



Multimedia State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) FY2009 Solicitation

May 2009

Office of Compliance
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (MC 2224-A)
Washington, D.C. 20460

<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/state/grants/stag/index.html>

FEDERAL AGENCY NAME: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA), Office of Compliance (OC)

FUNDING OPPORTUNITY TITLE: FY 09 Multi-Media Grant Program Solicitation Notice

ANNOUNCEMENT TYPE: Request for Proposals – Initial Announcement

FUNDING OPPORTUNITY NUMBER: EPA-OECA-NPMAS-09-001

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE (CFDA) NO: 66.709 – Multi-media Capacity Building Grants for States and Tribes

DATES: The closing date and time for proposal submissions, regardless of mode of submission, is (July 13, 2009, 4:00 p.m. EST). All hard copies of application packages must be received by (EPA contact) by (July 13, 2009), 4:00 p.m. EST in order to be considered for funding. Electronic submissions must be addressed to **MultimediaCapacity_Grants@epa.gov** and include the "Announcement title or # - [name of applicant]" in the subject line and be received by (July 13, 2009), 4:00 p.m., EST in order to be considered for funding. Applications received after the closing date will not be considered for funding. See Section IV for further submission information.

Questions must be submitted in writing via e-mail and must be received by the Agency Contact in Section VII before 5:00 PM EDT, June 12, 2009. Written responses will be posted on EPA's website at <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/state/grants/stag/index.html>.

SUMMARY: The Office of Compliance (OC), within EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA), is soliciting proposals for states and tribes to strengthen their ability to address environmental and public health threats, while furthering the art and science of environmental compliance. Projects under this Solicitation Notice will be used to build and expand the capacity and ability of the states and tribes to operate their environmental compliance and enforcement program. These funds cannot be used for the actual implementation of the compliance program. This year, EPA is soliciting proposals for the following focus areas: (1) Permit Compliance System (PCS) Modernization and ICIS-NPDES, (2) Funding Indian Country Compliance Assurance Circuit Riders, (3) Improving Flow of State Data to the Air Facility System (AFS), (4) State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training and (5) Demonstration of Better Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring Activities. EPA anticipates that approximately \$1.84 million will be available under this announcement, depending on Agency funding levels and other applicable considerations. The federal portion for each assistant agreement is anticipated to range between \$50,000 and \$200,000.

I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Statutory Authority

As a threshold determination, to be selected for funding, a project must consist of activities within the statutory terms of these EPA grant authorities: CAA §103(b)(3), CWA §104(b)(3), SDWA §1442(a)&(c), RCRA §8001, TSCA §10, FIFRA §20, and MPRSA §203. Most of these statutes authorize grants for the following activities: “research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys and studies.” These activities relate generally to the gathering or transferring of information or advancing the state of knowledge. Grant proposals must emphasize this “learning” concept, as opposed to “fixing” an environmental problem via a well-established method. For example, a proposal to install an established software program to upgrade a computer system would not in itself, fall within the statutory terms “research, studies,” etc. On the other hand, the statutory term “demonstration” can encompass the first instance of the application of a pollution control technique, or an innovative application of a previously used method. Similarly, the application of established practices may qualify when they are part of a broader project which qualifies under the term “research.” However, EPA cannot fund demonstration projects year after year for an indefinite period of time. Funding priorities must be allowable under 66.709 (Capacity Building Grants and Cooperative Agreements for States and Tribes) of the CFDA. Lastly, federal funds cannot generally be used to provide a match or cost-share for other federal projects.

B. Focus Areas open for pre-proposals under this solicitation

1. Permit Compliance System Modernization (PCS) and ICIS-NPDES

a. Background:

In FY2009, OECA will continue its effort in the phased implementation of the Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS). ICIS will be the single source for consolidated enforcement, compliance, and permit data for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. This new information management system will reduce burden and duplication by providing the national source of data for the NPMAS permitting and enforcement program, will improve public access to data, support the development of risk reduction strategies, and will provide EPA regions and states with a modernized system to meet their NPDES program management needs.

The Permit Compliance System (PCS), the NPDES legacy system and predecessor to ICIS, has little or no data for major new NPDES program requirements, such as Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO), Storm Water, and Combined Sewer (CSO) or Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO). The modernized ICIS system addresses these serious data gaps, provides for easy use of and access to the system, utilizes current information technology, supports the Agency's initiative for data integration, and promotes the exchange of data with our state partners via the National Environmental Information Exchange Network and the Agency's Central Data Exchange (CDX). (Go to www.epa.gov/exchangenetwork/grants/index.html about EPA's Office of Environmental Information's grant programs for implementation of data systems.)

The development of the final phase of the PCS modernization, the “batch” component of ICIS will include the implementation of the remaining non-direct entry user states (XML batch submissions of data via the CDX-portal and the National Environmental Information Exchange Network). The batch states can be grouped into two categories: Hybrid and Full Batch states.

- Hybrid states are those states that will electronically transfer (batch) discharge monitoring report (DMR) data from a state system to ICIS and will enter all of the non-DMR NPDES data into ICIS via the ICIS web screens. Most hybrid states are expected to use ICIS to directly manage their NPDES permitting and enforcement program.
- Full Batch states have their own information system to manage the NPDES program and will electronically transfer (batch) all of their NPDES data from their state system to ICIS.

The batch component of the system will be developed and implemented in three major releases:

1. Development and implementation of the XML data flow for hybrid states electronically submitting only their DMR data to ICIS. In FY2008, 5 hybrid states were put into production and several more states are expected in FY2009. Hybrid states are now directly entering all NPDES data into ICIS-NPDES, except for DMR data, which will be electronically transferred (batch) to ICIS-NPDES. Currently, twenty-eight (28) states now use ICIS-NPDES.
2. Development and implementation of NetDMR submissions from facilities electronically reporting DMR data directly to ICIS-NPDES. The first version of the NetDMR tool can only be used by those facilities that reside in states that have had their data migrated from PCS to ICIS-NPDES. The NetDMR tool is being developed pursuant to an Exchange Network grant managed by Texas with the participation of 11 other states, OEI and OECA. The NetDMR tool is scheduled to be implemented in ICIS-NPDES in spring 2009.
3. Development and implementation of the XML data flow for full batch states electronically submitting all of their NPDES data to ICIS. This means that the data migration from PCS to ICIS-NPDES for the full batch states would be complete, and those states would be able to flow all of their NPDES data electronically into ICIS-NPDES.

b: Project Approach:

The general purpose of FY2009 grant funding is to support state and tribal efforts to obtain technical assistance to ensure and enhance the continued flow of NPDES data from states and tribes to ICIS. More specifically, grant funding will support (1) clean-up and migration of data from legacy PCS to ICIS, data cleanup of migrated data within ICIS, feasibility studies and/or requirements analyses for required data entry into ICIS,

(2) pilot studies of state/tribal processes for data collection and entering of required data into ICIS, especially for new NPDES program areas such as CAFOs and/or (3) feasibility studies and/or requirements analyses for states adoption of the NetDMR tool.

Examples of state and tribal activities to be covered include:

1. Technical assistance to support migration and conversion of state and Indian country data from legacy PCS to the new ICIS, or for data clean-up to support the conversion and migration of state and Indian country data from legacy PCS to the ICIS

The functionality and the structure of the modernized system will be significantly different from that of the legacy PCS system. Therefore, the migration and conversion of the PCS legacy data to the modernized system, ICIS, will require a substantial amount of work to ensure that data migration is accurate, complete and in the right structure. Migration activities will include: preparing the data for migration to ICIS, building specialized PCS data retrievals, and reviewing data error logs from the migration process. For example, the structure and data for handling general permits in legacy PCS is not the same as ICIS. The general permit data in legacy PCS will have to be converted to correspond with the new general permit data requirements of ICIS and then migrated to the structure of the modernized system. Additional details on the ICIS data migration process and activities can be found in the "ICIS-NPDES Data Migration Plan," dated September 8, 2004, and the "ICIS-NPDES Data Migration Guidance Document." You may request an electronic copy of these documents by contacting Alison Kittle at (kittle.alison@epa.gov).

A critical part of converting and migrating data from legacy PCS to ICIS is the data clean up. This includes preparing for migration, identifying data errors generated in the data migration process, and correcting data in ICIS after the migration is completed. The clean-up effort will involve analyzing identified data errors (including missing data), determining how to best correct the errors, and correcting the data in legacy PCS and ICIS. More detailed information on ICIS data migration clean-up activities can be found in the document "PCS Data Clean-up List." You may request an electronic copy of this document by contacting Alison Kittle at (kittle.alison@epa.gov).

2. Feasibility study/requirements analysis to support states and tribes in considering options and pros/cons of undertaking a transition to the full or direct use of ICIS;

ICIS will support state, tribal and EPA requirements for effective management of the NPDES program. The modernized system contains more comprehensive data for existing (e.g., pretreatment) and new (i.e., CAFO, SSO, CSO, and Storm Water) NPDES program areas and, therefore, supports the ability to more effectively identify and target areas with the most significant environmental and human health risk. As a result of using new technology and a desk-top, web-based approach, all users of the system will have easy access allowing improved

data retrieval and analysis. States and tribes may decide to use ICIS as their primary system for managing their day-to-day NPDES program activities. To determine if the modernized system would meet most or all of their needs, an analysis of ICIS functionality and data requirements may need to be conducted.

3. Activities to support the development of a requirements analysis for complete entry of wet weather and minor facility NPDES data into ICIS and/or Technical assistance to support the completion of required data entry into ICIS of NPDES wet weather facilities (i.e., CAFO, Storm Water, SSO, and CSO) and Minor facilities;

ICIS data entry requirements for wet weather and minor facilities for some states or tribes may be resource intensive. A requirements analysis for entering the full amount of minor facility and wet weather data for a state or tribe can be performed to determine the best approach for collecting and for entering the data. A requirements analysis would also evaluate the steps necessary for data quality assurance checks, reconciliation of legacy PCS, state and tribal data, and data entry.

Currently in legacy PCS, only a limited amount of data is stored for wet weather facilities, and PCS does not have sufficient capabilities to allow states to manage their wet weather programs. After an initial entry of basic information on wet weather facilities, states will have more functionality to manage their wet weather programs with ICIS. Currently in legacy PCS, only a limited amount of data is required for minor facilities. In ICIS more data will be required to better track the compliance status and environmental impact of minor facilities. For example, DMR data will be required for some minor facilities. Before DMR data can be entered into the system, other required data (i.e. facility information, outfall data, and limit data) will also need to be entered into PCS.

States and tribes can begin to prepare for the entry of the wet weather data and/or minor data in ICIS by determining where, and in what format, the data resides in their state or tribe; and for batch states obtaining the required wet weather and minor facility data in preparation for the ICIS XML schema mapping. States and tribes may consider several alternatives for this work, such as doing some of the initial data entry in PCS (for those states that have not yet migrated to ICIS), doing some of initial data entry directly into ICIS (for those states that have migrated to ICIS), or batching some or all of the data from their state system to ICIS (for those states that have migrated to ICIS).

4. Activities to support pilot studies of the state and tribal process for collecting and entering the required NPDES data into ICIS for wet weather (CAFO, Storm Water, SSO, CSO sectors), and minor facilities.

In order for EPA and states to achieve the full benefits of ICIS for the wet weather and minor facility program areas, some states may need to analyze and revise their data collection and data entry practices associated with these program areas (as indicated in sections 4 and 5 above). After the analysis is completed, states and tribes may then need to conduct pilot studies to test out these new procedures. For example, a state may conduct a pilot study of its new or revised process for the collection and flow of minor and wet weather data into ICIS focusing on a particular set of facilities (e.g., those discharging to impaired water bodies) or focusing on a particular family of data for all facilities (e.g., facility and permit data for all CAFO). Pilot studies should help states and tribes develop short and long-term plans (i.e., work plans, performance partnership agreements) for completing the work required for the collection and entry of the all the required minor and wet weather facility data into ICIS.

5. Activities to support the development of a feasibility study/requirements analysis to assist states and tribes in evaluating options for and pros/cons of adopting and using the EPA/State NetDMR tool, and the development of outreach and marketing material for the state's use in promoting the use of NetDMR to their regulated community.

NetDMR is a web-based software tool that allows facilities to report discharge monitoring reports electronically into ICIS-NPDES. In addition, the tool is available for state and tribal use in EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) environment or a State-hosted environment. The use of the NetDMR tool can result in considerable savings to states and tribes because it provides for electronic submission of DMR data to EPA or the state and, therefore, reduces the amount of information that is currently being manually entered by state staff.

In order to fully take advantage of their use of the tool, states and tribes may need to evaluate the benefits of their using NetDMR versus developing a state built electronic reporting system. The development of a feasibility study/requirement analysis would assist the states and tribes in making informed decisions on how to go forward with implementing a DMR electronic reporting system. The feasibility study/requirement analysis could include; (1) analysis of the costs and benefits to the state of switching from an existing state electronic reporting systems to NetDMR (particularly for states that have existing systems that work with PCS and not with ICIS-NPDES), and from that analysis a plan for making the move from a state electronic reporting system to NetDMR, (2) analysis of the benefit to states/tribes of implementing a NetDMR state hosted tool, or utilizing the EPA's nationally-hosted tool, (3) analysis and review of their state business processes to determine the need for developing or revising those processes for NetDMR, (4) analysis of the benefits to states/tribes developing a new state DMR electronic reporting system versus using the already developed NetDMR tool, and (5) analysis of opportunities for marketing and outreach to their regulated community.

Secondly, for those states currently committed to adopting NetDMR, activities to support development of marketing and outreach materials that would increase the visibility (and user acceptance) of NetDMR by the states' regulated community could be supported by this grant.

c: Linkage with EPA's Strategic Plan and Expected Outputs/Outcomes

This project relates to USEPA Strategic Plan goals and objectives:

- Goal 5.1: Improve Compliance

Specifically, the PCS modernization efforts will result in the following outcomes and outputs:

Outputs:

- A modernized and improved information system that contains more accurate, timely and complete information, and addresses today's NPDES program requirements, especially wet weather sources.
- An easier to use system (e.g. simple drop down lists with plain English names, replacing cryptic PCS codes).
- Easier for states to exchange data with EPA using the new system and the National Environmental Exchange Network.
- More accurate and complete knowledge of the universe of facilities.
- Migrated and converted state and Indian country data from PCS to ICIS.

Outcomes:

- More complete and accurate information about the NPDES program and water quality for the public.
- Improved ability of EPA and states to manage the NPDES permitting and enforcement program, which should improve compliance and thus improve water quality and public health.

2. Funding Indian Country Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Circuit Riders

a: Background:

In FY 2009, grant funding will improve the ability of facilities in Indian country to comply with applicable environmental laws and improve the ability of tribal environmental professionals to facilitate compliance. The grant recipient will employ a "circuit rider" who travels extensively to provide environmental compliance and technical assistance and training in at least one of the following three areas: (1) schools, (2) drinking water systems or (3) solid and hazardous waste management matters. The circuit rider will also provide environmental compliance and technical assistance to environmental compliance professionals employed by tribes to facilitate long-term compliance in at least one of the following three areas: (1) schools, (2) drinking water systems, and (3) solid or hazardous waste management matters. The circuit rider's goal is to provide information on how to operate, maintain, and manage schools, drinking water systems, or waste management operations in a safe and compliant manner rather than to

implement solutions. Due to limited resources, priority will go to proposals that will ensure that the circuit rider provides assistance and training to multiple tribes. The funds must be used for building the compliance capacity at particular facilities and the compliance assurance capacity of tribal governments. These funds cannot be used for the actual program implementation (*i.e.*, solid waste cleanup, construction costs, purchasing equipment related to waste handling, storing, or disposing of waste, operating a drinking water system or school, or conducting compliance inspections or developing enforcement actions).

b: Project Approach:

Expected components and results of the project include:

1. Improve compliance in at least one of the following three areas: (1) schools, (2) drinking water systems, or (3) waste management matters from the Circuit Rider providing:
 - professional on-site technical and compliance assistance to regulated facilities to improve compliance with applicable federal and/or tribal laws and regulations;
 - training to facility personnel through on-site and off-site compliance and technical assistance; and
 - assistance to facilities in acquiring financing to build, expand, upgrade systems to facilitate compliance with federal and/or tribal laws and regulations.
2. Improve the ability of tribal environmental professionals to provide compliance assistance in Indian country and increase compliance in at least one of the following three areas: (1) schools, (2) drinking water systems, or (3) waste management matters from the Circuit Rider providing:
 - training on applicable federal and/or tribal environmental laws and regulations;
 - training on how to provide compliance assistance to regulated facilities;
 - training on how compliance monitoring is used to assess compliance; and
 - training on the role of enforcement to ensure compliance with applicable federal and/or tribal environmental laws and regulations.
3. Improve communication and sharing of information from the Circuit Rider:
 - communicating and disseminating relevant and up to date federal and tribal regulatory information to tribes;
 - collecting and disseminating success stories and best practices to share with other tribes and EPA; responding to inquiries from facilities, consumers, governmental agencies, and others regarding compliance and technical matters
 - identifying opportunities to enhance the knowledge of tribal environmental

- attending appropriate conferences, meetings, workshops, and seminars on environmental compliance and enforcement to gather and disseminate information to tribes during compliance assistance visits, trainings, and meetings.

c: Linkage with EPA's Strategic Plan and Expected Outputs/Outcomes

The funding of a tribal circuit rider is linked to the EPA Strategic Plan in the following areas:

- Goal 5.1: Improve Compliance
- Goal 5.3: Build Tribal Capacity

The following are potential output and outcome measures:

Outputs:

- Increased number of schools, drinking water systems, or waste operations in Indian country receiving on-site and off-site compliance and technical assistance;
- Increased number of schools, drinking water systems, or waste operations in Indian country receiving on-site and off-site training on how to comply with federal and tribal environmental laws; and
- Increased number of tribal environmental professionals receiving training in how to provide compliance assistance to schools, drinking water systems, or waste operations.

Outcomes:

- Pounds of pollutants reduced, treated, or eliminated by facilities receiving compliance assistance;
- Percent of participating schools, drinking water systems, or waste operations receiving direct compliance assistance that increased their understanding of environmental requirements;
- Percent of participating schools, drinking water systems, or waste operations receiving direct compliance assistance that reduces, treats, or eliminates pollution;
- Percent of participating schools, drinking water systems, or waste operations receiving direct compliance assistance reporting that they improved environmental management practices, including compliance and best management practice changes; and
- Improved ability of tribal environmental professionals to provide compliance assistance and encourage schools, drinking water systems, or waste operations to meet their environmental obligations.

3. Improving Flow of State Data to the Airs Facility System (AFS)

a: Background:

In FY2009, OECA will continue its efforts to assist state, local, and tribal agencies in reporting air compliance and enforcement minimum data requirements (MDRs) in a more efficient and less burdensome manner. Over the past eight years, OECA has provided over \$2 million dollars in assistance to states and tribes for projects that seek to facilitate data reporting to Air Facility System (AFS). An example of a project approved in the past included a feasibility study to streamline the transmission of Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) identified in the Information Collection Request (ICR) for AFS [Docket ID Number OECA-2007-0380].

The AFS system contains compliance and enforcement data for stationary sources of air pollution regulated by the U.S. EPA, as well as tribal, state and local air pollution agencies. This information is used by the entire environmental regulatory community to track the compliance status of point sources with various programs regulated under the Clean Air Act (CAA). Required information is identified in the AFS ICR. Agencies can report to AFS via an online connection or through a batch file transfer from their own data management systems. Batch file transfers can be accomplished via state-owned conversion programs or facilitated by the use of the Universal Interface (UI), a software tool provided by U.S. EPA to state, local, and tribal agencies. The UI's successful use has significantly reduced reporting burden of the MDRs and has saved agencies the cost of maintaining conversion software. Twenty Two (22) agencies currently use the software, and several additional agencies are in the UI implementation process.

(Go to www.epa.gov/exchangenetwork/grants/index.html for information about EPA's Office of Environmental Information's grant programs for implementation of data systems.)

b: Project Approach:

FY2009 grant funding will continue to support state, local, and tribal feasibility studies and requirements analyses that seek to advance the practice of improving and streamlining the states and tribes reporting of data to AFS. Regardless of the methods used to report data to AFS, states and tribes are currently required by regulation to report specific data to the Agency. Improving and streamlining the states' and tribes' AFS data flow will support the implementation of the CAA enforcement and compliance program, and CAA stationary source reporting.

In addition, this solicitation requests proposals which will support training for states, local, and tribal agencies who manage AFS data. Successful programs will manage and provide scholarships to state and local personnel to attend EPA's AFS training sessions or other training available on AFS offered in multiple regional offices.

Due to limited resources, priority will go to proposals that demonstrate the capacity to have the greatest impact over a broad range of state and local agencies in the United

States. The projects may apply to: (1) The Study/Analysis of the Universal Interface, (2) Technical Assistance for the Improvement of AFS Data Flow, or (3) UI Training and Technical Assistance. Examples of state and tribal activities to be covered include:

- Scholarships for State, Local, and Tribal Staff and Management: OECA is interested in maximizing state, local and tribal participation in the annual AFS National Workshop and Training Event, as well as ad-hoc AFS training events. Since substantial work is needed to organize and coordinate the distribution of tuition and/or travel funding to the various state and local agencies, this type of project is limited to national multi-state organizations. State, local, and tribal agencies with the greatest need, based on lack of experienced staff and distance from the training locations, as well as quality and completeness of data contained in AFS, will be given priority access to the funds under this program. EPA will provide training dates and locations to the grantee(s) in order for them to coordinate and distribute the travel funds for EPA training. The grantee should provide a list of any additional training sources they will utilize that provide training on the usage of AFS that are consistent with current regulatory requirements and operations. Training sources and providers must be consistent with current regulatory requirements as well as AFS operations and techniques used by EPA.
- Study/Analysis of the Universal Interface (UI). Feasibility study/requirements analysis to support states and tribes in considering options and pros/cons of the full utilization of the Universal Interface.

States and tribes currently use a variety of methods for transmitting data from their state system to AFS. The UI is one of the methods that can be utilized to support the streamlined flow of air enforcement and compliance data from a state system to AFS. States and tribes can analyze the capabilities of the UI and evaluate the feasibility of the UI for streamlining and improving their reporting to AFS. A feasibility study/requirements analysis will allow the states or tribes to evaluate the UI's ability to assist them in meeting environmental reporting needs, outline the improvements to the states' system business and data flow processes, and determine the resource (time and funding) benefits to the states.

Existing users of the UI, if using a previous version of the product, could analyze and evaluate potential additional benefits of upgrading to the current UI version for states and tribes;

- Technical Assistance for the Improvement of AFS Data Flow. Technical assistance to support the feasibility study/requirements analysis for improving the state and tribal flow of MDR data and other environmental data to AFS. Review of data flow within an agency to improve data quality as outlined within the State Review Framework.

Enforcement actions (including High Priority Violator (HPV) data), compliance status, MDR, and optional reporting data are currently reported to AFS.

Providing the states and tribes the opportunity to perform analyses on improving data and business flow processes to more easily report data to AFS will support their management of the air enforcement and compliance program and improve data quality.

- Feasibility Study for System –Generated Compliance Status Values: Using existing MDR data, study the feasibility of a system generated compliance status for upload to AFS. A system generated compliance status record for separate air pollutants would result in a significant reduction of time and resources. A system generated compliance status record would also improve data accuracy. The feasibility study could be conducted using the UI software or other software chosen by the grant recipient.
- Feasibility Study for the Creation of Meta Data from Electronic Documents: Many agencies are accepting or planning to accept electronic documentation to satisfy required reporting under the CAA. The electronic reporting of Title V Annual Compliance Certifications, Quarterly Reports, notifications, Full and Partial Compliance Evaluation (FCE and PCE) reports, Stack Test results, Excess Emission Reports and other required recordkeeping will become a standard procedure in the not too distant future. Agencies interested in facilitating the reporting of summary compliance monitoring and enforcement data to AFS could incorporate key records into the structure of the required data of the electronic submittal, thereby resulting in the creation of AFS records. This study would allow the agency to review the electronic process and ascertain if their reporting requirements could be replicated through the electronic submittal process. A demonstration of this kind would provide a valuable process for reducing the hours of compiling and reporting data to AFS, as well as providing data available for sharing with other agencies.

c: Linkage with EPA’s Strategic Plan and Expected Outputs/Outcomes

This project is related to USEPA Strategic Plan goals and objectives:

- Goal 5.1: Improve Compliance

Specifically, the improvement of the flow of state data through the UI will result in the following outcomes and outputs:

Outputs:

- Streamlined and less burdensome process for reporting state enforcement and compliance air data into AFS;
- Cost savings for states that no longer need to maintain their own conversion software
- Customized reporting of state air enforcement and compliance stationary

Outcomes:

- More complete and accurate information on stationary source air enforcement and compliance programs.

4. State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training

a: Background:

In FY2009, grant funding for this focus area will support training projects that include performing training needs assessments/analyses followed by designing/selecting, delivering, and evaluating environmental enforcement training to state environmental enforcement personnel. Proposals must address training for state/multi-state personnel who conduct enforcement activities under Environmental Laws. Environmental enforcement training encompasses both “basic” (inspector training, negotiations training, regulatory media-specific training, etc.) as well as “advanced” training such as intensive media or sector specific workshops, symposiums, and learning exchange forums. An ideal training program reaches both inexperienced staff as well as seasoned enforcement staff. EPA recognizes the inherent differences among state enforcement programs and the challenges to achieving effective program results, and therefore expects to find a wide range of training program needs.

One element of the proposals will be an enforcement program training needs assessment and analysis which identifies current gaps in performance due to lack of knowledge, skills, and abilities of state enforcement staff. The needs assessment/analysis may also identify potential gaps due to staff attrition and/or retirement issues. The training needs assessment/analysis will target one or more environmental enforcement professionals (i.e. inspectors, case development managers, investigators, attorneys, etc.), in one or more regulatory media programs, and in one or more state jurisdictions. Where training needs have already been well defined, proposals should discuss the findings of the assessment/analysis mechanism.

Applicants may propose the development and/or delivery of one or more courses that would address the needs of State personnel in subject, delivery mechanisms and location. Due to limited resources, priority will go to proposals that will improve the capabilities of multiple states or across multiple media or statutes, proposals that are demonstrated to be mission critical to an individual state or media program, or proposals that demonstrate methodologies/techniques/courses that can be transferred to other states. In addition, EPA is particularly interested in proposals that are intended to address potential declines in program effectiveness due to loss of senior enforcement staff and that have a knowledge management component. The funds must be used for building the capacity and expertise of states to implement compliance assurance and enforcement programs. These funds cannot be used for the actual implementation of compliance monitoring and enforcement programs.

b: Project Approach:

In summary, EPA is soliciting proposals from states, state consortiums, or other multi-state associations who are familiar with, and/or who implement environmental enforcement programs, to improve or strengthen the ability of state environmental professionals to perform compliance monitoring, compliance incentive, and enforcement activities, such as

conducting inspections, monitoring compliance, investigating violations, developing cases, or litigating/prosecuting cases. Proposals must address one or more of the following activities:

1. A preliminary assessment of state training needs based on available material such as state oversight reviews and reports, recent training needs surveys, or other mechanisms/forums that have identified gaps in performance of critical environmental enforcement personnel.
2. A targeted training needs analysis to identify specific training objectives to bridge actual or potential performance gaps.
3. Consideration of a variety of training delivery mechanisms and instructional methods, such as classroom, web-based, PC-based, lectures, practical exercises, etc.
4. Selection of an existing training course(s) or design of specialized training course(s) intended to address the performance deficiency and which is based on a cost-benefit analysis and well suited to achieving training objectives.
5. Delivery of training which includes a plan for ensuring student participation (e.g. travel costs, webinar costs, etc.) and administration of tests or follow-up activities that will gauge whether training objectives have been achieved.

Potential grantees should review and understand EPA Order 3500.1 *Training and Development for Compliance Inspectors/Field Investigators* at <http://www.epa.gov/Compliance/resources/publications/monitoring/cwa/inspections/npdesinspect/npdesinspectappa.pdf> and the Guidance for Issuing Federal EPA Inspector Credentials to Authorize Employees of State/Tribal Governments to Conduct Inspections on Behalf of EPA - <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/policies/monitoring/inspection/statetribalcredentials.pdf>. Potential grantees may also wish to review training curriculum and course information available from the National Enforcement Training Institute at <http://www.netonline.com/>.

c: Linkage with EPA's Strategic Plan and Expected Outputs/Outcomes

The funding of state compliance and enforcement training is linked to the EPA Strategic Plan in the following areas:

Goal 5.1: Improve Compliance (Sub-objective 5.1.3 Monitoring and Enforcement) -
Ensure a consistent level of effort among state enforcement and compliance assurance programs.

The following are potential output and outcome measures associated with the State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training focus area:

Outputs:

- Increase number of state environmental professionals trained to conduct inspections for enforcement and compliance assurance;
- Increased number of state environmental professionals trained to develop, manage, and reach settlement of enforcement cases;

- Increased number of state environmental professionals trained in program/media-specific (e.g. RCRA Subtitle C, CWA NPDES) and/or issue-specific (e.g. financial responsibility, negotiations) or priority enforcement areas.
- Development of a training measurement/evaluation system that demonstrates the effective transfer of skills.

Outcomes:

- Improved knowledge, skills, and abilities of environmental staff in inspection, case management, or legal protocols will improve environmental enforcement decision making, including how to respond to environmental compliance needs in a more timely and appropriate manner;
- Improved understanding of compliance and enforcement responsibilities will improve the ability of regulatory agencies to take appropriate action to address and resolve non-compliance;

5. Demonstration of Better Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring Activities

a: Background:

The advancement of new technologies such as portable, lightweight computers (including Tablet PCs, Personal Digital Assistants, and Ultra Mobile Personal Computers) and improved software capabilities has made it possible to collect information in an electronic format in the field. The use of mobile, lightweight hardware and software should allow an inspector to collect and use information in the field in a manner that reduces redundancy by writing once and subsequently populating numerous documents and data systems. The ability of these computers, unlike a laptop, allows the inspector to collect data by handwriting, including drawings, as though he were using pen and paper, and to save the information electronically. The electronic information can then be used to populate inspection forms, prepare inspection reports using the information generated during the inspection, and submit data in a timely manner to the appropriate database. This eliminates the need for the inspector to enter data separately or to provide the data to a data entry person. The integration of technology into workflow processes for compliance monitoring and enforcement can increase the efficiency of the inspection process, improve the timeliness of the inspection report, improve the timeliness and accuracy of data entry, and increase the speed and efficiency of case development and enforcement actions.

This focus area encourages states to develop a trial program and demonstrate the ability to use portable personal computing technology in compliance monitoring activities under EPA environmental statutes. While the technology should primarily focus on field data collection, the solution should consider the entire compliance monitoring process. Some examples of compliance monitoring activities that can be automated include:

- Pre-Inspection: Targeting, Facility Information, Background Materials
- Inspection: Note Taking, Document Collection, Photographs and Diagrams, Printing Forms

- Post Inspection: Data Entry, Report Writing, Statute References, Case Development

In order to automate these activities, the demonstration may incorporate the use of any appropriate accessories for electronic data collection including, but not limited to: printers, scanners, digital cameras, global positioning systems (GPS), and geographic information systems (GIS). Funding may also be used for travel and training costs related to the demonstration project.

A successful project will demonstrate the ability for any state or tribal inspector to conduct an inspection or investigation with the tested technology solution and that this method will save personnel time and reduce errors from transcription of information and data. Throughout the process, the participant should use the steps described in EPA's Draft Field Activity Compliance Technology (FACT) Strategy (contact Dan Klaus at klaus.dan@epa.gov for a copy).

b: Project Approach:

Expected components and results of the project include:

- A feasibility study/requirements analysis including review of inspection manual and interviews with experienced inspectors to examine workflow and information needs (Note: The documented workflow process should capture the knowledge of experienced inspectors and providing a consistent and uniform approach to inspections.);
- Initial system requirements and design recommendations, including hardware software requirements, forms which should be created, a database entity relationship diagram, and properties of each field that needs to be created;
- Standardized e-forms for all documents that are regularly distributed during the inspection or investigation;
- Interactive data fields which minimize the amount of re-writing, electronic, or keyboard entry of the same data across different forms, including hard copy or electronic reports;
- Software or e-forms that can be used on multiple hardware platforms;
- The ability to generate and edit an inspection report based on electronic notes collected in the field;
- Export capability to an EPA database of record, or a universal data format such as extensible markup language (XML);
- Complete source code with comments following generally accepted coding style standards for all programming created specifically for the project;
- A help manual and training curriculum for use of the technology;
- Demonstration of the technology during pre-inspection, inspection, and post-inspection phases; and
- A report with net savings or costs in overall implementation of the compliance monitoring technology solution including staff and data system efficiencies; a

comparison of the standard inspection procedures with the new technology inspection procedures; and methods and standards for other states and tribes that may want to use this technological inspection procedure.

Substantial federal involvement with the recipient during the project is expected, and any proposal under this focus area would require designation as a cooperative agreement.

c: Linkage with EPA's Strategic Plan and Expected Outputs/Outcomes

This project related to USEPA Strategic Plan goals and objectives:

- Goal 5.1: Improve Compliance

The following are potential output and outcome measures associated with the Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring Activities:

Outputs:

- Increased number of inspectors who have been trained in the use of portable electronic devices and software for compliance monitoring activities.

Outcomes:

- Improved efficiency and quality of compliance monitoring activities.

II. AWARD INFORMATION

A. Funding Type

Applicants have the option of requesting that the assistance agreement will be a grant or cooperative agreement. EPA anticipates that all awards will be grants except for awards under the inspector technology focus area; those will be cooperative agreements. The awards under the inspector technology focus area will be cooperative agreements which allow for substantial involvement between the EPA and the selected applicants in the performance of the work supported. Although EPA will negotiate precise terms and conditions relating to substantial involvement as part of the award process, the anticipated substantial Federal involvement for this project may include the following:

- Close monitoring of the successful applicant's performance to verify the results reported by the applicant;
- Collaboration during performance of the scope of work;
- In accordance with 40 CFR part 30 or 31, as applicable, review of proposed procurements and subawards including approval of the substantive terms of procurement contracts and subawards (EPA will not select contractors or subawardees);
- Review qualifications of key personnel (EPA will not select employees or contractors employed by the award recipient); and
- Review and comment on reports and publications prepared under the cooperative agreement (the final decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient).

Please go to <http://www.epa.gov/ogd> for more guidance on when substantial involvement may be required and what that involvement might entail.

B. Amount of Funding Available

EPA anticipates that approximately \$1.84 million will be available under this announcement, depending on Agency funding levels and other applicable considerations. The funds available are from OECA's Multi-Media State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) appropriation. The federal portion for each assistant agreement is anticipated to range between \$50,000 and \$200,000, although proposals below or above that range will be considered. The U.S. EPA reserves the right to make no awards under this solicitation. State and tribal matching funds are not required.

C. Additional Information

EPA reserves the right to reject all applications and make no award as a result of this announcement or make fewer awards than anticipated. EPA also reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement, consistent with Agency policy, if additional funding becomes available after the original selections are made. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than six months after the original selection decisions.

In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund applications by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund an application, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the application or portion thereof, was evaluated and selected for award, and therefore maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.

EPA cannot predict that additional funds for these focus areas will be available in future years. Therefore, states and tribes should assume that these funds will be available on a one-time only basis and should not propose projects requiring additional annual funding beyond the maximum three year period of the grant or cooperative agreement.

D. Project Duration

EPA will negotiate a project start date that follows award acceptance by the successful applicant.

EPA will only consider funding projects for the focus areas described below which can be completed in three years or less. Applications describing proposals for projects lasting more than 3 years may need to be re-negotiated to a 3 year fundable period.

E. Contracts and Subawards

1. Funding may be used to provide subgrants or subawards of financial assistance to fund partnerships provided the recipient complies with applicable requirements for subawards or subgrants including those contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. Successful applicants must compete contracts for services and products and conduct cost and price analyses to the extent required by the procurement provisions of these

regulations. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify contractors or consultants in their applications. Moreover, the fact that a successful applicant has named a specific contractor or consultant in the application EPA approves does not relieve it of its obligations to comply with competitive procurement requirements. Please note that applicants may not award sole source contracts to consulting, engineering or other firms assisting applicants with the application solely based on the firm's role in preparing the application.

Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or subawards to avoid requirements in EPA grant regulations for competitive procurement by using these instruments to acquire commercial services or products from for-profit organizations to carry out its assistance agreement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the subawardee or subgrantee must be consistent with the standards for distinguishing between vendor transactions and subrecipient assistance under Subpart B Section .210 of OMB Circular A-133, and the definitions of “subaward” at 40 CFR 30.2(ff) or “subgrant” at 40 CFR 31.3, as applicable. EPA will not be a party to these transactions.

2. Section V of the announcement describes the evaluation criteria and evaluation process that will be used by EPA to make selections under this announcement. During this evaluation, except for those criteria that relate to the applicant's own qualifications, past performance, and reporting history, the review panel will consider, if appropriate and relevant, the qualifications, expertise, and experience of:

- (i) an applicant's named subawardees/subgrantees identified in the proposal/application if the applicant demonstrates in the proposal/application that if it receives an award that the subaward/subgrant will be properly awarded consistent with the applicable regulations in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31. For example, applicants must not use subawards/subgrants to obtain commercial services or products from for profit firms or individual consultants.
- (ii) an applicant's named contractor(s), including consultants, identified in the proposal/application if the applicant demonstrates in its proposal/application that the contractor(s) was selected in compliance with the competitive Procurement Standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR 31.36 as appropriate. For example, an applicant must demonstrate that it selected the contractor(s) competitively or that a proper non-competitive sole-source award consistent with the regulations will be made to the contractor(s), that efforts were made to provide small and disadvantaged businesses with opportunities to compete, and that some form of cost or price analysis was conducted. EPA may not accept sole source justifications for contracts for services or products that are otherwise readily available in the commercial marketplace.

EPA will not consider the qualifications, experience, and expertise of named subawardees/subgrantees and/or named contractor(s) during the proposal/application evaluation process unless the applicant complies with these requirements.

III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

State agencies, U.S. territories, the District of Columbia, federally recognized Indian Tribes and Intertribal Consortia, and multi-jurisdictional State organizations and associations of environmental regulatory professionals with enforcement and compliance assurance responsibilities or responsibilities that support enforcement and compliance assurance including but not limited to data management or research. In addition, public universities and colleges with expertise in compliance assurance and enforcement issues, including compliance assistance and training to tribal environmental professionals. Applicants who do not meet this threshold factor will be notified within 15 days.

B. Partnerships

EPA awards funds to one eligible applicant as the “recipient” even if other eligible applicants are named as “partners” or “co-applicants” or members of a “coalition” or “consortium”. The recipient is accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds.

C. Cost Sharing and Leveraging Information

While there is no cost sharing requirement, applicants may propose a voluntary financial or in-kind commitment of state or tribal resources towards the total project cost. Applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. Cost-shares/matches can be in the form of cash or can come from in-kind contributions, such as the use of volunteers and/or donated time, equipment, expertise, *etc.*, subject to the regulations governing matching fund requirements at 40 CFR 31.24 or 40 CFR 30.23, as applicable. In addition, state or tribal personnel salary dedicated to the project is considered “in-kind” contributions. The value of donated or “in-kind” services in the performance of a project shall be considered in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, “Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments.”

Leveraged funding or other resources need not be for eligible and allowable project costs under the EPA assistance agreement unless the Applicant proposes to provide a voluntary cost share or match. If EPA accepts an offer for a voluntary cost share/match/participation, applicants must meet their matching/sharing/participation commitment as a condition of receiving EPA funding. Applicants may use their own funds or other resources for voluntary match/cost share/participation if the standards of 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24, as applicable, are met. Only eligible and allowable costs may be used for voluntary matches/cost shares/participation. Other Federal grants may not be used as voluntary matches or cost shares without specific authority (e.g. HUD’s Community Development Block Grants).

Any form of proposed leveraging that is evaluated under Section V ranking criteria must be included in the proposal and the proposal must describe how the applicant will obtain the leveraged resources and what role EPA funding will play in the overall project.

D. Eligibility Screening Requirements: Threshold Criteria

These are requirements that, if not met by the time of application submission, will result in elimination of the application from consideration for funding. Only applications that meet all of these criteria will be evaluated against the ranking factors in Section V of this announcement. Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration as a result of the threshold eligibility review will be notified within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

1. Substantial Compliance with Submission requirements:

a. Proposal packages must substantially comply with the proposal submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this announcement or else they will be rejected. Where a page limit is expressed in Section IV with respect to the project narrative, pages in excess of the page limitation (5- 12) will not be reviewed.

b. In addition, proposal packages must be received by the EPA on or before the proposal submission deadline published in Section IV.F of this announcement. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their proposal reaches the designated person/office specified in Section IV of the announcement by the submission deadline. .

c. Proposal packages received after the submission deadline will be considered late and returned to the sender without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposals with Ginger Gotliffe or Lorna Washington as soon as possible after the submission deadline—failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.

2. Eligible applicants: Applicants must be an eligible applicant as described in Section III.A.

3. **Proper focus areas and projects:** Each proposal may only cover one focus area. Applicants interested in applying for multiple focus areas may submit a separate application for each focus area. The work in the proposals must address capacity building activities. Implementation of compliance inspections or enforcement activities cannot be covered by this grant program.

Proposals must include full and complete narratives. Several focus areas identify the specific projects that are allowed under this solicitation. Proposals must describe how the project, training, or demonstration pilot will address all critical components as described in the narrative (Sections I.B.) and evaluation criteria (Section V.A.). Proposals that do not fully comply with this requirement will not be considered for funding. The projects for each focus area deal with the following projects:

PCS/ICIS projects - grant funding will support (1) clean-up and migration of data from legacy PCS to ICIS, data cleanup of migrated data within ICIS, feasibility studies and/or requirements analyses for required data entry into ICIS, (2) pilot studies of state/tribal processes for data collection and entering of required data into ICIS, especially for new NPDES program areas such as CAFOs, and/or feasibility studies and/or requirements analyses for states adoption of the NetDMR tool.

Indian Country Compliance Assurance Circuit Riders - The grant recipient will employ a “circuit rider” who travels extensively to provide environmental compliance and technical assistance and training in at least one of the following three areas; (1) schools, (2) drinking water systems and (3) solid and hazardous waste management matters.

AFS - Improving and streamlining the states’ and tribes’ AFS data flow will support the implementation of the CAA enforcement and compliance program, and CAA stationary source reporting. In addition, projects may support training for states, local, and tribal agencies who manage AFS data. The projects may apply to: (1) The Study/Analysis of the Universal Interface, (2) Technical Assistance for the Improvement of AFS Data Flow, or (3) UI Training and Technical Assistance.

State Training - Improve or strengthen the ability of state environmental professionals to perform compliance monitoring, compliance incentive, and enforcement activities, such as conducting inspections, monitoring compliance, investigating violations, developing cases, or litigating/prosecuting cases. Projects should address one or more of the following: reviewing or conducting a training needs assessment/analysis; reviewing existing training courses and delivery mechanisms/instructional methods and delivering courses to target audiences; designing specialized training course(s) and delivering courses to target audiences; and/or delivery of training courses must include a plan for ensuring student participation and administration of tests or follow-up activities that will gauge whether training objectives have been achieved.

Better Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring - A successful project will demonstrate the ability for any state or tribal inspector to conduct an inspection or investigation with the tested technology solution and that this method will save personnel time and reduce errors from transcription of information and data.

Please be aware that proposals which do not address one of the focus areas described in Section I of this notice are considered ‘ineligible’ and will not be considered for funding. Applicants who do not meet this threshold factor will be notified within 15 days.

IV. PROPOSAL AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. How to Obtain Proposal Packages

Applicants can download individual proposal/application forms from EPA’s Office of Grants and Debarment website at http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/how_to_apply.htm and by mail upon request by calling the Grants and Interagency Management Division at (202) 564-5320. .

B. Mode of Proposal Submission

Applicants have the following options to submit their proposals: 1) Electronically through email to the specified EPA contact in Section IV.D. below, or 2) Hard copy by express delivery service to the EPA contact specified below. Proposals will not be accepted via fax or standard 1st class mail delivery by U.S. Postal Service. All proposal packages must be prepared, and include the information, as described below in Section IV.C, “Content of Proposal Submission” regardless of mode of transmission.

1. E-mail Submission Instructions

E-mail submissions must be submitted to **MultimediaCapacity_Grants@epa.gov** and received by the submission deadline stated in Section IV.E of this announcement. All required documents listed in Sections IV.B and IV.C of the announcement must be attached to the e-mail as separate Adobe PDF files. Please note that if you choose to submit your materials via e-mail, you are accepting all risks attendant to e-mail submission including server delays and transmission difficulties. E-mail submissions exceeding 15MB will experience transmission delays which will affect when they are received by the Agency. For these size submissions, applicants should submit their application materials via hardcopy or else they may be received late and not considered for funding. Applicants submitting their application materials through e-mail should confirm receipt of the materials with Ginger Gotliffe or Lorna Washington as soon as possible after submission.

2. Hard Copy Submission - Please provide one original of the proposal package (including signed and completed SF 424 and SF 424A forms) and four copies--**no binders or spiral binding**--to:

Hard Copy via Express Delivery (FedEx, UPS, DHL, USPS, etc.)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ATTN: Ginger Gotliffe (Mail Code: 2221A)
OECA/Office of Compliance.
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-7072

C. Content of Proposal Submission

The proposal package **must** include all of the following materials:

1. Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance

Complete the form. There are no attachments. Please note that the organizational Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number must be included on the SF-424. Organizations may obtain a DUNS number at no cost by calling the toll-free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711 or by visiting the web site at www.dnb.com.

2. SF-424A, Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs

Complete the form. There are no attachments. The total amount of Federal funding requested for the three year project period should be shown on line 5(e) and on line 6(k) of SF-424A. If indirect costs are included, the amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (i.e., a percentage), the base (e.g., personnel costs and fringe benefits), and the amount should also be indicated on line 22. If indirect costs are requested, a copy of the Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement must be submitted as part of the application package. (See instructions for document 10 below.)

3. *Project Narrative* – The project narrative must include the information listed below. If a particular item is not applicable, clearly state this in the proposal. **This project narrative must be 5-12 typewritten 8.5 x 11-inch pages (a page is one side of a piece of paper) including the cover page, supporting appendices, and resumes. Additional pages will not be considered.** Letters of support from potential partner entities and the budget narrative will not count against the page limit for the project narrative.

Pages should be numbered for ease of reading. Applicants must use a standard 12-point type font with 1-inch margins. While these guidelines establish the minimum type size requirements, applicants are advised that readability is of paramount importance and should take precedence in selection of an appropriate font for use in the application. The font size for tables, charts, graphs, and figures may be smaller than font size 12 but should be clearly visible. All project narratives must include the following documentation:

1. **Cover Page:** Include the following information: State or Tribe and Department; Title of Project; Focus Area; Total Project Cost (including state/tribe cash and in-kind contributions); Total Funds Requested from EPA; Contact Person (name, title, address, phone, fax and e-mail); preferred assistance agreement (grant or cooperative agreement)
2. **Narrative:** Summary of problem being addressed, project goals and components, and how project components will address the problem and attain the goals.
3. **Workplan and Project Milestones**
4. **Project Costs:** personnel (staff positions and title), travel (number of individuals traveling, destination, number of trips and reasons for travel), equipment (identify each item (and estimated cost) to be purchased with an estimated cost of \$5,000 or more per unit and a useful life of more than one year; supplies, contractual (list each proposed contract and specify its purpose and estimated cost; other expenses that are necessary to carry out this project (provide enough detail to determine reasonableness and allowability of costs) , total direct, indirect costs, and total charges.

Management Fees: When formulating budgets for proposals, applicants must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the

direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicants cognizant audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges may not be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the scope of work.

5. **Evaluation criteria:** address each of the evaluation criteria (Section V.A.) for the focus area that you are applying for. Background information for general criteria that are provided for multiple focus areas are provided below. For more in depth information on criteria dealing with a specific focus area please refer to Section I.B.

6. **Timeline with milestones and Budget:** Provide a projected timeline for the project period (the start date will follow award acceptance by the successful applicant). A three year project period is the maximum that will be allowed. The timeline should show timeframes and major milestones for the projects. The budget should address the project costs listed above.

7. **Tracking Environmental Results:** Provide the following: Provide a clear description of the project's anticipated outputs, including deliverables, as well as likely short-term and long-term outcomes. Describe the planned strategy for measuring and tracking progress toward achieving the expected environmental outputs and outcomes identified in this announcement. See Sections I.B.1.c, I.B.2.c, I.B.3.c, I.B.4.c, or I.B.5.c, for the discussion of anticipated environmental results for the specific focus area.

As part of the Project Narrative, an applicant should describe how the project will result in the protection of environmental resources and link the outcomes to the Agency's Strategic Plan. Additional information regarding EPA's discussion of environmental results in terms of "outputs" and "outcomes" can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700.7.pdf>.

8. **Past Reporting of Environmental Results:** Submit a list of federally and/or nonfederally funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include Federal grants and cooperative agreements but not Federal contracts) that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than five, and preferably EPA agreements) that were similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project, and describe how you documented and/or reported on whether you were making progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outputs and outcomes) under those agreements. Applicants with OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of those grants and use them to comply with this section.

If you were not making progress, please indicate whether, and how, you documented why not. In evaluating applicants under this factor in Section V, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current and prior federal agency grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If the applicant does not have any relevant or available environmental results past performance information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for this factor under Section V.

9. Leveraging Funds and Resources: While not required, applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate (i) how they will coordinate the use of EPA funding with other Federal and/or non Federal sources of funds to leverage additional resources to carry out the proposed project(s) and/or (ii) that EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds or resources. Applicants may use their own funds, staff salary or other resources for a voluntary match or cost share if the standards at 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24, as applicable, are met. Only eligible and allowable costs may be used for matches or cost shares. Other Federal grants may not be used as matches or cost shares without specific statutory authority (e.g. HUD's Community Development Block Grants).

D. Submission Dates and Times

The closing date and time for receipt of application submissions, regardless of mode of submission, is **(July 13, 2009, 4:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time (EST))**. All hard copies of application packages must be received by (Ginger Gotliffe or Lorna Washington by (July 13, 2009, 4:00 p.m. EST. Electronic submissions must be addressed to **MultimediaCapacity_Grants@epa.gov** and include, "Announcement title or #" – [name of applicant] in the subject line and must be received **by July 13, 2009, 4:00 p.m. EST**. Applications received after the closing date and time will not be considered for funding.

E. Intergovernmental Review – not applicable.

F. Funding Restrictions

In accordance with EPA guidance and the OMB Circulars, as appropriate, the recipient must agree that it will not use assistance funds for lobbying, fund-raising or political activities (e.g., lobbying members of Congress, or lobbying for other Federal grants, cooperative agreements or contracts). Foreign travel is not permissible, and equipment purchases require prior written permission by the EPA project officer if they were not included in the approved application. The terms and conditions of the formal assistance agreement may put additional and specific limitations on the funding.

G. Other Submission Requirements

All applicants are required to provide a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering (DUNS) number when applying for federal grants or cooperative agreements. Organizations can receive a DUNS number when applying for federal grants or cooperative agreements. Organizations can receive a DUNS number in one day, at no cost, by calling the dedicated toll free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711 or by visiting the web site at www.dnb.com.

H. Confidential Business Information

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their application as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark applications or portions of applications they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204(c)(2) prior to disclosure. However, competitive proposals/applications are considered confidential and protected from disclosure prior to the completion of the competitive selection process.

V. APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

A. Ranking Criteria

EPA will first review applications to determine if they satisfy the threshold criteria described in Section III of this announcement. Applications that meet all of the threshold eligibility factors will then be evaluated and ranked based on how well they address the criteria detailed below. (Maximum points for each criterion are indicated.)

1. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria for PCS / ICIS-NPDES Proposals:

All PCS / ICIS-NPDES proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the criteria outlined below. See Section I.B.1 for more details about the projects that are allowed under this focus area. Go to Section IV.C. for more information about the general evaluation criteria. The following criteria and associated points will be used by EPA to evaluate the proposals:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weight (100 point scale)
CRITERION ONE: <u>Use of PCS or ICIS-NPDES</u>	20 points
Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describe the applicant's current and future use of PCS (current use, if any) or ICIS-NPDES (current and/or future use). (5 points)• Clearly identify the state or tribal activities (e.g., support management of the Clean Water Act (CWA) compliance and enforcement program) and how data is currently being entered into the system in current use. (5 points)• Describe how the activities in proposal will ensure that the states or tribes continue to meet or exceed their NPDES regulatory requirements to report to EPA. (5 points)• Activities identified must include how states and tribes will ensure continued	

data flow and data entry to ICIS-NPDES and how the states or tribes will implement business practices to fulfill meeting new data requirements (i.e., wet weather). (5 points)	
CRITERION TWO: <u>Project Plan and Approach</u>	40 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identify whether the focus is 1) on data cleanup, conversion and migration of PCS data to ICIS, or, 2) on requirements analyses, pilot studies, or technical assistance related to ICIS-NPDES. (5 points) Pick one: 1) <u>For projects related to PCS data cleanup, conversion and migration of data to ICIS,</u> the proposal must clearly describe: the plan and approach for data clean up in PCS, especially how data on minor facilities will be improved; data migration and conversion activities planned to be performed to ensure that the data migrated from legacy PCS to ICIS is accurate, complete and in the correct format; activities related to the coordination needed between EPA and the state or tribes to ensure the data migration effort is completed; plans for tracking and determining the status of the data migration efforts, showing how the proposed work would enhance the state or tribal ability to manage the NPDES program including assessing environmental conditions and results. (25 points) OR 2) <u>For projects related to ICIS-NPDES requirements analyses, pilot studies, marketing and outreach analyses, or technical assistance,</u> each proposal must clearly describe: the plan and approach for performing the requirements analysis or pilot study, especially how the effort will support state's completion of entry of data requirements into ICIS-NPDES; the state and tribal process for collecting and entering the required data into ICIS-NPDES; and, activities to be performed to ensure that the state/tribal process for the collection and entry/flow of the required ICIS-NPDES data (e.g., DMRs) is reasonable and doable, and/or expected to increase as a result of electronic reporting. (25 points) Describe activities related to the coordination needed between EPA and the states or tribes (5 points) Describe the plans for tracking and determining the status of the analysis or study. (5 points) 	
CRITERION THREE: <u>Quality Assurance / Quality Control</u>	15 points
<p>Applications will be scored based on an assessment of the applicant's ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly describe any quality assurance checks planned for development to ensure the improvement of the quality of the minor data entered into either PCS and/or ICIS-NPDES. (7.5 points) Clearly describe pilot QA/QC activities planned to ensure that the final analysis of the process and the results of the pilot study is accurate, complete and in the correct format. (7.5 points) 	
CRITERION FOUR: <u>Tracking Environmental Results</u>	5 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes. (2.5 points) Describe a plan for tracking and measuring their progress toward achieving the anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes identified in Section I.B.1.c. (2.5 points) 	
CRITERION FIVE: <u>Past Reporting of Environmental Results</u>	5 points

Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) under federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements performed within the last three years, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. (5 points)	
CRITERION SIX: Timeline with Milestones and Budget	10 points
Applicants will be evaluated based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The adequacy of the budget information provided and whether the proposed costs are reasonable. (5 points) • The extent to which the proposed timeline with milestones demonstrates realistic and sound planning to achieve the goals of the proposal. (5 points) 	
CRITERION SEVEN: Leveraging	5 points
The proposal demonstrates: (i) how the applicant will coordinate/leverage the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds (<i>i.e.</i> , project partners, including other federally-recognized tribes, surrounding communities, businesses) to carry out the proposed project, and/or (ii) that EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds, salary or resources.	

2. Tribal

All Tribal Compliance Assurance Circuit Rider proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the criteria outlined below. See Section I.B.2 for more details about the projects that are allowed under this focus area. Go to Section IV.C. for more information about the general evaluation criteria. The following criteria and associated points will be used by EPA to evaluate the proposals:

Evaluation Criterion	Weight 100 point scale
Criterion One: Program Description	40 Points
Under this criterion, EPA will evaluate the extent to which the proposal effectively addresses the scope of work activities described in Section I. B.2 of this announcement. Proposals will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly, concisely and realistically provides a description of the proposed project goals, activities, budget, and project milestones. (10 points) • Demonstrates a qualitative approach/contribution to providing compliance assistance and training to schools, drinking water systems, or in the management of solid and hazardous waste in Indian country. (10 points) • Demonstrates a qualitative approach/contribution to training tribal environmental professionals in providing compliance assistance to Indian country facility owners/operators. (10 points) • Demonstrates a qualitative approach/contribution to overall tribal compliance program development and collaboration with tribes. (10 points) <i>Note:</i> The program description should focus on one or more of the three environmental areas (1) schools, (2) drinking water systems, and (3) waste management operations.	
Criterion Two: Programmatic Capability	30 Points
This criterion refers to the technical capability of an applicant or recipient to successfully carry out the proposed project (circuit rider providing on-site and on-site compliance and technical assistance in at least one of the three areas: (1) schools, (2) drinking water systems, or (3) waste management operations) taking into account such factors as the applicant's:	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational experience and plan for timely and successful achievement of the objectives of the project. (10 points) Staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project. (10 points). Ability to work with, and travel to multiple facilities in Indian country and multiple Indian reservations or other tribal areas to provide on-site compliance assistance, technical assistance and/or training. (10 points) 	
Criterion Three: Performance Measurement: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs.	8 Points
<p>EPA will evaluate the extent to which the “Narrative Proposal” realistically describes how the project will lead to measurable environmental results as described in Section I.B.2. Proposals will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly specify anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs as described in Section I.B.2.c. (2 points) Clearly describe the measures of success for the project. Measure of success should be either measures of environmental improvement or should be directly linked to such measures. EPA will look for quantitative and qualitative measurability. (3 points) Describe how success in achieving project outcomes and outputs will be evaluated and measured. Include a description of any planned reports or other deliverables that measure and track the project success and, document achievement of expected/outputs identified in Section I.B.2.c. (3 points) 	
Criterion Four: Environmental Results Past Performance.	14 Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they adequately documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) under federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements (an assistance agreement is a grant or cooperative agreement and not a contract) similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project performed within the last three years, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. 	
Criterion Five: Timeline with Milestones and Budget/Resources	4 Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant clearly describes the budget using appropriate categories; a detailed write-up; and appropriate funding amounts to achieve the project’s objectives. The budget proposal demonstrates the ability to effectively sustain the proposed project. The budget proposal includes cost estimates for each of the proposed project activities to be conducted using EPA funds. The budget describes the applicant’s plan on managing the budget. The budget proposal describes how the applicant will manage the budget within cost parameters. The proposed timeline with milestones demonstrates sound planning to achieve the outcomes and outputs of the project. 	
Criterion Six: Leveraging	4 Points
The proposal demonstrates: (i) how the applicant will coordinate/leverage the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds (i.e., project partners, including other federally-recognized tribes, surrounding communities, businesses) to carry out the proposed project, and/or (ii) that EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds, salary or resources.	

3. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria for Air Facility System (AFS) Proposals:

All AFS proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the criteria outlined below. See Section I.B.3. for more details about the projects that are allowed under this focus area. Go to Section IV.C. for more information about the general evaluation criteria. The following criteria and associated points will be used by EPA to evaluate the proposals:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weight (100 point scale)
CRITERION ONE: <u>Existing Use of AFS.</u>	10 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly describe the existing use of the AFS system (e.g., support management of the Clean Air Act (CAA) compliance and enforcement program and how data is currently being entered into AFS. (5 points) Clearly describe how the agency is reporting all Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) and any existing process for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the MDR data. (5 points) 	
CRITERION TWO: <u>Project Plan and Approach</u>	35 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify which of the following areas the proposal applies to: (1) The Study/Analysis of the Universal Interface, (2) Technical Assistance for the Improvement of AFS Data Flow, or (3) UI Training and Technical Assistance. (5 points) <p>Pick one: 1) Include a Project Plan for the project that describes the approach to conducting the project, the resources used for each project phase, federal interaction required, and an estimated length of time for the project. (20 points)</p> <p>OR 2) For Applicants applying for the training and scholarship project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain their ability to describe the states and tribes need for AFS training and provide a listing of any training providers that the grantee may utilize and whose courses address those AFS needs. (10 points) Provide evidence of adequate staff already on board or the ability to locate and contract with staff for the purpose of organizing and prioritizing the distribution of funds for tuition and or travel to training sessions put on by EPA or other training providers. (10 points) 	
CRITERION THREE: <u>Burden Reduction</u>	10 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe estimated burden reductions and cost savings to the agency through development and use of the proposed project. 	
CRITERION FOUR: <u>Quality Improvements</u>	20 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain how completion of the proposed project is expected to improve the quality (e.g. timeliness, accuracy, completeness) of the data, the expected benefits to the management of the air enforcement and compliance program from improved data, and how these improvements and benefits will be measured. (3 points) The Plan for Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results from the will be also be used for evaluation and ranking of this criteria. (2 points) 	
CRITERION FIVE: <u>Tracking Environmental Results</u>	5 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes. (2.5 points) Describe a plan for tracking and measuring their progress toward achieving the anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes identified in Section I.D. (2.5 points) 	

CRITERION SIX: Past Reporting of Environmental Results	5 points
Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) under federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements performed within the last three years, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. (5 points)	
CRITERION SEVEN: Timeline with Milestones and Budget (10 points)	10 points
Applicants will be evaluated based on the adequacy of the information provided in the detailed budget and whether the proposed costs are reasonable. (5 points) Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which: • The proposed timeline with milestones demonstrates sound planning to achieve the outcomes and outputs of the project. (5 points)	
CRITERION SEVEN: Leveraging	5 points
The proposal demonstrates: (i) how the applicant will coordinate/leverage the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds (<i>i.e.</i> , project partners, including other federally-recognized tribes, surrounding communities, businesses) to carry out the proposed project, and/or (ii) that EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds, salary, or resources.	

4. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria for State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training

All State training proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the criteria outlined below. See Section I.B.4. for more details about the projects that are allowed under this focus area. Go to Section IV.C. for more information about the general evaluation criteria. The following criteria and associated points will be used by EPA to evaluate the proposals:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weight (100 point scale)
CRITERION ONE: Project Description.	35 points
Under this criterion, EPA will evaluate the extent to which the proposal effectively addresses the scope of work activities described in Section I of this announcement. Proposals will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses well-defined training needs of state environmental enforcement personnel (10 pts) • Provides a clear and concise description of realistic training goals (e.g. # of staff trained), activities (e.g.. # of training events), and project milestones. (10 points) • Provides for training opportunities or learning exchanges for a mix of regulatory, legal, and civil/criminal investigation staff. (5 points) • Will improve the capabilities of multiple states or across multiple media or statutes, are mission critical to an individual state or media program, or that demonstrate methodologies/techniques/courses that can be transferred to other states. (10 pts) 	

CRITERION TWO: Programmatic and Organizational Capability	20 points
<p>This criterion refers to the technical and organizational capability of an applicant or recipient to successfully carry out the proposed project taking into account such factors as the applicant's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational experience in managing training programs, workshops, networking opportunities, and conferences and how administration of the proposed project will further the recipient's mission (10 pts) Evidence of adequate personnel already on board or the ability to locate and contract with training organizations that have staff with clear expertise in: 1) conducting training needs assessments and analyses; 2) developing new or reviewing and revising existing training/material on compliance assistance, compliance monitoring, and enforcement matters; or 3) developing and running training/workshops on environmental and governmental programs. Adequacy must be demonstrated by <u>existing or planned</u> knowledge about the proposed activity and the ability to conduct the proposed activity. (10 pts) 	
CRITERION THREE: Tracking Environmental Results	10 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes. (2.5 points) Describe a plan for tracking and measuring their progress toward achieving the anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes identified in Section I.D. (2.5 points) 	
CRITERION FOUR: Environmental Results Past Performance	20 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) under federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements performed within the last three years, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. (10 points) Past performance in successfully completing and managing federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements (does not include contracts) similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project performed within the last 3 years, including meeting reporting requirements under federally and non-federally funded assistance agreements. (5 pts.) <p><i>NOTE: In evaluating applicants for programmatic capability purposes, EPA will consider information provided by the applicant in their proposal as well as relevant information from other sources including EPA agency files and prior/current grantors (i.e., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). Applicants with no relevant or available past performance and/or reporting history (the last item above) will receive a neutral score for those elements of this criterion.</i></p>	
CRITERION Five: Timeline with Milestones and Budget and Resources	10 points
<p>The applicant clearly describes the budget using appropriate categories; a detailed write-up; and appropriate funding amounts to achieve the project's objectives. The budget proposal reflects a balanced approach in funding categories (e.g. equipment, travel, etc.) and is not allocated to only one budget category. The budget proposal demonstrates the ability to effectively sustain the proposed project. The budget proposal includes cost estimates for each of the proposed project activities to be conducted using EPA funds. The budget describes the applicant's plan on managing the budget within the cost parameters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed timeline with milestones demonstrates sound planning to achieve the outcomes and outputs of the project. (5 points) 	
CRITERION Six: Leveraging	5 points

The proposal demonstrates: (i) how the applicant will coordinate/leverage the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds to carry out the proposed project, and/or (ii) that EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds, salary, or resources.	
---	--

5. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria for Demonstration of Better Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring Activities Proposals

All Inspection Technology proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the criteria outlined below. See Section I.B.5. for more details about the projects that are allowed under this focus area. Go to Section IV.C. for more information about the general evaluation criteria. The following criteria and associated points will be used by EPA to evaluate the proposals:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weight (100 point scale)
CRITERION ONE: <u>Workflow Process and Requirements Analysis</u>	20 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the plan and approach for analyzing the compliance monitoring workflow process for the specified inspection program • Describe the compliance monitoring activities (as suggested in Focus Area description) that will be considered for automation • Describe how automation of the identified inspection activities could potentially benefit from automation. • Describe clearly identify the relevant resources (e.g., inspectors, case development and enforcement staff, databases, inspection manuals and guidance documents, past inspection reports, and inspection forms) that will be used in developing the requirements analysis. • Describe clearly describe the plan for determining the most appropriate hardware and software for the demonstration. 	
CRITERION TWO: <u>Usability and Expandability</u>	20 points
<p>Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • must include a plan for training and supporting inspectors in the proper use of the hardware and software provided (5 points) • describe a method for evaluating potential security, safety, and legal concerns with the use and enforceability of the information collected with the hardware and software (5 points) • clearly describe whether any data systems or functions will be proprietary and specific to a particular state or program, and if so should consider methods for making the software extensible for other states or programs. (5 points) • The plan must clearly explain how the results of the project could be shared and expanded for use by other inspection programs, by other states and tribes, or by EPA. (5 points) 	
CRITERION THREE: <u>Project Work Plan Description</u>	20 points
<p>The proposal must clearly describe the scale of the implementation for the demonstration (i.e., number of inspectors and inspections). The proposal must identify the resources required for each project phase, and an estimated length of time for the project. The proposal must show evidence of—or the ability to locate and contract—adequate expertise, resources, and staff to carry out the development of software and implementation of a project of the scale described. The proposal must include a budget and work plan time frame that is clearly stated, detailed, and appropriate to achieve the project’s objectives.</p>	

CRITERION FOUR: <u>Plan for Measuring Environmental Results.</u>	15 points
Applications will be scored based on an assessment of the applicant's ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account the following factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how completion of the proposed project is expected to improve the cost, timeliness, accuracy, and/or completeness of the compliance monitoring and enforcement process (3 points)* • how these improvements and benefits will be measured. (2 points)* • Identify anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes. (3 points) - the quality of the plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the expected project environmental outputs and outcomes including those listed in Section I of the announcement (5 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the degree to which the proposal contains clear measures of success and timeline for the project(s), and provides a description of the format in which these measurements will be reported and compared. (5 points) 	
CRITERION FIVE: Past Reporting of Environmental Results	5 points
Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) under federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements performed within the last three years, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. (5 points)	
CRITERION SIX: Timeline with Milestones and Budget	15 points
Applicants will be evaluated based on the adequacy of the information provided in the detailed budget and whether the proposed costs are reasonable. (7.5 points) Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed timeline with milestones demonstrates sound planning to achieve a fully operational contamination warning system that will be evaluated within a three year project period. (7.5 points) 	
CRITERION SEVEN: Leveraging	5 points
The proposal demonstrates: (i) how the applicant will coordinate/leverage the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds to carry out the proposed project, and/or (ii) that EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds, salary or resources.	

B. Additional Selection Factors The Agency may consider the need to provide funding to high ranking applicants who have not previously received funding within a similar focus area from previous STAG grant solicitations.

C. Review and Selection Process

All applications received by the submission deadline will first be screened by EPA staff against the threshold criteria in Section III of this announcement. Applications that do not pass the threshold review will not be evaluated further or considered for funding. Applications that successfully pass those reviews will then be evaluated on the evaluation criteria (Section V.A and B) by program experts familiar with the project funding areas. In general, program experts are composed of EPA Headquarters and Regional program analysts, environmental protection specialists, and computer analysts who are experts in their respective areas and proficient in the technical subjects they are reviewing. Each reviewer assigns a numeric score to each ranking criteria area. These program experts will then convene as a consensus panel to finalize their evaluation and scoring and

prepare a list of recommended projects based on the ranking of the final scores. The list will be provided to the Selection Official who makes the final funding recommendations. In making the final funding recommendations, the Selection Official will consider the panel rankings and scores and may also take into consideration programmatic priorities

The applicant must explain how they will fulfill the requirements by including timetables, schedules, interim products, and planned activities. The review process also is designed to evaluate each applicant on their knowledge, experience, and familiarity with the program funding area to assure that projects are completed successfully and in a timely manner.

VI. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Award Notices

All applicants, including those who are not selected for funding, will be notified once selection decisions have been made. EPA anticipates notification to successful applicant(s) will be made via e-mail or mail within 15 calendar days of the selection decision. This notification, which advises that the application has been selected and is being recommended for award, is not an authorization to begin performance. The award notice signed by the EPA Award Official is the authorizing document and will be provided through postal mail. EPA also anticipates notification to unsuccessful applicant(s) will be made via e-mail or mail within 15 calendar days of the selection decision. The notification will be sent to the original signer of the application.

EPA reserves the right to negotiate appropriate changes in work plans after the selection and before the final award consistent with EPA Order 5700.5A1, Section 11. In addition, successful applicants will be required to certify that they have not been Debarred, Suspended, or otherwise restricted from participation in federal assistance awards in accordance with 40 CFR Part 32.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

The general award and administration process for assistance agreements are governed by regulations at 40 CFR Part 30 (Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations) and 40 CFR Part 31 (States, Tribes, interstate agencies, intertribal consortia and local governments). A listing and description of general EPA Regulations applicable to the award of assistance agreements may be viewed at:

http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/applicable_epa_regulations_and_description.htm

C. Reporting

In general, recipients are responsible for managing the day-to-day operations and activities supported by the assistance funding, to assure compliance with applicable

federal requirements, and for ensuring that established milestones and performance goals are being achieved. Performance reports and financial reports must be submitted semi-annually and are due 30 days after the reporting period. The final report is due 90 days after the assistance agreement has expired. Recipients will be required to report direct and indirect environmental results from the work accomplished through the award. In negotiating this cooperative agreement, EPA will work closely with the recipient to incorporate appropriate performance measures and reporting requirements in the work plan consistent with 40 CFR 30.51, and 31.40.27

D. Dispute Resolution Provision

Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005) which can be found at <http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20051800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2005/05-1371.htm>. Copies of the dispute procedures may also be requested by contacting Ginger Gotliffe at (202) 564-7072 or Lorna Washington at (202) 564-1386. Requests may also be sent to MultimediaCapacity_Grants@epa.gov.

E. Administrative Capability Review

Nonprofit applicants that are recommended for funding **for the first time** will be subject to pre-award administrative capability reviews consistent with Sections 8.b, 8.c, and 9.d of EPA Order 5700.8 - Policy on Assessing Capabilities of Non-Profit Applicants for Managing Assistance Awards (http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700_8.pdf). In addition, nonprofit applicants that qualify for funding may, depending on the size of the award, be required to fill out and submit to the Grants Management Office the Administrative Capabilities Form with supporting documents contained in Appendix A of EPA Order 5700.8.

VII. AGENCY CONTACT

Note to Applicants: EPA will respond to questions from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the application, and requests for clarification about the announcement. Questions must be submitted in writing via e-mail and must be received by the Agency Contact identified below before **5:00 PM EDT, June 12, 2009**. Written responses will be posted on EPA's website at: <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/state/grants/stag/index.html>.

In accordance with EPA's Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants or discuss draft applications, provide informal comments on draft applications, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their applications.

Agency Contact:

Ginger Gotliffe or Lorna Washington
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Mail code 2221A
Washington, DC 20460
Office of Compliance, OECA
Phone Number: (202) 564-7072 or (202) 564-1386
E-mail: **MultimediaCapacity_Grants@epa.gov**

VIII. OTHER INFORMATION**A. Data Sharing**

All recipients of assistance agreements under this announcement will be required to share with EPA any data generated through this funding agreement as a defined deliverable in the final narrative statement. EPA will protect critical infrastructure information from public disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable statutes and regulations.

EPA, states, territories, and tribes are working together to develop the National Environmental Information Exchange Network, a secure, Internet- and standards-based way to support electronic data reporting, sharing, and integration of both regulatory and non-regulatory environmental data. States, tribes and territories exchanging data with each other or with EPA, should make the Exchange Network and the Agency's connection to it, the Central Data Exchange (CDX), the standard way they exchange data and should phase out any legacy methods they have been using. More information on the Exchange Network is available at www.exchangenetwork.net.

B. Copyrights

EPA reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish or otherwise use, and to authorize others to use, for Federal Government purposes in accordance with 40 CFR 31.34: (a) the copyright in any work developed under a grant, subgrant, or contract under a grant or subgrant; and (b) any rights of copyright to which a grantee, subgrantee or a contractor purchases ownership with grant support.

C. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC)

Quality Assurance/Quality Control requirements are applicable to these cooperative agreements (see 40 CFR 30.54 and 40 CFR 31.45). If selected for award, the applicant will be required to develop and demonstrate an EPA approved Quality System, consisting of systematic procedures and tests that allow the recipient the ability to ascertain the uncertainty of the data. QA/QC requirements apply to the collection of environmental data. Environmental data are any measurements or information that describe environmental processes, location, or conditions; ecological or health effects and consequences; or the performance of environmental technology. Environmental data

include information collected directly from measurements, produced from models, and compiled from other sources such as databases or literature. Applicants should allow sufficient time and resources for this process. The components of a Quality System are a Quality Management Plan (QMP) and a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). Guidance on Quality Systems is available at http://www.epa.gov/quality/qa_docs.html.