

USEPA Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance FY 08 Multi-Media Grant Program Solicitation Notice

OVERVIEW INFORMATION

A. Required Overview Information

1. **Agency Name and Office:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA), Office of Compliance (OC)
2. **Funding Opportunity Title:** FY 08 Multi-Media Grant Program Solicitation Notice
3. **Announcement Type:** Initial Announcement; Subject to availability; of funding solicitation notice.
4. **Funding Opportunity Number:** EPA-OECA-NPMAS-08-001
5. **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number:** 66.709
6. **Dates:**
 - July 8, 2008 (12 midnight Eastern Time) – Deadline for submitting applications (proposal and partial grant application) to EPA.
 - August 8, 2008 – Notifications sent to applicants regarding funding recommendations.
 - First quarter FY2009 – Completed grant applications, certifications are due to EPA regional offices.
 - First quarter FY2009– Reprogram funding to appropriate Regions.
 - First quarter FY2009– Issuance of FY 2008 STAG Program Awards.

B. Optional Overview Information

1. **Description:** 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 pre-proposals for the following focus areas: (1) Permit Compliance System (PCS) Modernization and ICIS-NPDES, (2) Tribal Compliance Assurance Training and Workshops, (3) Air Facility System (AFS), (4) Development of a State-to-State New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (NSR/PSD) Mentoring Program and Permit and Enforcement Training Support, (5) State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training and (6) Demonstration of Better Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring Activities. The total grant award to be funded is \$2,800,000 and will be awarded to selected proposals in the range of \$50,000 - \$200,000.
2. **Award Information:** The funds available are from OECA's Multi-Media State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) appropriation. The grants or cooperative

agreements should be in the range of \$50,000 to \$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. 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.

3. EPA Competition Policy: In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals, provide informal comments on draft proposals, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their applications/proposals. To provide more detailed information to applicants, answers to frequently asked questions have been prepared and are available at <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/state/grants/stag/index.html>. In addition, applicants may submit questions to Ginger Gotliffe (gotliffe.ginger@epa.gov) by June 10, 2008 and the answers will be added to the Frequently Asked Questions web page.

I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION (Desired Projects)

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. Please note an applicant must not address more than one focus area in a proposal. Each focus area is separate and proposals from an applicant for each focus area will be evaluated independently. The descriptions of each focus area in this Section provide background information, examples of projects and activities that meet the expectations of this solicitation, as well as the outputs and outcomes expected from this work that link to the goals and objectives of the EPA Strategic Plan.

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 Area - Permit Compliance System Modernization (PCS) and ICIS-NPDES

In FY2008, 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 a single source of data entry, will improve public access to data, support the development of risk reduction strategies, and will provide states with a modernized system to meet their NPDES program management needs.

The Permits Compliance System (PCS), the NPDES legacy system and precursor to ICIS, has little or no data for major new NPDES program requirements, such as Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO), Storm Water, and 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).

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.
- Migrated and converted state and Indian country data from PCS to ICIS.
- State and Indian country data that is 'cleaned-up' in PCS for migration and conversion to ICIS per the PCS Data Clean-up List.

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.

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. Our goal is to complete a pilot of hybrid state XML batch submittal of DMR data to ICIS–NPDES and to implement that state in ICIS production by the end of April 2008. The pilot also would include the migration of that state’s data from PCS to ICIS–NPDES in the same time period. The remaining hybrid states are targeted to be implemented for electronic DMR data submittals to ICIS–NPDES and their data migrated from PCS to ICIS–NPDES in August 2008. This means that before the end of 2008, hybrid states would be directly entering all NPDES data into ICIS–NPDES, except for DMR data, which would be electronically transferred (batch) to ICIS.
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 others states, OEI and OECA. The NetDMR tool is targeted to be implemented in ICIS-NPDES by the first or second quarter of FY2009.
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.

The general purpose of FY2008 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 clean-up and migration of data from legacy PCS to ICIS, feasibility studies and/or requirements analyses for required data entry into ICIS, and/or 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.

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;

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. More 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).

2. Technical assistance for data clean-up to support the conversion and migration of state and Indian country data from legacy PCS to the ICIS;

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).

3. 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, a desk-top, web-based approach, all users of the system will have easy access to the system, thus allowing much 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.

4. Activities to support the development of a requirements analysis for complete entry of wet weather and minor facility NPDES data into ICIS;

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 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.

5. Technical assistance to support the completion of required data entry into ICIS or NPDES wet weather facilities (i.e., CAFO, Storm Water, SSO, and CSO) and minor facilities;

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. With ICIS, states will have more functionality to manage their wet weather programs, and this will require an initial entry of basic information on these facilities. 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 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).

6. 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), 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.

C. Focus Area - Funding Tribal Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training

In FY2008, grant funding will support two types of environmental training in Indian country and other tribal areas. The two types of environmental training will: (1) improve the ability of tribal environmental professionals to properly and safely conduct inspections pursuant to applicable environmental laws; and (2) increase understanding of the roles and responsibilities of EPA and federally-recognized Indian tribes in ensuring environmental compliance in Indian country and other tribal areas. Due to limited resources, priority will go to proposals that will improve the capabilities of multiple tribes. The funds must be used for building the capacity and expertise of tribes to implement compliance assurance and enforcement programs. These funds cannot be used for the actual implementation of compliance monitoring and enforcement programs.

The funding of tribal compliance and enforcement training 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 associated with the Tribal Compliance and Enforcement Training focus area:

Outputs:

- Increased number of tribal environmental professionals, tribal members, or tribal leaders trained in enforcement and compliance assurance areas;
- Increased number of tribes with environmental laws containing inspection and enforcement provisions or environmental regulations, guidance, and procedures for implementing compliance monitoring and enforcement; and
- Increased number of tribes with environmental compliance and enforcement programs.

Outcomes:

- Improved understanding of the range of regulated facilities in Indian country will improve tribal environmental decision making, including how to respond to environmental compliance needs in a more timely and appropriate manner;
- Improved understanding of who is responsible for ensuring compliance with federal, tribal, and state environmental laws will improve the ability of regulatory agencies to take appropriate action to address and resolve non-compliance;
- Improved tribal government knowledge of why compliance assurance and enforcement is an integral part of encouraging regulated businesses and other companies to meet their environmental obligations;

Tribal training goals to be covered include:

1. Improve the ability of tribal environmental professionals to conduct compliance monitoring inspections in Indian country.

Inspectors are able to assess and monitor compliance at regulated facilities consistent with applicable laws. EPA retains authority to conduct compliance monitoring inspections in Indian country under applicable federal environmental laws. EPA also retains discretionary authority to ask tribes and states to conduct civil compliance monitoring inspections on behalf of the Agency under a variety of federal environmental statutes. Tribes maintain inherent authority to conduct compliance monitoring inspections in Indian country under a tribe's laws, ordinances and regulations. In addition, tribes are eligible for "treatment in the same manner as a state" to conduct inspections under several federal environmental laws after obtaining approval from EPA.

Proper training is essential to ensure that tribal inspectors are able to safely and properly conduct inspections. This is essential regardless of whether inspections are conducted pursuant to federal or tribal laws and who conducts the inspection. EPA developed a series of training protocols designed to ensure that environmental inspectors are safely and properly trained. These protocols, used by EPA, tribes, and states, divide the types of inspector training into three categories: (1) "basic" inspector training; (2) "media-specific" inspector training; and (3) "health and safety" training. Basic inspector training is designed to provide inspectors with an overview of all aspects of inspection preparation, conduct, and follow-up. The course also introduces various federal environmental laws and regulations. Media-specific training is designed to teach inspectors how to apply the detailed legal and technical requirements of a particular environmental law during an inspection. Health and safety training is designed to provide inspectors with information on hazards, including how to avoid exposure to such hazards that may arise while conducting inspections.

OECA will consider funding for basic inspector training, media-specific inspector training, and/or health and safety training courses for inspectors. Because of both their general and specific application, 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/npde>

[sinspect/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>). In addition, potential grantees may wish to review information available from the National Enforcement Training Institute at <http://www.netionline.com/> which currently makes the three categories of classes available to environmental professionals at the federal, tribal, state, and local level.

2. Increase understanding of the roles and responsibilities of tribes in ensuring environmental compliance in Indian country and other tribal areas.

Federal and tribal environmental laws and regulations are major tools to protect the environment and human health in Indian country and other tribal areas, and apply to a wide array of regulated facilities. EPA recognizes federally-recognized tribal governments as the primary parties for setting and enforcing standards for Indian country. In addition, several federal environmental laws authorize EPA to treat an eligible tribe in the same manner as a state for implementing and managing certain environmental programs, including compliance assurance and enforcement programs. EPA retains aspects of certain enforcement programs even when a tribe gets approval of the whole program. Unless and until a tribe obtains program approval, EPA retains the compliance assurance and enforcement program responsibilities in Indian country under applicable federal environmental laws. EPA-approved state programs generally do not apply in Indian country. An exception exists when a state asks for, establishes that it is entitled to, and obtains EPA approval of its program for such areas. Alaska, which has 229 tribes, over 200 Alaskan Native Regional and Village corporations, and 13 regional for-profit corporations, presents unique issues due to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The presence of Indian country is limited to one Indian reservation and over 16,000 Alaska Native restricted allotments. The 1998 Supreme Court case of Alaska v. Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government, 522 U.S. 520, has limited the possibility of Indian country in Alaska as "dependent Indian communities" on Native corporation lands. Tribes in Oklahoma are impacted by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 (SAFE-TE).

OECA will consider funding training and workshops for tribal government officials and tribal environmental professionals that are designed to improve understanding of the roles and responsibilities for ensuring compliance with environmental laws in Indian country and other tribal areas, including those in Alaska. The workshops may cover a range of topics, including but not limited to, the importance of compliance assurance, how enforcement encourages regulated entities to meet their environmental obligations, the range and types of facilities in Indian country (tribal, non-tribal, federal), the role of tribal and non-tribal members in compliance assurance and enforcement programs, jurisdictional issues that arise when ensuring compliance in Indian country, roles and tools for protecting tribal resources, characteristics of an effective compliance and enforcement program, and how EPA, tribes, and states can coordinate in ensuring compliance. As a specific example, the workshop(s) could discuss how tribes can develop

solid waste compliance assurance and enforcement programs that comply with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Potential topics could include the following: ensuring compliance under federal environmental laws and tribal inherent authority (i.e., the creation of solid waste codes to address open and illegal dumping, the need for tribes to obtain sustainable program funding, how tribes can provide compliance assistance to the regulated community, how and when tribal enforcement actions against code violators is appropriate, and tribal coordination with EPA and states). Potential grantees should review and understand federal environmental laws, regulations, and policies, including the *EPA Policy for the Administration Of Environmental Programs on Indian Reservations* (November, 8, 1984), the *Enforcement Guidance on the 1984 Indian Policy* (January 20, 2001), and media-specific program material. See <http://epa.gov/tribal> and <http://epa.gov/tribalcompliance>. For proposals related to Alaska, see the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and *Alaska v. Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government*, 522 U.S. 520 (1998). For proposals related to Oklahoma, see the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 (SFTE-TE).

D. Focus Area – Improving Flow of State Data to the Airs Facility System (AFS)

In FY2008, 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 7 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). Projects approved in the past included feasibility studies 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. Eighteen (18) agencies currently use the software, and several additional agencies are in the UI implementation process.

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 source data to EPA.

Outcomes:

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

FY2008 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. Examples of state and tribal activities to be covered include:

- 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 man hours of compiling and reporting data to AFS, as well as providing data available for sharing with other agencies.

E. Focus Area - Development of a State-to-State New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (NSR/PSD) Mentoring Program and Permit and Enforcement Training Support

In order to improve the ability of state and local agencies to properly write permits, build expertise in permitting/enforcement relationships, and conduct inspections and appropriately enforce permits pursuant to applicable environmental laws and the NSR/PSD regulations, utilization of training and mentoring activities is being supported through this focus area. The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) will conduct training in New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (NSR/PSD) at EPA regional offices during the grant period. The training will focus on the relationship between NSR/PSD program permitting and enforcement and will emphasize permit terms and emission limits which aid the process of assessing compliance and enforcement of the permits. In addition to the training that will be provided by EPA, other entities may be providing training on NSR/PSD permitting and enforcement issues. A state-to-state mentoring program would also contribute to the improved ability and capacity of the states to manage the NSR/PSD permitting and enforcement programs. The funds must be used for building the capacity and expertise of state and local air pollution control agencies to write enforceable permits, understand the needs of enforcement in permitting, develop procedures for permit enforcement oversight and improve their overall Clean Air Act (CAA) compliance

assurance and enforcement programs.

This solicitation requests proposals which will support training for states and local pollution control agencies who manage the Clean Air Act (CAA) permitting and compliance of sources. Successful programs will manage and provide scholarships to state and local personnel to attend EPA's training sessions or other training classes offered that address subjects under this focus area, and/or develop and run a state-to-state mentoring program. Successful proposals will also identify any non-EPA training sources that provide courses on NSR/PSD permitting and enforcement programs that are consistent with the current regulatory requirements and operations. These scholarships will primarily be used for state and local pollution control agencies who manage the CAA permitting and compliance of sources in the priority focus areas which are: sulfuric and nitric acid plants, Portland cement plants, glass manufacturing plants, and polystyrene foam manufacturing plants.

The objectives of this environmental training proposal will be to: (1) manage and distribute scholarship funds to allow state and local personnel to participate in EPA training or other training available on NSR/PSD permitting, compliance and enforcement in multiple regional offices; and (2) establish a mentoring program for state-to-state interaction on permitting and permit enforcement. 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.

Compliance training is linked to the EPA Strategic Plan Goal 5.1: Improve Compliance. The following are potential output and outcome measures associated with the Permitting and Compliance Training focus area:

Outputs:

- Increased number of environmental professionals and staff within state and local CAA permit agencies trained in permit, enforcement and compliance assurance areas.

Outcomes:

- Improved knowledge of evaluating and drafting permit language which improves the efficiency of compliance assurance, enforcement and compliance demonstration.

Examples of projects include:

1. Scholarships for State and Local Permit Staff and Management

OECA is interested in the maximum amount of participation in NSR/PSD permit and enforcement training. It will require a great deal of organizing and planning in order to coordinate the distribution of tuition and/or travel funding to the various state and local agencies. Those state and local agencies with the greatest needs based on lack of experienced staff and distance from the training locations, and quality of enforceable permits 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 NSR/PSD permits

and enforcement issues and that are consistent with current regulatory requirements and operations.

Priority for travel funds will be distributed primarily to those agencies responsible for permitting sources and bringing enforcement actions.

2. State-to-State mentoring program

Develop and implement a state-to-state mentoring program for the purpose of improving the permitting of and enforcement against sources in priority sectors and promoting a level playing field across the country. This project would identify states that have demonstrated proficiency in producing high-quality, enforceable permits as potential mentors for state programs that are interested in reaching that level of performance. States who have taken the EPA-led training may also receive materials useful for mentoring additional personnel within the state or in other states. The grantee(s) would broker the pairing of mentors and mentees, utilizing the provided funding for any travel, training, and materials needed for the program. Training and materials may need to be developed and utilized to maximize the mentoring experience.

F. Focus Area – State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training

In FY2008, grant funding for this focus area will support a needs-based approach to designing, delivering, and evaluating environmental enforcement training to state enforcement personnel. 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.

The basis for 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.

In addition, applicants may propose the development and/or delivery of one or more courses that would address the needs of the 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.

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;

EPA is soliciting proposals from states, state consortiums, or other multi-state associations 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 may 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).
6. 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.netionline.com/>.

G. Focus Area – Demonstration of Better Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring Activities

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).

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.

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.

II. Award Information for the Focus Areas:

The funds available are from OECA's Multi-Media State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) appropriation for both grants and cooperative agreements. The total assistance agreement award to be funded is \$2,800,000 and will be awarded to selected proposals in the range of \$50,000 - \$200,000, although proposals below or above that range will be considered. EPA reserves the right to reject all applications and make no awards under this solicitation. 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 shall not propose projects requiring additional annual funding. Applicants can apply for an assistance agreement and EPA may determine that the proposal would require designation as a cooperative agreement if substantial federal involvement with the recipient during the performance of an activity or project is required. Substantial federal involvement could include: monitoring by EPA, joint operational involvement, EPA prior review or approval of project phases or collaboration regarding the scope of work. Please go to <http://www.epa.gov/ogd> for more guidance on when substantial involvement may be required and what that involvement might entail.

A. Partial Funding: In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund proposals by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund a proposal, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the proposal, or portion thereof, was evaluated and selected for

award, and therefore maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.

B. Additional Awards: EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement consistent with Agency policy, if additional funding becomes available. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than four months from the date of the original selection. EPA also reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards.

III. Eligibility Information:

A. Eligibility Information: 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. For certain competitive funding opportunities under this CFDA description, the Agency may limit eligibility to compete to a number or subset of eligible applicants consistent with the Agency's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy.

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.

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 complete 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 proposal. Moreover, the fact that a successful applicant has named a specific contractor or consultant in the proposal 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 proposal based on the firm's role in preparing the proposal.

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.

C. Cost Sharing Information: While not required, applicants are encouraged to make a

commitment of state or tribal resources towards the total project cost. Applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. This can be state or tribal personnel salary dedicated to the project, cash contribution to the project budget, or other “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.” Lastly, federal funds cannot generally be used to provide a match or cost-share for other federal projects.

THRESHOLD FACTORS

D. Substantial Compliance with Submission requirements: Applications/Proposals must substantially comply with the application/proposal submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this announcement or else they will be rejected. In addition, where a page limit is expressed in Section IV with respect to the proposal/application and /or parts of the application /proposal, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.

Applications/proposals must be received by the EPA through www.grants.gov on or before the solicitation closing data published in Section IV of this announcement. Applicants who do not meet this threshold factor will be notified within 15 days.

E. Proper focus areas: Applications that 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. Each application may only cover one focus area. These focus areas are: (1) Permit Compliance System (PCS) Modernization and ICIS-NPDES, (2) Tribal Compliance Assurance Training and Workshops, (3) Air Facility System (AFS), (4) [Development of a State-to-State](#) New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (NSR/PSD) Mentoring Program and Permit and Enforcement Training Support, (5) State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training and (6) Demonstration of Better Use of Technology in Compliance Monitoring Activities. The work in the proposals must address capacity building activities

F. Timely Applications: OECA will not review or fund any applications that are received electronically after July 8, 2008 (12 midnight Eastern Time) or that are received from ineligible applicants. Applicants who do not meet these threshold factors will be notified within 15 days.

IV. Application and Submission Information: Grant application packages must be submitted through www.grants.gov. The due date for submitting the package through www.grants.gov is July 8, 2008. All forms and application preparation and submission instructions are located at the www.grants.gov web site and are included below in sections A and C. Applicants without access to a computer should contact Ginger Gotliffe (202-564-7072) for alternative submission options.

A. Application Materials:

The application package must be made up of three items: SF 424, SF 424-A, and the Proposal Narrative. See Section IV. C for instructions on preparing the SF 424 and SF 424-A.

1. Submission Format for Proposals:

Proposals must not exceed 14 pages prepared in Microsoft Word or WordPerfect, and follow the format 12 point font, on 8 ½ by 11 inch paper. Proposals shall address the following information:

a. **Project Information to be included:**

- State or Tribe and Department:
- Title of Project:
- Focus Area: Section I:
- Total Funds Requested from EPA:
- Total Project Cost (including state/tribe cash and in-kind contributions):
- Contact Person: (*name, title, address, phone, fax, & email*)
- Preferred Assistance Agreement: (*Grant or cooperative agreement*)

b. **Summary:**

- Summary of the problem being addressed;
- Summary of project goal(s);
- Summary of project components;
- Summary of how the project components will address the problem and attain the goals.

c. **Summary Work Plan:**

- Proposed activities - list and describe activities and how they relate to the proposal criteria;
- Sharing results - how will the results of the project be shared across states or tribes?

d. Project Milestones: OECA is looking to fund projects for 3 years or less. List project milestones with estimated dates, including estimated duration of project.

e. **Project Costs:**

- Include a detailed itemized budget for all project costs and complete the SF 424A (budget information) -- distinguish the funds requested from any state or tribe contributions (in-kind or other)

f. **Addressing the Section V Ranking Criteria:**

Ranking criteria for each of the focus areas are presented in Section V below. Applicants must address all ranking criteria for the funding area for which they are applying in their proposal. In addition to the ranking criteria specific to the projects requested, there are several standard criteria that apply to all focus areas. These are past grants reporting, plan for measuring environmental results, and leveraging funds or resources. The plan for measuring environmental results must describe how the project will measure its results and success and how it will address the outputs and outcomes associated with each focus area in Section I of this Notice.

B. Submission Dates and Times

- July 8, 2008 (12 midnight Eastern Time)– Deadline for submitting application packages described in Section IV.A of the announcement to EPA or thru grants.gov.
- August 8, 2008 – Notifications sent to applicants regarding funding recommendations.
- First quarter FY2009 – Completed grant applications, certifications are due to EPA

regional office.

- First quarter FY2009 – Reprogram funding to appropriate Regions.
- First quarter FY2009 - Issuance of FY 2008 STAG Program awards.

C. Grants.gov submission: The electronic submission of your proposal/application must be made by an official representative of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on “Get Registered” on the left side of the page. *Note that the registration process may take a week or longer to complete.* If your organization is not currently registered with Grants.gov, please encourage your office to designate an AOR and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible.

To begin the proposal/application process under this grant announcement, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Apply for Grants” tab on the left side of the page. Then click on “Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package” to download the compatible Adobe viewer and obtain the application package. **To apply through grants.gov you must use Adobe Reader applications and download the compatible Adobe Reader version (Adobe Reader applications are available to download for free on the Grants.gov website. For more information on Adobe Reader please visit the Help section on grants.gov at**

<http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program_status.jsp).

Once you have downloaded the viewer, you may retrieve the application package by entering the Funding Opportunity Number, EPA-OECA-NPMAS-08-001, or the CFDA number that applies to the announcement (CFDA 66.709), in the appropriate field. You may also be able to access the proposal/application package by clicking on the Application button at the top right of the synopsis page for this announcement on <http://www.grants.gov> (to find the synopsis page, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Find Grant Opportunities” button on the left side of the page and then go to Search Opportunities and use the Browse by Agency feature to find EPA opportunities).

Application/Proposal Submission Deadline: Your organization’s AOR must submit your complete proposal/application electronically to EPA through Grants.gov (<http://www.grants.gov>) no later than July 8, 2008.

Please submit *all* of the proposal/application materials described below. To view the full funding announcement, go to <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/state/grants/stag/opportunities.html> or go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on “Find Grant Opportunities” on the left side of the page and then click on Search Opportunities/Browse by Agency and select Environmental Protection Agency.

Proposal/Application Materials

The following forms and documents are required to be submitted under this announcement:

- I. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

II. Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)

III. Narrative Proposal and Workplan as described in Section IV. A of this announcement.

The proposal/application 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 be sure to include organization fax number and email address in Block 5 of the Standard Form SF 424.

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.

II. Standard Form SF 424A – Budget Information:

Complete the form. There are no attachments.

The total amount of federal funding requested for the 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.

III. Narrative Proposal:

The proposal must address all components as described in Section IV.A. of this announcement.

The document should be readable in PDF, MS Word or Word Perfect WP6/7/8 for Windows and consolidated into a single file.

Application Preparation and Submission Instructions

Documents I through III listed under Proposal/Application Materials above should appear in the “Mandatory Documents” box on the Grants.gov Grant Application Package page.

For documents I and II, click on the appropriate form and then click “Open Form” below the box. The fields that must be completed will be highlighted in yellow. Optional fields and completed fields will be displayed in white. If you enter an invalid response or incomplete information in a field, you will receive an error message. When you have finished filling out each form, click “Save.” When you return to the electronic Grant Application Package page, click on the form you just completed, and then click on the box that says, “Move Form to Submission List.” This action will move the document over to the box that says, “Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission.”

For document III, you will need to attach electronic files. Prepare your narrative proposal as described above in Section IV.A of the announcement and save the document to your computer as an MS Word, PDF or WordPerfect file. When you are ready to attach your proposal to the application package, click on “Project Narrative Attachment Form,” and open the form. Click “Add Mandatory Project Narrative File,” and then attach your proposal (previously saved to your

computer) using the browse window that appears. You may then click “View Mandatory Project Narrative File” to view it. Enter a brief descriptive title of your project in the space beside “Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename;” the filename should be no more than 40 characters long. If there other attachments that you would like to submit to accompany your proposal, you may click “Add Optional Project Narrative File” and proceed as before. When you have finished attaching the necessary documents, click “Close Form.” When you return to the “Grant Application Package” page, select the “Project Narrative Attachment Form” and click “Move Form to Submission List.” The form should now appear in the box that says, “Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission.”

Once you have finished filling out all of the forms/attachments and they appear in one of the “Completed Documents for Submission” boxes, click the “Save” button that appears at the top of the Web page. It is suggested that you save the document a second time, using a different name, since this will make it easier to submit an amended package later if necessary. Please use the following format when saving your file: “Applicant Name – FY08 – Assoc Prog Supp – 1st Submission” or “Applicant Name – FY 08 Assoc Prog Supp – Back-up Submission.” If it becomes necessary to submit an amended package at a later date, then the name of the 2nd submission should be changed to “Applicant Name – FY08 Assoc Prog Supp – 2nd Submission.”

Once your proposal/application package has been completed and saved, send it to your AOR for submission to U.S. EPA through Grants.gov. Please advise your AOR to close all other software programs before attempting to submit the application package through Grants.gov.

In the “Application Filing Name” box, your AOR should enter your organization’s name (abbreviate where possible), the fiscal year (e.g., FY08), and the grant category (e.g., Assoc Prog Supp). The filing name should not exceed 40 characters. From the “Grant Application Package” page, your AOR may submit the application package by clicking the “Submit” button that appears at the top of the page. The AOR will then be asked to verify the agency and funding opportunity number for which the application package is being submitted. If problems are encountered during the submission process, the AOR should reboot his/her computer before trying to submit the application package again. [It may be necessary to turn off the computer (not just restart it) before attempting to submit the package again.] If the AOR continues to experience submission problems, he/she may contact Grants.gov for assistance by phone at 1-800-518-4726 or email at <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or contact Ginger Gotliffe (202-564-7072).

Application/proposal packages submitted thru grants.gov will be time/date stamped electronically.

If you have not received a confirmation of receipt from EPA (*not from grants.gov*) within 30 days of the proposal/application deadline, please contact Ginger Gotliffe (202-564-7072). Failure to do so may result in your proposal/application not being reviewed.

D. Intergovernmental Review: Not applicable

E. Treatment of Late Proposals/Application

OECA will not review or fund any application packages that are received electronically after

July 8, 2008 (12 midnight Eastern Time) or that are received from ineligible applicants.

F. Confidential Business Information Provision

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their application/proposal as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark applications/proposals or portions of applications/proposals 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.

G. Additional Application Submissions at the Time of Selection.

After the grant proposals have been reviewed and the selections have been made, the grantees selected will need to provide the remainder of the grant/cooperative agreement application. Those items can also be submitted or through www.grants.gov. Some of the standard forms may not be applicable to all grantees and will not need to be submitted. Further submission instructions will be provided at that time.

H. Pre-proposal/Application Assistance and Communications

In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals, provide informal comments on draft proposals, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their applications/proposals. However, EPA will respond to questions in writing from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission for the proposal, and requests for clarification about the announcement. Applicants may submit those questions to Ginger Gotliffe (gotliffe.ginger@epa.gov) by June 10, 2008 and the answers will be added to the Frequently Asked Questions web page at <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/state/grants/stag/index.html>.

Management Fees

Management Fees: When formulating budgets for proposals/applications, 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

Contracts and Subawards:

a. Can funding be used for the applicant to make subawards, acquire contract services, or fund 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.

Funding may be used to provide subgrants or subawards of financial assistance, which includes using subawards or subgrants 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. Applicants must compete contracts for services and products, including consultant contracts, and conduct cost and price analyses, to the extent required by the procurement provisions of the regulations at 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify subawardees/subgrantees and/or contractors (including consultants) in their proposal/application. However, if they do, the fact that an applicant selected for award has named a specific subawardee/subgrantee, contractor, or consultant in the proposal/application EPA selects for funding does not relieve the applicant of its obligations to comply with subaward/subgrant and/or competitive procurement requirements as appropriate. Please note that applicants may not award sole source contracts to consulting, engineering or other firms assisting applicants with the proposal solely based on the firm's role in preparing the proposal/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. Applicants acquiring commercial goods or services must comply with the competitive procurement standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR Part 31.36 and cannot use a subaward/subgrant as the funding mechanism.

b. How will an applicant's proposed subawardees/subgrantees and contractors be considered during the evaluation process described in Section V of the announcement?

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, as 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.

V. Application Review Information

Section V provides information about the evaluation criteria, the additional selection factors as well as the review and selection process. Evaluation ranking criteria for each focus area under this Solicitation are provided in this Section. These criteria highlight the important factors and information that must be provided in the pre-proposal. The reviewers of the proposals will be using these criteria and the corresponding point values during the selection process.

A. Ranking Criteria

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

All PCS Modernization proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the criteria outlined below. The following six criteria and associated points will be used by EPA to evaluate the proposals:

(a) Data Clean up and Migration. [25 points] The proposal must clearly describe the plan and approach for data clean up in PCS, especially how data on minor facilities will be improved. The proposal must clearly describe any quality assurance checks planned for development to ensure the improvement of the quality of the minor data entered into PCS and/or ICIS-NPDES. The proposal must clearly describe 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. The proposal must clearly describe activities related to the coordination needed between EPA and the states or tribes to ensure the data migration effort is completed. The proposal must clearly describe the plans for tracking and determining the status of the data migration and data clean-up efforts. The proposal must show how this work would enhance the state or tribal ability to manage the NPDES program including, assessing environmental conditions and results.

(b) Requirements Analyses and Pilot Studies. [25 points] The proposal must clearly describe the plan and approach for performing the requirements analysis or pilot study, especially how the effort will support the state's completion of entry of data requirement into ICIS-NPDES.

The proposal must clearly describe the state/tribal process for collecting and entering the required data into ICIS. The proposal must 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. The proposal must clearly describe the activities to be performed to ensure that the state/tribal process for the collection and entry/flow of the required ICIS data is reasonable and doable. The proposal must clearly describe activities related to the coordination needed between EPA and the states or tribes. The proposal must clearly describe the plans for tracking and determining the status of the analysis or study. The proposal must show how this work would enhance the state or tribal ability to manage the NPDES program including, assessing environmental conditions and results.

(c) Use of ICIS. [25 points] Proposals must clearly identify the state or tribal activities to be performed that will ensure the states or tribes continue to meet their regulatory NPDES requirements to report to EPA. Activities identified must include how the states and tribes will ensure continued data flow and data entry to ICIS and how the states or tribes will implement business practices to fulfill meeting new data requirements (i.e., wet weather). The proposal must clearly describe the analyses or studies to be conducted to support the state's full use of the modernized system.

(d) Plan for Measuring Environmental Results [15 points] Quality of the plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes including those listed in Section I of the announcement. Reviewers will also focus on 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.

(e) Past Performance for Environmental Results. [5 points] Applicants will be evaluated based on how well they documented and/or reported (e.g., by filing timely progress/final technical reports; or by otherwise demonstrating how they adequately documented and reported) on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes (e.g., results) under assistance agreements awarded within the last 5 years and; if they were not making such progress whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explained why not. In evaluating applicants under this factor, the Agency will consider the information supplied by the applicant in its proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files (e.g., Grantee Compliance Database) and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant.) Applicants with OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of those grants and use them to comply with this section. Applicants without OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of all EPA and other Federal agency assistance agreements that your organization performed within the last five years that were similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project and use those assistance agreements to comply with this section. Applicants without any prior assistance agreement experience must provide a statement of that and will receive a neutral score for this factor.

(f) Leveraging Funds and Resources. [5 points] While not required, applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. Under this criteria, 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 compliment 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 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).

2. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria for Tribal Environmental Compliance and

Enforcement Training: All tribal training proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the six criteria outlined below.

(a) Experience in Developing and Delivering Training and Workshops for Tribal Environmental Professionals and Tribal Leaders [35 points]:

- **Expertise** [10 points]: Evidence of adequate environmental staff already on board or the ability to locate and contract/employ with training or tribal organizations that have staff with clear expertise in: 1) developing new or reviewing and revising existing training/material on compliance assistance, compliance monitoring, and enforcement matters; or 2) developing and running training/workshops on tribal environmental and governmental programs. Adequacy demonstrated by existing or planned environmental knowledge about the proposed activity and the ability to conduct the proposed activity.
- Select the one that corresponds to the project selected from Section I.B.: [15 points]

Inspector Training Project: Evidence that the recipient understands the training standards applicable to tribal and EPA inspectors and inspectors authorized by EPA to conduct inspections on behalf of EPA. Evidence of understanding would include information on how the course content would be consistent with EPA guidelines and how the course content would be consistent with tribal approaches to conducting inspections. See the Guidance for Issuing Federal EPA Inspector Credentials to Authorize Employees of State/Tribal Governments to Conduct Inspections on Behalf of EPA. (Contact: Julie Tankersley at tankersely.julie@epa.gov or Jonathan Binder at binder.jonathan@epa.gov for Guidance) **OR**

General Compliance Assurance Enforcement Workshop: Evidence the recipient understands tribal and EPA roles and responsibilities to ensure compliance in Indian country and other tribal areas, and EPA-approval of tribes and state environmental programs to ensure environmental compliance for facilities located within their jurisdiction. Evidence the recipient understands current interpretations and applications of federal, tribal, and state laws and policies related to ensuring environmental compliance in Indian country. See EPA's regulations on approving state programs and treating tribes in the same manner as states, EPA's Anti-Checkerboarding Policy, EPA Policy for the Administration Of Environmental Programs on Indian Reservations (November, 8, 1984), and the Enforcement Guidance on the 1984 Indian Policy (January 20, 2001). (Contact

Jonathan Binder at binder.jonathan@epa.gov for information)

- Tribal Experience and Relationships. [10 points] Evidence that the recipient has experience training tribal leaders and tribal environmental professionals in a culturally sensitive manner, including the ability to recruit tribal and non-tribal course or workshop instructors, to support improved tribal compliance assurance and enforcement programs and the EPA Policy for the Administration of Environmental Programs on Indian Reservations, Enforcement Guidance on the 1984 Indian Policy, and the EPA Working Effectively with Tribal Governments Training. Evidence in the ability to develop and maintain meaningful relationships and acceptance by tribal governments and tribal members and collaboration with EPA.

(b) Project Description and Organizational Capability [20 Points]

Extent to which the proposal effectively addresses and demonstrates:

- Knowledge and experience related to compliance assistance, compliance monitoring, and enforcement in Indian country both under federal and tribal environmental laws and regulations, including how tribes and EPA conduct inspections in Indian country, provide compliance assistance, and conduct enforcement activity
 - Include knowledge and experience related to environmental challenges and conditions in Indian country that can be addressed through compliance assistance, compliance monitoring, or enforcement.
- Significant knowledge of, and experience with, the federally-recognized Indian tribes that the applicant would be working with.
 - For proposals dealing with tribes located in Alaska, knowledge and understanding of current interpretations of the following: Federally-recognized Tribes in Alaska, Alaska Native Corporations, Alaska Native Villages, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, EPA-approval of state of Alaska environmental programs, Indian country in Alaska (as defined in 18 USC § 1151), and Alaska v. Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government, 522 U.S. 520 (1998).
 - For proposals dealing with tribes located in Oklahoma, knowledge and understanding of current interpretations of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 (SAFE-TE).
- Significant knowledge of, and experience with, federally-recognized Indian tribes, tribal sovereignty, including the interplay between Federal environmental laws, Federal Indian law, and tribal, and state environmental laws in the compliance assistance, compliance monitoring, and enforcement context (e.g., the Federal Trust Relationship, Montana v. United States, 450 US 544(1981) and subsequent case law, the EPA Policy for the Administration of Environmental Programs on Indian Reservations, and OECA's National Tribal Compliance Assurance Priority (<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/data/planning/priorities/tribal.html>)).
 - For proposals dealing with tribes located in Alaska, knowledge and understanding of current interpretations of the following: Federally-recognized Tribes in Alaska, Alaska Native Corporations, Alaska Native Villages, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, EPA-approval of state of Alaska environmental programs, Indian country in Alaska (as defined in 18 USC X 1151), and Alaska v. Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government, 522 U.S. 520 (1998).

- For proposals dealing with tribes located in Oklahoma, knowledge and understanding of current interpretations of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 (SAFE-TE).
- Knowledge and experience in managing similar training programs or workshops and how administration of the proposed project will further the recipient's mission.
- The budget and work plan time frame is clearly stated, detailed, and appropriate to achieve the project's objectives.

(c) Plan for Measuring Environmental Results [15 Points]

- Quality of the plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes including those listed in Section I of the announcement. Reviewers will also focus on 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.
- An effective method to identify pre-training/workshop knowledge about the information to be conveyed and post-test understanding of the information conveyed.
- An effective method for tracking the number of tribal environmental professionals and tribal leaders trained or attending the workshop(s).
- An effective method of tracking the post-training/workshop activities of attendees, and changes in the number and methods of tribes carrying out compliance assurance and enforcement activities in Indian country

(d) Location, Marketing, and Reach [20 Points] Applicant's ability to provide training or hold workshops for tribal environmental professionals and tribal leaders in locations that will allow multiple tribes to participate and yet be in or near Indian country where possible. Proximity is important to successful performance under this grant because close contact and demonstration of accessibility indicates an ability to ensure participation of a diverse pool of tribal environmental professionals from multiple tribes and impacts travel costs associated with travel to/from the training.

- Applicant's choice of location for training and workshops and number of tribes that will be addressed through that training or workshops. Locations will be evaluated by number of tribes/attendees that will be addressed at that location versus the cost of travel to that location. Proposals addressing Alaska may stand alone.
- Applicant's ability to ensure that tribes located within the geographic region chosen by the applicant to address, obtain information about the training activities (dates, costs, potential training needs) and have the ability to attend the training.
- Experience developing and delivering training courses or workshops in lecture and interactive formats or developing and delivering information in a manner accessible to tribal environmental professionals.

(e) Leveraging Funds and Resources: [5 points]

While not required, applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. Under this criteria, 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 compliment 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 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).

(f) Past Performance for Environmental Results [5 Points]

Applicants will be evaluated based on how well they documented and/or reported (e.g., by filing timely progress/final technical reports; or by otherwise demonstrating how they adequately documented and reported) on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes (e.g., results) under assistance agreements awarded within the last 5 years and; if they were not making such progress whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explained why not. In evaluating applicants under this factor, the Agency will consider the information supplied by the applicant in its proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files (e.g., Grantee Compliance Database) and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant.) Applicants with OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of those grants and use them to comply with this section. Applicants without OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of all EPA and other Federal agency assistance agreements that your organization performed within the last five years that were similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project and use those assistance agreements to comply with this section. Applicants without any prior assistance agreement experience must provide a statement of that and will receive a neutral score for this factor.

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

All AFS proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the criteria outlined below. The following six criteria and associated points will be used by EPA to evaluate the proposals:

(a) Existing Use of AFS. [20 points] The proposal must 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. The proposal should describe how the agency is reporting all Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) and any existing process for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of data entry requirements;

(b) Project Plan and Approach. [20 points] The proposal must describe the project plan and approach by indicating which focus area is applied for: The Study/Analysis of the Universal Interface, Technical Assistance for the Improvement of AFS Data Flow, or UI Training and Technical Assistance. The proposal must include a Summary Plan for the project indicating the resources used for each project phase, federal interaction required, and an estimated length of time for the project.

(c) Burden Reduction and Cost Savings. [20 points] The proposal must describe estimated burden reductions and cost savings to the agency through development and use of the proposed project.

(d) Quality Improvements. [25 points] The proposal must 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. The Plan for Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results from the Summary Plan will be also be used for evaluation and ranking of this criteria.

(e) Past Performance for Environmental Results. [10 points] Applicants will be evaluated based on how well they documented and/or reported (e.g., by filing timely progress/final technical reports; or by otherwise demonstrating how they adequately documented and reported) on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes (e.g., results) under assistance agreements awarded within the last 5 years and; if they were not making such progress whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explained why not. In evaluating applicants under this factor, the Agency will consider the information supplied by the applicant in its proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files (e.g., Grantee Compliance Database) and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant.) Applicants with OECA STAG grants history should submit a list of those grants and use them to comply with this section. Applicants without OECA STAG grants history should submit a list of all EPA and other Federal agency assistance agreements that your organization performed within the last five years that were similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project and use those assistance agreements to comply with this section. Applicants without any prior assistance agreement experience should provide a statement of that and will receive a neutral score for this factor.

(f) Leveraged Funds. [5 points] While not required, applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. Under this criteria, 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 compliment 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 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)

4. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria for NSR/PSD Development of a State-to-State Mentoring Program and Permit and Enforcement Training Support:

All proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the six criteria outlined below:

(a) Experience in Developing and Delivering Mentoring Programs and Training Support for State and Local Air Pollution Control Agencies [30 points]:

- Expertise [10 points]: 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 as well as developing and establishing a state-to-state mentoring program.

- Focus on Enforcement/Permitting Relationship [10 points]: Evidence that the recipient organization has experience working with state and local CAA agencies in both the permitting and enforcement capacity.
- State Mentoring Experience and Relationships [10 points]: Evidence that the grantee has experience developing mentoring programs for state and local CAA agencies.

(b) Project Description and Organizational Capability [25 Points]:

The extent to which the proposal effectively addresses and demonstrates:

- Knowledge and experience related to compliance assistance, compliance monitoring, and enforcement of CAA regulations.
- Knowledge and experience related to environmental challenges and conditions in CAA NSR/PSD permitting that can be addressed through compliance assistance, compliance monitoring, or enforcement.
- Significant knowledge of, and experience with, the state and local air agencies which are responsible for NSR/PSD permitting and compliance.
- Significant knowledge of, and experience with, developing a program to distribute funds for travel or tuition expenses to the various state and local agencies. The demonstrated ability to differentiate between the optimal needs of various agencies. The ability to evaluate different States' permit programs and assess the best environmental outcome of funds disbursement.
- Knowledge and experience in managing state-to-state mentoring program or other air permit and compliance programs which focus on the relationship between permits and enforceability,
- Ability to identify and provide a listing of any training providers that the grantee may utilize and whose courses address the NSR/PSD permitting and enforcement programs and issues addressed by this focus area. These training classes must be consistent with current regulatory requirements and operations.

(c) Plan for Measuring Environmental Results [15 Points]:

The Plan for measuring environmental results will be evaluated by the:

- Quality of the plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes. Reviewers will also focus on the degree to which the proposal contains clear measures of success and a timeline for the project(s), and provides a description of the format in which these measurements will be reported.
- Effectiveness of the method for tracking the number of states and environmental professionals participating in the mentoring program.
- Effectiveness of the method of tracking the post-mentoring activities of attendees, and changes in the actions of those trained through the state-to-state program.

(d) Location, Marketing, and Reach [20 Points]

- The location, marketing and reach will be evaluated by the applicant's ability to provide information about the state-to-state mentoring program and organize the distribution of tuition and/or travel funds for training programs and for travel required under the mentoring program. It is important to be in close contact and demonstrate accessibility with

other states in order to ensure participation of a diverse pool of environmental professionals and to mitigate travel costs associated with the program.

(e) Leveraging Funds and Resources: [5 points]

- While not required, applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. Under this criteria, 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 compliment 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 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).

(f) Past Performance for Environmental Results [5 Points]

- Applicants will be evaluated based on how well they documented and/or reported (*e.g.*, by filing timely progress/final technical reports; or by otherwise demonstrating how they adequately documented and reported) on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes (*e.g.*, results) under assistance agreements awarded within the last 5 years and; if they were not making such progress whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explained why not. In evaluating applicants under this factor, the Agency will consider the information supplied by the applicant in its proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files (*e.g.*, Grantee Compliance Database) and prior/current grantors (*e.g.*, to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant.) Applicants with OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of those grants and use them to comply with this section. Applicants without OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of all EPA and other Federal agency assistance agreements that your organization performed within the last five years that were similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project and use those assistance agreements to comply with this section. Applicants without any prior assistance agreement experience must provide a statement of that and will receive a neutral score for this factor.

5. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria for State Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training : All proposals will be evaluated and ranked based on the six criteria outlined below.

(a) Experience and Expertise in Needs Identification, Developing, Delivering, and Evaluating Training and Workshops for State Environmental Professionals [35 points]:

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 demonstrated by existing or planned knowledge about the proposed activity and the ability to conduct the proposed activity.

(b) Project Description, Alignment with Existing Evaluation of State Program Needs, and Organizational Capability [20 Points]

Extent to which the proposal effectively addresses and demonstrates:

- Knowledge and experience related to compliance assistance and incentives, compliance monitoring, and enforcement both under federal and state environmental laws and regulations,
- Knowledge and experience in managing training programs or workshops and how administration of the proposed project will further the recipient's mission,
- Experience developing and delivering training courses or workshops in lecture and interactive formats or developing and delivering workshops that are accessible to state environmental professionals,
- Alignment with training needs reported in State program evaluation/oversight materials,
- The budget and work plan time frame is clearly stated, detailed, and appropriate to achieve the project's objectives,
- The extent the project 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.

(c) Plan for Measuring Environmental Results [15 Points]

Quality of the plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes including those listed in Section I of the announcement.

Reviewers will also focus on 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.

- An effective method to identify pre-training/workshop knowledge about the information to be conveyed and post-test understanding of the information conveyed.
- An effective method for tracking the number of state environmental professionals trained or attending the workshop(s).
- An effective method or proposal for tracking the post-training/workshop activities of attendees.

(d) Location, Marketing, and Reach [20 Points]

- Applicant's ability to provide training or hold workshops for state environmental professionals in locations that will allow targeted states to attend.
- Applicant's ability to ensure that potential students located within the geographic region chosen by the applicant to address, obtain information about the training activities (dates, costs, potential training needs) and have the ability to attend the training.

(e) Leveraging Funds and Resources: [5 points]

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 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).

(f) Past Performance for Environmental Results [5 Points]

Applicants will be evaluated based on how well they documented and/or reported (e.g., by filing timely progress/final technical reports; or by otherwise demonstrating how they adequately documented and reported) on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes (e.g., results) under assistance agreements awarded within the last 5 years and; if they were not making such progress whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explained why not. In evaluating applicants under this factor, the Agency will consider the information supplied by the applicant in its proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files (e.g., Grantee Compliance Database) and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant.) Applicants with OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of those grants and use them to comply with this section. Applicants without OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of all EPA and other Federal agency assistance agreements that your organization performed within the last five years that were similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project and use those assistance agreements to comply with this section. Applicants without any prior assistance agreement experience must provide a statement of that and will receive a neutral score for this factor.

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

All proposals will be evaluation and ranked based on the six criteria outlined below.

(a) Workflow Process and Requirements Analysis. [25 points] The proposal must clearly describe the plan and approach for analyzing the compliance monitoring workflow process for the specified inspection program. The proposal must clearly describe the compliance monitoring activities (as suggested in Focus Area description) that will be considered for automation. The proposal must describe how automation of the identified inspection activities could potentially benefit from automation. The proposal must 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. The proposal must clearly describe the plan for determining the most appropriate hardware and software for the demonstration.

(b) Usability and Expandability. [25 points] The proposal must include a plan for training and supporting inspectors in the proper use of the hardware and software provided. The proposal must 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. The proposal

must 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. 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.

(c) Project Work Plan Description. [25 points] 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.

(d) Plan for Measuring Environmental Results. [15 points] The proposal must explain how completion of the proposed project is expected to improve the cost, timeliness, accuracy, and/or completeness of the compliance monitoring and enforcement process and how these improvements and benefits will be measured. Reviewers will evaluate the quality of the plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes including those listed in Section I of the announcement. Reviewers will also focus on 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.

(e) Past Performance for Environmental Results. [5 points] Applicants will be evaluated based on how well they documented and/or reported (e.g., by filing timely progress/final technical reports; or by otherwise demonstrating how they adequately documented and reported) on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes (e.g., results) under assistance agreements awarded within the last 5 years and; if they were not making such progress whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explained why not. In evaluating applicants under this factor, the Agency will consider the information supplied by the applicant in its proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files (e.g., Grantee Compliance Database) and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant.) Applicants with OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of those grants and use them to comply with this section. Applicants without OECA STAG grants history must submit a list of all EPA and other Federal agency assistance agreements that your organization performed within the last five years that were similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project and use those assistance agreements to comply with this section. Applicants without any prior assistance agreement experience must provide a statement of that and will receive a neutral score for this factor.

(f) Leveraging Funds and Resources. [5 points] While not required, applicants will be evaluated on their ability to produce leveraging funds. Under this criteria, 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 compliment 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 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).

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 are initially reviewed for meeting the threshold requirements using the eligibility criteria (Section III) after which regional reviewers will conduct an initial relevancy review. 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. These recommendations will be submitted to the Approving Official. The Approving Official will have the final authority to make the selection. The review process is designed to evaluate each application for the potential grantees' ability to demonstrate how they will fulfill the requirements in each criteria category. 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

Notices will be made by August 8, 2008. The applicant will then need to complete the full application through www.grants.gov.

B. Reporting

Awarded recipients will be required to submit semi-annual and final progress reports to their project officer and to Ginger Gotliffe, at gotliffe.ginger@epa.gov or (202) 564-7072. Information topics to be covered will be e-mailed to all recipients. Recipients will also be required to complete annual financial status reports. All reports must be prepared in either Word or WordPerfect formats and delivered electronically to the appropriate project officer.

C. 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](#)

VII. Agency Contacts: Questions about this solicitation notice or the grant program in general may be addressed to Ginger Gotliffe, at gotliffe.ginger@epa.gov or (202) 564-7072.

VIII. Other Information:

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 .