partners. At least two additional governmental partners beyond USACE who will be engaged in collaborative execution must be identified for the effort to be considered interagency (e.g., other Federal, State, regional, local, or Tribal governments, or other public agencies); proposed work that will not be accomplished via interagency effort will not be considered. Proposals should consider including partners at each level of government (e.g., local, State, Federal) as appropriate. A wide range of partners, public and private, is encouraged. Proposals are not limited to those developed by Silver Jackets teams, although collaboration with the Silver Jackets team is recommended for states with such teams.
- **Proposals should seek to reduce flood risk through nonstructural means.** Typically, proposals will seek to reduce human exposure or vulnerability to a flood hazard without altering the nature or extent of that hazard (e.g., reduce consequences). Nonstructural measures promote solutions that reduce flood consequences, as opposed to solely engineered solutions that reduce flood hazards. Natural and nature-based approaches are encouraged when consistent with the state of understanding and uncertainty regarding their flood risk management benefits and may be submitted when they promote nonstructural solutions. Proposals that illustrate innovation through nonstructural flood risk management are encouraged, particularly if they illustrate innovation in evaluating nonstructural benefits, including non-monetary benefits (note that the use of alternative procedures and consideration of new benefit categories, including procedures to estimate them, require advance approval from HQUSACE (CECW-P).) Proposals that increase risk, or transfer risk to another party or into the future will not be considered. Proposals utilizing USACE funds for construction or intended to culminate in Corps-funded construction will not be considered. Descriptions of various nonstructural measures are available on the [USACE National Nonstructural Committee's website](#), including both physical measures such as elevation, relocation, buyout/acquisition, and dry/wet floodproofing, as well as nonphysical measures such as flood warning systems, floodplain mapping (as a tool supporting planning and/or management), flood emergency preparedness plans, land use regulation/zoning, evacuation plans, and risk communication (as a vehicle for reducing consequences.) In accordance with USACE Planning Bulletin (PB 2016-01), berms, floodwalls, and other similar structures are considered structural measures and must be treated as such.

- **All proposals must include or enable flood risk management action.** It is not required that resulting flood risk reduction be measured in terms of dollars, but risk reduction outcomes should be communicated clearly. Activities should stem from a life-cycle approach to flood risk management: prepare, respond, recover, and mitigate, with consideration of increased resiliency. Data collection (where appropriate as a small portion of overall requested funding), modeling, and mapping activities should be explicitly linked to resulting use by proposed partners for management purposes; similarly, risk communication efforts should be linked to resulting changed behavior.
- **Proposals must describe work capable of being completed within 12-18 months from initiation; a 12-month timeline is preferred.**
- **An average proposal requests approximately \$100,000 in FPMS funding support or less, and the vast majority of proposals request \$150,000 or less.** The submitter will be asked to provide additional justification for a proposal requesting \$150,000 or more, and may be asked to re-scope (reduce) proposals requesting \$200,000 or more.
- **Proposals must be entered into a template** (see separate .pdf) to streamline preparation and review.
- **Proposals must be appropriately coordinated with anticipated partners:**
 - Because proposed efforts are to be executed collaboratively with partners who are also devoting resources (including work-in-kind) to the effort, coordination with those partners is required prior to submitting a proposal, with the point of contact and date coordinated entered into the proposal template.
 - Proposals must attach support documentation (email, letter, or optional partner support template) from one partner who will be engaged in collaborative execution. Support documentation must be from the State lead of the Silver Jackets team for a Silver Jackets team's submission; it should be from a non-Federal governmental partner if not a Silver Jackets team's submission. The partner should specify, preferably in their own words:
 - (a) how the proposal helps achieve Tribal, State or community goals in reducing flood risk,
 - (b) the role the Tribal, State or partner anticipates taking in the conduct of the proposed effort, and
 - (c) the Tribe's, State or partner's ongoing commitment to long-term outcomes, if the proposal is selected.
- Support documentation from additional partners is accepted but not required.
- **Proposals must be appropriately coordinated within USACE:**
 - Proposals must first be coordinated within the District and with the District FPMS Program Manager (PM) to receive consideration. Proposals entailing dams and/or levees must be coordinated with District dam and/or levee safety personnel and with District Emergency Management personnel. Proposals that include support from the National Nonstructural Committee must be coordinated with the committee chairperson.
 - Coordination with appropriate Communities of Practice is advisable, particularly for proposals entailing innovative approaches (e.g., Climate Preparedness and Resilience; Conflict Resolution and Public Participation; Environmental; Geospatial; Hydrology, Hydraulics and Coastal (HHC); Tribal Nations; National Nonstructural Committee; etc.) Proposals entailing flood mapping must conform with EC 1110-2-6075, published 1 October 2020, and with its supporting Flood Inundation Mapping Standard Operating Procedure, prepared by the Geospatial and HHC Communities of Practice (and preferably with supporting data and modeling enabling acceptance by the Federal Emergency Management Agency at its option.)
 - Under unusual circumstances where contracting or any substantial data collection to be funded via FPMS is being considered, early coordination through the FPMS chain to include Headquarters, and in advance of developing and submitting a proposal, is strongly recommended in order to ensure aligned understanding of whether that activity conforms with the FPMS program's focus on providing Corps of Engineers' technical and planning expertise to non-federal governments within its resource constraints.
 - Division FPMS PMs should coordinate with Division FRM Business Line Managers, Division FRM PMs, and Division Silver Jackets PMs, and consider the proposal both for acceptability within the FPMS program and capacity to undertake and manage the proposed effort.
- **Proposals (templates and attachments included in a single .pdf) must be provided to the Division for review by Wednesday, March 31, 2020 by uploading to SharePoint, and in the manner requested by the Division FPMS PM if different. District FPMS PMs may require earlier submission for District review purposes. Provide final proposals to the following SharePoint site by Friday, April 30, 2021: <https://team.usace.army.mil/sites/IWR/PDT/sj/FY22%20Interagency%20NS%20Proposals/>**

- An Interagency Nonstructural Proposals Submission Checklist is included as Enclosure 1.

Proposal Selection Criteria:

- Proposal selection criteria are listed below. Guidelines for evaluating proposals are included in Enclosure 2.
 1. Directly protects life safety, reduces or prevents increases in flood risk, and/or increases resiliency (the ability to anticipate, prepare for, and adapt to changing conditions and withstand, respond to, and recover rapidly from disruptions). For example, reduces future flood consequences (including reduced exposure or vulnerability), reduces future emergency response needs, or improves flood recovery time.
 2. Promotes shared responsibility for flood risk management by prompting actions by others in support of risk reduction, including by communicating flood risks. For example: provides better tools that, coupled with identified partner use, result in wiser decisions; or clearly enables or prompts action by others, such as partners implementing actions in a floodplain management plan or developing a floodplain management plan.
 3. Addresses priority in State or Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.
 4. Leverages partner resources, with emphasis on collaborative execution. Partners may include Tribal, Federal, State, local, and/or ongoing teams and task forces with a role in carrying out the proposed effort, thus helping achieve an interagency solution. Leveraged resources may include data/information, expertise, and funding.
 5. Additionally, proposals will be judged more favorably if they (a) improve environmental function; or (b) result in non-monetary social benefits (excluding life safety, resilience, or raising awareness, since those are reflected in other criteria.)
 6. Demonstrated execution of a submitter's previous efforts.

Resources:

- The USACE portion of selected efforts will be carried out using funds from the FPMS Program, authorized by Public Law 86-645, Section 206. [ER 1105-2-100](#) describes the program (page 3-18), including the nature of assistance and coordination, and provides examples of efforts appropriate for consideration of funding via FPMS (Appendix G Section V). The FPMS Program objective is to encourage prudent use of the Nation's flood plains for the benefit of the national economy and general welfare by supporting comprehensive flood plain management planning at all appropriate government levels. USACE may provide flood plain information and planning assistance to State, county, and city governments, federally recognized tribes, as well as other Federal agencies. Cost recovery applies for services provided to other Federal agencies and the private sector.
- The USACE National Nonstructural Committee (<http://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/CivilWorks/ProjectPlanning/nfpc.aspx>) is a resource and may be incorporated into proposals for educational activities, scoping, reviews, and collaboration on nonstructural assessments.
- Designated Public Involvement Specialists at USACE Districts (http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/Portals/70/docs/CPCX/PIS_Fact_Sheet.pdf) and the USACE Conflict Resolution & Public Participation Center of Expertise can serve as a resource and may provide advice and/or be incorporated into proposals for designing and implementing risk communication and collaborative processes as a means of increasing the likelihood of achieving flood risk reduction outcomes.
- Tips, cautions, and observations from previous proposal reviews are provided in Enclosure 3.

Proposal Selection and Funding:

- Proposals will be reviewed by an interdisciplinary committee. A schematic of the planned proposal review process is included as Enclosure 4.
- The committee's evaluation of proposals will be based primarily on information contained in the submission.
- Notification of selected proposals is anticipated by early July 2021 with initial funding available early October 2021. There should be no delay or interruption in study execution during any Continuing Resolution in FY22.
- For selected proposals, FY22 FPMS funds for FY22 work are expected to be provided from Headquarters to the MSC for further distribution to Districts at the project level, with multiple allocations as needed.

Advance coordination with the MSC FPMS PM must be completed to receive funds (CCS 251, Program Activity Code 0002, unique project-level AMSCO, projected budget needs for select time periods.) If under Continuing Resolution (CR), the amount to be obligated through the end of the CR should be coordinated with the MSC FPMS PM. Subsequent MSC requests can be made upon coordination with the FPMS Program Manager at HQUSACE. Any remaining FY22 needs will be allocated upon resolution of FY22 appropriations.

- At the time of initial FY22 funding identification (early July 2021), proposals from Districts with ongoing interagency efforts with significant unscheduled unexecuted funding may be deferred for later consideration, as funding permits, until after those earlier efforts show significant progress.
- If funds identified for a single District exceed 15% of the available national budget for interagency nonstructural efforts, some proposals may be deferred after discussion with the Division.

Execution and Reporting Requirements:

- Districts and Divisions shall manage execution in accordance with their typical procedures, including for development of Scope of Work and/or Project Management Plans. Funds shall be expended in the fiscal year provided to the maximum extent possible, and Districts shall communicate promptly to MSC FPMS PMs regarding significant delays or obstacles to execution. Any excess funds shall be returned promptly to Headquarters at project completion.
- Interim Reviews will occur regularly (approximately semi-annually). USACE leads will be asked to document and present information regarding schedules and expenditures, partner roles and resources, and anticipated outcomes.
- Close-out documentation is required at effort completion: filling in a template to document assistance provided and outcomes achieved. A one-page poster may be requested for use in workshop and other presentation settings.
- Execution and reporting needs, including semi-annual updates, close-out documentation, and poster development, should be included in the proposal's funding request as part of the overall effort's anticipated cost.

Enclosure 1: Interagency Nonstructural Proposal Checklist

Using this optional checklist can help avoid major issues associated with proposal submissions. References to the proposal template's specific sections are provided in italics where applicable.

Have you:

1. Described the USACE scope of work to support the requested funds (*Section 7**)?
2. Described partner roles and who will take what action (*Sections 6A, 7**)?
3. Described proposed work that is:
 - a. Interagency (at least two governmental partners beyond USACE will collaboratively execute)?
 - b. Nonstructural (seeks to promote nonstructural approaches to managing flood risk that would affect flood consequences rather than the flood hazard)?
4. Provided existing Hazard Mitigation Plan text and citation, where applicable (*Section 6C**)?
5. Coordinated with all involved parties?
 - a. Obtained documentation from a non-Federal governmental entity that will benefit from the proposed work? (Must be from the State lead of a Silver Jackets team if the proposal is submitted by that team.) (*Section 10**)
 - b. Coordinated with all partners listed in the proposal that will collaboratively execute? (*Section 7**)
 - c. Engaged others at all levels of government (Federal, State, Local) for collaborative execution, or described why that was not appropriate (*Section 11**)?
 - d. Coordinated with all affected/interested USACE programs, at the District and MSC (*Section 10**)?
6. Combined supporting documentation and proposal form into one PDF?
 - a. Avoided portfolios or re-scanned versions of the template?
 - b. Used appropriate naming convention (e.g., LRE_Muskegon_Flood_Warning)?

** Refers to the section of the FY22 FPMS Interagency Nonstructural Flood Risk Management Proposal Template*

Enclosure 2: Guidelines for Evaluating Proposals

1. Directly protects life safety, reduces or prevents increases in flood risk, and/or increases resiliency.

5=Proposed effort will result in outstanding achievement of this criterion; upon completion, at least one effect on reducing/managing flood risk, increasing life safety, or increasing resiliency is direct, specific, and quantifiable

Example: the proposed coordinated multi-city mass evacuation planning of this densely populated high-risk region will reduce the loss of life during major flood events.

4=Proposed effort will likely achieve criterion pending post-effort action by partners

3=Proposed effort may achieve criterion pending post-effort action by partners

2=Proposed effort is unlikely to achieve criterion

1=Proposed effort will not achieve criterion

2. Promotes shared responsibility for flood risk management by prompting actions by others in support of risk reduction, including by communicating flood risks.

5=Proposed effort will result in outstanding achievement of this criterion; upon completion, achieves at least one specific flood risk action by an identified actor (e.g., the community)

Example: the community is committed to holding a town hall to discuss the new flood risk information, updating its floodplain zoning, and developing reverse 9-1-1 capability to provide tailored alerts to business and residents at pre-determined flood level triggers.

4=Proposed effort will likely achieve criterion pending post-effort action by partners

3=Proposed effort may achieve criterion pending post-effort action by partners

2=Proposed effort is unlikely to achieve criterion

1=Proposed effort will not achieve criterion

3. Addresses priority in State or Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

3=Proposal identifies why the proposed effort is a state or local priority and specifies how the proposed effort supports, augments, or implements an existing state or local hazard mitigation plan, with specific reference to the relevant plan.

0=Proposal does not include information indicating that effort will meet this criterion

4. Leverages partner resources, with emphasis on collaborative execution.

5=Proposed effort will result in outstanding achievement of this criterion; multiple appropriate other Federal, State, and local partners, and tribal and other partners where relevant, have significant roles in collaborative execution of the proposed effort and thus significant contributions (monetary or in-kind) in relation to USACE funding request; proposed effort considers partners at each level of government (e.g., local, State, Federal) as appropriate.

4=Proposed effort will likely achieve criterion; multiple appropriate partners are identified with resources and some partners have significant roles specified for carrying out the proposed effort, but with less significant contribution to collaborative execution in relation to USACE funding request

3=Proposed effort may achieve criterion; most appropriate partners are identified, but role or contribution to collaborative execution is minor or unclear or partner contributions are primarily in advance of collaborative execution

2=Proposed effort is unlikely to achieve criterion; proposed effort appears to be largely USACE performance of work with minimal partner involvement

1=Proposed effort will not achieve criterion; proposed effort does not appear to be interagency

5. (Optional with different weighting) Proposal either improves environmental function or results in non-monetary social benefits (excluding life safety, resilience, or raising awareness).

1=Proposal demonstrates achievement of at least one element of this criterion

0=Proposal does not demonstrate achievement of either element of this criterion

- 6. Demonstrated execution of a submitter's previous efforts.** By March 31, 2020, the submitter's previously-initiated interagency nonstructural efforts conform with the following:
- a. 100% of funds provided FY19 and earlier are expended (zero unexpended balance);
 - b. at least 75% of funds provided FY20 are expended;
 - c. at least 50% of initially-identified FY21 2nd quarter funding needs, which were identified at the start of FY21, are expended*; and
 - d. efforts with a zero balance reflect a completion date (actual) and outcomes achieved, as documented via the "closeout" template.

Exceptions may be considered for unusual circumstances coordinated with the MSC during the first two quarters of FY21, when consistent with demonstrated execution and any other exceptions nationwide.

0=Demonstrated execution

-1=Penalty (subtraction) for lack of demonstrated execution

Enclosure 3: Tips, Cautions, and Observations from Previous Proposal Reviews

Note: An example proposal, selected from FY19 submissions, is provided for consideration at <https://team.usace.army.mil/sites/IWR/PDT/sj/FY20%20Interagency%20NS%20Proposals/>

Tips and Cautions

- **Tip:** Identify initial partners and jointly consider who else could add value. Include at least two governmental partners beyond USACE; consider all levels of government (Federal, State, local; Tribal and regional if applicable), and consider explaining omissions as appropriate. Identify each partner's planned task(s), suited to its expertise and authorities, and how USACE planned tasks are carried out in conjunction with those partners. As warranted by size and scope of proposed effort, a best practice is to develop a spreadsheet of planned tasks across all partners with associated budget.
- **Tip:** Consider what actions will change flood risk. Who will take that action? What will they do? How will that action affect flood risk? Often action is required beyond what USACE can offer; engage key partners, to include those with decision authority, in up-front scoping with a view to achieving expanded outcomes.
- **Tip:** address internal and external schedule and budget expectations. Identify partner timing and schedule/budget accordingly. Budget for internal USACE reporting requirements, including semi-annual updates and final close-out documentation. Plan to request USACE funding under any continuing resolution and to execute USACE funds received during the fiscal year obtained (funds may be requested in up to two fiscal years.)
- **Tip:** For proposal development, consider limiting partner support documentation to one or two that use their own words in a way that enhances understanding of the proposal and the partner's role.
- **Tip:** Since not all proposals can be funded, remain mindful of time spent developing proposal: while the nature of the proposal may make it appropriate for USACE staff to use Silver Jackets team coordination funding or FPMS unit funding for proposal development, caveats on such use include the overall budgets for those funding sources, appropriate balance within those overall budgets, and being able to demonstrate appropriate achievements for those overall budgets consistent with their intended purpose.
- **Caution:** Scrutinize any contracting proposed for funding by USACE. Available USACE FPMS funds support making USACE technical services and planning guidance and assistance available within personnel and funding capabilities; USACE contracts using FPMS funds are atypical. Proposals should clearly identify any proposed USACE contracting, explain why such work cannot be accomplished by USACE personnel or partners, and state why a contract is necessary to the overall effort.
- **Caution:** Limit proposed USACE data collection. USACE should use available data from all sources whenever practical, although some small (overall and relatively) ancillary data collection may support provision of appropriate USACE services. Proposals should clearly identify any proposed data collection, explain why existing information is insufficient for the intended purpose, whether the planned data collection is discrete or ongoing (such as for stream gaging), what size geographic area is being covered, and how much of the USACE cost is data collection versus data processing.

- Additional tips and cautions, presented in a 6 February 2020 overview of the FY21 FPMS Interagency Nonstructural Call for Proposals, are available at <https://planning.erdc.dren.mil/toolbox/resources.cfm?id=0&WId=514&Option=Planning%20Webinars>

Observations from Previous Proposal Reviews

1. Directly protects life safety, reduces or prevents increases in loss of property, and/or increases resiliency.
 - Proposals describing how partners were committed to permanently removing existing structures from harm's way tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals that described how community action (or commitment to action) was tied to specific reduction in flood risk tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals that used multiple partners' programs in combination to achieve a greater (or more likely) reduction in flood risk or flood-related expenditures tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Unique proposals with outcomes suitable for wider application and a clear means for achieving that wider application tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals that described how outcomes could reduce flood risk, but without connection to the actors needed to make it happen, tended to be rated less favorably.
2. Promotes shared responsibility for flood risk management by prompting actions by others in support of flood risk reduction.
 - Proposals that identified *who* were engaged and willing partners – often (but not always) local communities eager for results that they could use in the short-term for concrete actions – tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals that described *how* locals would be involved in outcomes, with specific anticipated actions by identified partners as opposed to general possible actions that might be taken, tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals that recognized appropriate roles of other agencies, and described how those agencies would fulfill those roles in conjunction with the role to be undertaken by USACE with the requested funding, tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals that described how more information-oriented outcomes would be communicated to those capable of taking subsequent action (including outreach to members of the public where appropriate) tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals where all work was to be performed by USACE, without any apparent commitment or tasks by others, tended to be rated less favorably.
3. Leverages partner resources and is completed in collaboration with partners (note all: Tribal, Federal, State, Local, and/or ongoing teams and task forces).
 - Proposals that described specific partner roles/tasks *in conducting the effort* tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals with significant partner contributions *to the conduct of the effort* (including but not limited to funding) tended to be rated more favorably.
 - Proposals seeking to transfer USACE funds to others as the means of achieving partnerships tended to be rated less favorably, particularly if the entirety of the requested USACE funding was proposed to be transferred to others such that little or no substantive USACE role in conducting the effort remained.
 - Proposals seeking to transfer USACE funds to other Federal agencies raised questions, and, barring specific unique circumstances, tended to be rated less favorably.
 - Proposals in which partners provided the \$4,000 fee for NOAA's contractor so that flood maps could be uploaded to NOAA's AHPS website tended to be rated more highly (USACE funds are not provided for this purpose.).
 - Proposals with no apparent partners tended to be rated less favorably.

Enclosure 4: Schematic of Planned Proposal Review Process

