

Dear APPLICANT:

Thank you for your Letter of Intent (LOI) submission to the NIHHS IRA FY24 NOFO competition. We review LOIs to determine responsiveness to the program priorities and specifics of the call outlined in the [competition information sheet](#) and [NOFO document](#).

We appreciate the time and effort that goes into coordinating and writing a proposal, so we do not want to encourage an unrealistic number of proposals given the number of LOIs received this year as well as our expectations of the budget we will be working with. We expect vigorous competition for limited funding.

Based on your LOI, our recommendation is:

### RECOMMENDATION

-----

You may interpret this recommendation as follows:

#### ENCOURAGED

We encourage you to develop a full proposal for this competition. Your LOI was deemed responsive to the competition as written. You may still find the general reminders below helpful.

#### MAYBE

While your LOI is generally relevant to the announcement, it requires some modification(s) to be fully responsive to the requirements and priorities identified. While we do not provide tailored suggestions per LOI, we encourage you to consider the following aggregated suggestions in response to the LOIs.

#### DISCOURAGED

We discourage you from developing a full proposal for this competition. Though we enjoyed reading your LOI, it may not be the best fit for this particular opportunity as articulated in the NOFO and information sheet. You may review the reminders below, which speak to some of the reasons we did not find some of the LOIs we received to be responsive to the call. We thank you for your interest and LOI submission.

-----

Regardless of our above response to you, we are providing the following general reminders to all applicants regarding the program priorities and competition goals:

1. Some LOIs appeared to focus exclusively or primarily on a few communities or a region of the U.S., but applicants to this competition are encouraged to consider reaching many different communities nationally rather than making the benefits of the center available to a very limited region or group. **At least 10 communities must be served per year.**
2. Some LOIs read as applied research proposals that had been repurposed for the call - where the focus was primarily on research outcomes rather than supporting communities in building resilience to heat based on their needs. Applicants are encouraged to achieve applied research goals *on the way to* serving community needs, particularly supporting **measurable outcomes** in

communities. For example, databases, maps, and indices are important process outcomes, but it should be clear how such outcomes may be used to improve resilience to heat.

3. Some LOIs had very thoughtful community engagement methods but did not provide technical details, for example, in the case of Center 1 some LOIs did not indicate what observational approaches they would help communities with or how they would manage collected data.
4. While linkages between Centers 1 and 2 are encouraged, since it is not known which applications will be selected for funding, it would be prudent not to make detailed assumptions about the function or outputs of the other center beyond the details specified in the Information Sheet.
5. LOIs that focus on investigating only one single approach to mitigating heat risk are discouraged. It is anticipated that communities will need technical assistance understanding how to choose among many options, so the services of the centers should not be too limited. It is acceptable, however, to delineate a specific subset of services the centers will provide.
6. LOIs that built upon prior successes and drew upon many collaborative partnerships to build community resilience are encouraged - particularly if they detailed how they would collaborate with communities to develop solutions, rather than proposing a one-size-fits-all solution and turning it over to communities.
7. LOIs that addressed the challenges of many different kinds of communities in taking action to mitigate heat risk - showing that careful thought had been put into some of the existing barriers - are encouraged.
8. Some LOIs lacked detail on outcomes and methods, focusing most of their text instead on describing the problem or the organizations involved. While those components are important, it is hard to evaluate an LOI that does not articulate a clear approach and anticipated community benefits. While some of this will come from community science engagement, proposals should demonstrate that applicants already have specific working ideas from prior engagement.
9. A [Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQ\)](#) document is being maintained and regularly updated on the competition web page on the Climate Program Office website.
- 10.

Thank you again for your LOI. Full applications must be received by **5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, October 16th, 2023. Applications received after this date and time will not be considered for funding.**

Applications must be submitted via <http://www.grants.gov>. For applications submitted through grants.gov, the basis for determining timeliness is the receipt notice issued by grants.gov, which includes the date and time received. If an applicant does not have Internet access, CPO [Grants Manager Diane Brown](#) should be contacted by mail at NOAA Climate Program Office per the instructions in the NOFO. Proposals may NOT be submitted by **email or fax**. We suggest that you submit your proposal at least two days before the deadline to assure that there are no computer outages, glitches, last minute storms, etc. It is not uncommon that we have to turn down proposals thought to have been sent in time, but that unbeknownst to the sender, had not been submitted in the correct manner.

Sincerely,

Hunter Jones  
NIHHIS Program Manager