US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

2005 Requests for Initial Proposals (RFIP)

Agency Name: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9, Office of Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste

Funding Opportunity Name: Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT)
Announcement Type: Initial solicitation dated 6/7/2005

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number: 66.717

Important Anticipated Dates:

June 7, 2005 – RFIP Issued.
June 22, 2005 – Submit written questions regarding the solicitation to EPA
June 29, 2005 – Written questions and responses regarding the RFIP will be posted to *www.epa.gov/region09/funding/epeat-faq.html*; any modifications to the RFIP will be posted on *www.epa.gov/region09/funding/epeat.html* and *www.fedgrants.gov*.
July 29, 2005 – Deadline for proposals received through US Mail or overnight delivery – hand delivery, fax or electronic submission of proposals are not allowed-See Section IV for further information
August 15, 2005 – Initial selection of finalists identified and those finalists are contacted to schedule teleconference interview
August 30, 2005 – all finalist interviews conducted
September 9, 2005 – selection of applicant for award, and applicant will be requested to submit a formal application package. Schedule may be modified based on the level of response.
September 30, 2005 – Grant application and workplan must be submitted to EPA.
October 30, 2005 – Award made

Overview

US EPA is soliciting initial proposals for the Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) program. This cooperative agreement supports the coordination and acceleration of investigations, training, demonstrations, surveys and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction and elimination of pollution that impact multiple environmental media. The purpose of this program is to provide funding for the final development and demonstration of a system to assist institutional purchasers in evaluating and selecting environmentally preferable electronic products. This cooperative agreement will be issued under the authority of the Solid Waste Disposal Act Section 8001(a). EPA is offering up to $300,000 over three years for this program. Only one award will be made. EPA requires applicants to provide matching funds of at least 5% of the requested federal funding.

Contents of Full Text Announcement:

I. Funding opportunity description
II. Award information
III. Eligibility information
IV. Application and submission information
V. Application review information
VI. Award administration information
VII. Agency contacts
VIII. Other information

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool: 2005 Request for Initial Proposals

Full Text Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

The purpose of this grant assistance program is to provide funding for the completion and pilot testing of a system to assist institutional purchasers in identifying and selecting environmentally preferable electronic products. This cooperative agreement will build on the work developed through the EPEAT (the Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool) Project, a multi-stakeholder consensus decision-making process that was funded by U.S. EPA and managed by a grantee, the Zero Waste Alliance. The goal of this RFIP is to select an organization that will implement the system developed under the EPEAT project

A. Introduction

The development of EPEAT was prompted by a growing demand by institutional purchasers for an easy-to-use evaluation tool that allows the comparison and selection of electronic products based on environmental performance. Institutional purchasers are increasingly interested in using procurement policies to reward the design and manufacture of electronic products that pose fewer environmental risks. Until the development of EPEAT, these "green" procurement initiatives were largely uncoordinated and often did not take a life cycle approach to the environmental impacts posed by electronic products. Manufacturers were frustrated by the proliferation of complex and conflicting requirements. In addition, purchasers do not have the resources or technical expertise to develop and evaluate complex environmental information.

The electronics industry welcomed and actively participated in the development of EPEAT and envisioned EPEAT as a way to communicate relevant and meaningful information to institutional purchasers about the environmental impacts posed by electronic products. This RFIP is issued because there is a need to identify a host organization that can finalize and pilot test the EPEAT approach to harness the significant purchasing power of institutional purchasers.

B. Program History

EPEAT has been developed through a multi-stakeholder consensus decision-making process that was funded by U.S. EPA and managed by a grantee, the Zero Waste Alliance. The stakeholders worked in a Development Team for 18 months to balance competing interests. The Development Team decided on both a structural design for the Assessment Tool - the way it will function - and the environmental criteria. The process was guided by the following principles agreed upon by all the stakeholders:

- Purchasers want a single source of information about all products that meet the environmental criteria. Manufacturers want a single place that they can go to have their products qualified. Both purchasers and manufacturers did not want several, competing environmental standards that could confuse the marketplace and make compliance more difficult.

- The stakeholders agreed on a system whereby manufacturers would self-declare that their products meet a set of defined environmental criteria. To validate the efficacy of the system, a sample of the listed products would go through a verification process to ensure the accuracy of the self-declarations. This approach assures that the system causes no delay in time to market, while it protects the credibility of the system.
- The environmental criteria set a standard of environmental leadership, that is, as is the case with Energy Star, only the environmentally best products will meet the criteria.
- The environmental criteria are developed through a consensus process of knowledgeable professionals from a variety of fields representing a balance of the stakeholder interests. Thus the criteria taken as a whole represent the consensus viewpoint of an environmentally preferable product. Though the criteria are based on scientific and life cycle perspectives of the stakeholders, each criterion has not been, and need not be, tested against rigorous scientific or life cycle analyses.

EPEAT will offer many benefits for institutional purchasers, manufacturers, and the environment, including:

Providing institutional purchasers with:

- An easy way to specify and purchase computer products that meet challenging yet realistic environmental criteria simply by requiring that the equipment be EPEAT-qualified.
- An efficient and credible means for verifying that equipment meets the criteria.
- Flexibility to select equipment that meets the minimum performance criteria or to give preference to models with higher levels of environmental performance by specifying a higher EPEAT qualification level.
- Credibility for the procurement decisions since the EPEAT criteria were developed through a consensus process that balanced the concerns of purchasers, industry, environmental groups and other stakeholders.
- Assurance that the same set of criteria is used by purchasers nationwide to ensure competitive product pricing, consistent availability and significant impact on the industry and the environment.

Providing manufacturers with:

- One clear set of performance criteria for the design of products and services.
- Flexibility as to how they meet the higher levels of EPEAT qualification.
- A market advantage for environmentally preferable products.
- A low cost, user friendly system which will not delay the process for getting a new product to market.

Providing environmental stakeholders with:

- A credible assessment of electronic products based on environmental criteria.
- A system that promotes the continuous improvement of environmental performance across the entire lifecycle of electronic products.

The EPEAT Project was an 18 month-long multi-stakeholder process. The EPEAT Development Team was composed of stakeholders that represented manufacturers, trade

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

associations, institutional purchasers, environmental organizations, electronics recyclers, academics, and others. The development process followed the essential requirements developed by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), which dictate openness, balance, consideration of all views, and consensus decision making.

The EPEAT system includes the following elements, which will be provided to the selected organization after grant award:

- an easy to use web based interface system that allows manufacturers to self-declare that their products meet certain environmental criteria, and that allows purchasers access to that information. This is currently under development by the Mid-Atlantic Recycling Center for End-of-Life Electronics (MARCEE).
- a scoring system that recognizes three tiers of environmental performance
- a system for verifying that products meet the stated claims
- background and marketing materials to inform manufacturers and purchasers about the system
- a draft set of environmental criteria that will be finalized by an ANSI accredited Standards Development Organization.
- an evaluation tool to help identify the environmental benefits associated with products that meet the environmental criteria (currently under development by University of Tennessee Center for Clean Products and Technologies, with an anticipated completion date of December 2005)

C. Program Goals

EPA is issuing this RFIP as one of two major efforts to implement the EPEAT approach. The draft criteria developed in EPEAT will be finalized through a Standards Development Organization accredited by ANSI. The organizational aspects of the tool - product registration, verification, and spot checking, and marketing to procurement officials - will be implemented through this RFIP. The selected organization will be expected to build on the work completed by the EPEAT Development Team to create, pilot test, implement, and manage the tool with manufacturers and purchasers. It will also be expected to work closely with the existing EPEAT Implementation Team to make the transition, and to maintain active involvement of the EPEAT stakeholders.

D. Background information needed to respond to this RFIP

Applicants will need to be familiar with the history and outcomes of the EPEAT project. As described in Section V below, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to implement the processes and tools developed by the EPEAT Development Team. Therefore, in order to be able to fully address the Section V evaluation criteria, applicants must refer to the following documents available at *www.epeat.net* (if there is any difficulty accessing these materials, please contact John Katz at the email below).

1. Description of How EPEAT Will Work
2. EPEAT Frequently Asked Questions
3. EPEAT Development Team final report
4. Specifications of the web-based product registration system
5. Project description of the environmental benefits calculator
6. Draft environmental criteria

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

For questions regarding the EPEAT process, stakeholders, history, or other background not addressed in the documents above, contact John Katz (katz.john@epa.gov) or Holly Elwood (elwood.holly@epa.gov).

E. Linkage to EPA's Strategic Plan

This project furthers the EPA's Strategic Plan Goal 5 Objective 2 - Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Innovation by reducing the impact of purchasing decisions made by government (Subobjective 5.2.1) and businesses (Subobjective 5.2.2). It also promotes Goal 3, Objective 1 - Reducing and Recycling Waste through Innovative Partnerships and Product Stewardship, by giving purchasers a tool to evaluate the entire life cycle of the products they purchase. Finally, the program supports the Cross Goal Strategy to promote innovative partnerships to achieve environmental results. Applicants may view the objective and sub-objectives by visiting *www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm*.

F. Expected outputs and outcomes:

The main output expected from this cooperative agreement is a functioning tool that allows purchasers to identify and select electronic products that meet a specified set of environmental criteria. A successful project will ensure that the tool is widely available, that it meets the principles agreed upon by stakeholders in the EPEAT Project, and that is being used by both purchasers and manufacturers.

Specific outputs and outcomes include:

Output

- functioning web based tool that allows manufacturers to declare how their products meet certain environmental criteria
- guidance documents for manufacturers and purchasers on how to use the tool
- marketing and outreach efforts and materials to gain acceptance of the tool by purchasers and manufacturers
- successful pilot test of the tool by manufacturers (no more than 9) and purchasers

Outcomes

- number of manufacturers (no more than 9) willing to pilot test the process to self declare how their products meet specified environmental criteria
- number of products registered on the project web site.
- number of purchasers (no more than 9) willing to pilot using the tool to review and select products
- volume (in number of units) of products that meet the specified environmental criteria purchased by participating purchasers.
- estimates of the environmental benefits resulting from those purchases

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

II. Award Information

US EPA Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Pollution Prevention Division, and the Officer of Solid Waste, intends to award approximately $300,000 to one applicant under this announcement through a cooperative assistance agreement. It is expected that the agreement will be incrementally funded. The first phase (Phase 1) of funding will be approximately $100,000 for the first year, to support finalization and piloting of the EPEAT system. Additional funding (Phase 2) up to approximately $200,000 may be available in following years depending on performance of Phase 1 and the availability of funding. Applicants should submit a workplan and budget encompassing both Phase 1 and 2, for the full $300,000 amount. One award will be made under this announcement. The anticipated award date will be October 30, 2005. The duration of the project should be no longer than 3 years, at the potential funding level of approximately $100,000 per year.

As a cooperative agreement, EPA will have a "substantial involvement" in the project. This will include participation in selecting pilot project participants (both purchasers and manufacturers), providing technical guidance to the recipient regarding outreach and marketing to purchasers, and ensuring that all stakeholders are included in development of the final tool.

Awards will be made through a competitive process. EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and to not make any awards under this announcement. Award of this cooperative agreement is contingent on the availability of funds. In addition, EPA reserves the right to partially fund proposals by funding discrete activities, projects, or phases of proposed proposals. If EPA decides to partially fund proposals, 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 that maintains the integrity of the competition and evaluation/selection process. EPA is not bound by any estimates in this announcement.

In certain circumstances costs incurred prior to the grant award may be eligible for reimbursement. However, this does not include any costs associated with responding to this RFP or in finalizing the application package. Please note that Research is ineligible for funding as well as other ineligible costs outlined in 40 CFR Parts 30 and 31, and applicable Office of Management and Budget Circulars.

III. Eligibility Information

EPA is soliciting proposals from states, the District of Columbia, any territory or possession of the U.S., Federally recognized Tribal governments, local governments, independent school district governments, universities, non-profits, and community-based grassroots organizations. For-profit entities are not eligible. Non-profit organizations that meet the definition under Section 4 of OMB Circular A-122 are eligible (available at *www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a122/a122.html*). Applicants who have an IRS 501(c)(4) designation are not eligible for EPA grants if they engage in lobbying, no matter what the source of funding for the lobbying activities.. Applicant eligibility will be used as a pass/fail criterion when evaluating proposals.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Applicants must provide a 5% match. The match can be in the form of cash or can come from in-kind contributions (e.g. volunteer services, donations, etc.).

Funding may be used to acquire services or fund partnerships, provided the recipient follows procurement and subaward or subgrant procedures contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as applicable. Successful applicants must compete contracts for services and products and conduct cost and price analyses to the extent required by 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.

Subgrants or subawards may be used to fund partnerships with non profit organizations and governmental entities. 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 to carry out its cooperative agreement. For profit organizations are not eligible subgrant recipients under this announcement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the 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.

Screening Requirements:
Before they are reviewed against the section V criteria, proposals/applications will first be screened to ensure they meet the minimum requirements set forth below. Proposals/Applications that fail to meet one or more of these requirements will receive no further consideration and will be rejected:

- Is the applicant eligible to receive funding (see Eligibility requirements above)?
- Is the requested funding greater than $100,000 for the first year, and greater than $300,000 over three years? Proposals/Applications requesting more funding than is available will not be considered.

IV. Application and Submission Information

A. Content and Format for Proposals

The following format must be used for all proposals. Within the format guidelines, applicants must include information that relates to the ranking factors outlined in Section V. Where a page limit is specified for a section of this format, reviewers will only read up to the number of pages specified– any material exceeding the page limits will not be considered in the evaluation.

1. Name of Applying Organization
2. Point of contact (Individual and Organization Name, Address, Phone Number, Fax Number, E-mail Address)
3. Proposed federal funding
4. Proposed funding leveraged from other sources (a 5% cost share is required, but applicants will be evaluated on their ability to leverage additional funds beyond the 5% – see section V below).

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

5. Organization description (no more than 4 pages) containing information on the following:
    - Organization's mission and goals
    - Current programs
    - Office locations and staffing
    - Explanation of organizational capacity to successfully implement the goals outlined in the RFIP, including description of current or past work that is relevant
    - Organization's financial status, including summary of audited balance sheets for the past 3 years
6. A staffing proposal (no more than two pages) detailing the number and responsibilities of the personnel which the applicant anticipates providing and/or establishing for the management of EPEAT.
7. Resumes of key personnel which will be assigned or have expressed interest in being hired to manage EPEAT if the respondent is awarded.
8. Program implementation plan (no more than 10 pages) providing detailed information on the following:
    - Clear program plan for implementation of the EPEAT tool and pilot, indicating how the applicant will build on the work already completed and meet the goals of the program listed above
    - Description of the proposed governance structure of the project, including a description of how the applicant will work with the existing EPEAT Implementation Team in transition.
    - Description of how the organization will work with multiple stakeholders, including government, manufacturers, environmental community, purchasing community and act as a non-partisan advocate for the EPEAT process.
    - Plan for publicizing and marketing EPEAT tool to interested stakeholders
    - A plan for tracking and measuring progress towards achieving the expected outputs/outcomes identified in section I of the announcement.
    - Plan for securing funding for EPEAT both during and beyond the term of this assistance agreement. This funding can be from other public or private sources or from revenues generated from users of the tool.
    - Plan for the maintaining and updating the system and the environmental standards over the project period
9. Detailed budget proposal providing a breakdown of anticipated expenses and proposed revenues for the first three years of EPEAT implementation. The costs and revenues must include at a minimum the following items:
    - EPA seed funding
    - Cash or in kind contributions
    - Operating expenses (rent, phone, supplies, etc.)
    - Travel expenses
    - Costs of maintaining the web-based system
    - Other sources of revenue
    - Staffing costs consistent with staffing proposal

10. A list of no less than three references including but not limited to those from

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

organizations in the electronics industry, institutional purchasing community or electronics recycling.

B. Submission Dates and Addresses

All proposals must be **received** no later than 5:00 pm PDT, July 29, 2005. ***Proposals received after this date will not be reviewed.*** We will accept submissions by mail or overnight express only. Proposals submitted by hand delivery, fax or electronic mail will not be accepted.

Please send three copies of the proposals to:

John Katz
USEPA Region 9, WST-7
75 Hawthorne St.
San Francisco, CA 94105

For additional information, please contact John Katz at 415-972-3283 or Holly Elwood at 202-564-8854.

C. Questions on this Announcement

Administrative Questions:

EPA will respond directly to individual applicants with questions regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the proposal, and requests for clarification about the announcement. If a request for a clarification results in a modification to the announcement, the modification will be posted at *www.epa.gov/region09/funding/epeat.html*, and on *www.fedgrants.gov* no later than June 29, 2005.

Questions clarifying the RFIP:

EPA will review questions regarding the announcement and will respond to those that may be pertinent to all potential applicants and modify the announcement if necessary. The questions must be submitted in writing by June 22, 2005 to John Katz (see address above, or via email at katz.john@epa.gov). Those questions and EPA's responses will be posted on *www.epa.gov/region09/funding/epeat-faq.html* on or around June 29.

Questions related to proposal content: In accordance with EPA's Competition Policy of January 11, 2005 (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 and proposals.

D. Confidential Business Information

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.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

E. Information Used in Review
In evaluating an applicant for programmatic capability purposes, EPA will consider information provided by the applicant in the application/proposal and may consider information from other sources including agency files.

F. Dun and Bradstreet
The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) now requires grant applicants to provide a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number when applying for Federal grants or cooperative agreements. The DUNS number will supplement other identifiers required by statute or regulation, such as tax identification numbers.

Applicants can receive a DUNS number in one day, at no cost, by calling the toll- free DUNS Number request line at 1–866–705– 5711. The website where an organization can obtain a DUNS number is: *http://www.dnb.com*. This takes 30 business days and there is no cost unless the organization requests expedited (1-day) processing, which includes a fee of $40.

A DUNS number must be included in every application for a new award or renewal of an award. A revised version of form SF-424 will include the DUNS number. The revised SF-424 form is available at *http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/application.htm*.

G. Intergovernmental Review
Applicants must comply with the Intergovernmental Review Process and/or the consultation provisions of Section 204, of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, if applicable, which are contained in 40 CFR Part 29. All State applicants should consult with the official designated as the single point of contact in his or her State for more information on the process the State requires when applying for assistance; if the State has selected the program for review. If you do not know who your Single Point of Contact is, please call the EPA Headquarters Grant Policy Information and Training Branch at 202-564-5325 or refer to the State Single Point of Contact web site at *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html*. Federally recognized tribal governments are not required to comply with this procedure.

V. Application Review Information

A. Review and Selection Process
EPA will award the EPEAT Program funding on a competitive basis.

Applications/proposals that pass the threshold eligibility and screening review described in Section III will then be evaluated against the ranking criteria identified below for the initial proposals. The proposals will be reviewed against these criteria by a panel of external reviewers and EPA staff members from the Office of Pollution Prevention, Office of Solid Waste, and at least two EPA regional offices. The external reviewers may include representatives from the electronics, purchasing, and environmental fields. All of the reviewers will be required to certify that they have no conflicts of interest with respect to any proposal/application or applicant. The panel will select the top ranked applicants (no more than three) to go forward to the next evaluation phase. These applicants will then be asked to develop and deliver a presentation for a teleconference meeting with EPA and external reviewers which will be evaluated against the

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

presentation criteria identified below.

The purpose of the presentation will be to provide reviewers more depth on the applicants' areas of expertise, the applicants' plan for maintaining continuity with the EPEAT efforts to date and a plan for working with stakeholders, and information to evaluate overall quality and ability to manage a complex project. Each applicant will be asked a set of identical questions based on the evaluation criterion below that will apply to the presentations. These questions will be supplied to the applicant finalists in advance. After the presentations, the review panel will combine the scores from the evaluation of the presentation and interview with the scores from the evaluation of the initial proposals to make a final recommendation to EPA for a preferred applicant. EPA retains the sole authority to make final decisions for funding.

B. Criteria and Ranking factors:

1. Review of Initial Proposals
The initial proposals will be scored and ranked based on the following criteria:

a. Organizational Capacity (25 Points):
The applicant will be evaluated based on the extent it demonstrates that it has the ability to credibly manage a project with the complexity and scope of EPEAT. Factors that will be considered include:

- Review of past performance in successfully completing federally and/or non-federally funded projects similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project, and history of meeting reporting requirements on prior or current assistance agreements with federal and/or non-federal organizations and submitting acceptable final technical reports. (5 points)
- Demonstrated ability to work with multiple stakeholders. (10 points)
- Adequate financial, management, and operational capabilities to complete tasks outlined in the project plan, including ability to raise funding. (10 points)

b. Staff Capacity (15 points)

Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate that the project participants are well qualified to conduct the proposed project, have a demonstrated record of success in their previous work in areas related to the EPEAT program, and whether the applicant demonstrates ability to ensure accountability by key personnel. One indication of staff capacity will be whether there are staff involved with experience in one or more of the following subject areas:
- Electronic products and design
- U.S. procurement activities by large institutions
- Environmentally preferable purchasing
- Database and website maintenance
- Marketing/Outreach
- Ecolabeling
- Maintaining credibility and independence from key stakeholder groups

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

c. Clear and feasible program implementation plan (40 points)
Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they provide a clear description of a strategy to achieve the program goals focusing on the following factors:

- success in maintaining continuity with, and incorporating systems and materials developed by, the existing EPEAT project, including plan for maintaining and updating the system and environmental criteria (25 points)
- well crafted approach for gaining input from, and participation of, multiple stakeholders, and for effectively managing the stakeholder process, (10 points)
- well written, clear explanation of how they intend to achieve the expected outputs/outcomes described Section I (5 points)

d. Cost Leveraging (15 points)
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate 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, beyond the required 5% cost share. 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). Any form of proposed leveraging must be included in the application/proposal and the application/proposal must describe how the applicant will obtain the leveraged resources and what role EPA funding will play in the overall project

e. Tracking and Measuring Progress (5 points)
Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent to which their proposal clearly indicates how they will track and measure its progress toward accomplishing the outputs and outcomes expected under this grant as identified in Section I of this announcement.

2. Evaluation of Presentation and Interview
The following criteria worth a total of 40 points (10 points each) will be used to evaluate those applicants selected to make the presentation and interview. The applicant's presentation and interview will be evaluated based on the extent they clearly demonstrate the applicant's:

- ability to manage a complex project,
- depth of technical and organizational expertise,
- ability to convene and involve diverse stakeholders, and
- plan for maintaining the EPEAT system beyond the funding period.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

VI. Award Administration Information

A. Award Notices:

EPA will recommend one proposal for funding. The applicant recommended for funding will be asked to complete an application for federal funds (Standard Form 424 and attachments) and complete a detailed workplan. Receipt of an application kit is not a guarantee of funding. Deadlines must be met and the work plan must be approved by the EPA Project Officer for funding to occur. Non-profit applicants that are recommended for funding will be subject to pre-award administrative capability reviews consistent with paragraphs 8.b, 8.c, and 9.d of EPA Order 5700.8.

B. Regulations

Applicant must comply with the regulations governing the award and administration of Cooperative Agreements: 40 CFR Part 30 (for institutions of higher learning, hospitals, and other non-profit organizations), and 40 CFR Part 31 (for States, local governments, and Federally recognized Tribal governments).

C. Reporting

Quarterly project status reports and Financial Status Reports will be required. Quarterly reports should describe project activities and provide the EPA Project Officer with information about project development. The Financial Status Report must accurately account for all federal funds expended and identify appropriate use of federal funds.

D. Disputes:

Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005) which can be found at

http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20051800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2005/05-1371.htm.

Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting the Agency Contact listed below.

VII. Agency Contact

For additional information, please contact

John Katz, Office of Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste, EPA Region 9
Phone: 415-972-3283
email: mkatz.john@epa.gov

or

Holly Elwood, Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics
Phone: 202-564-8854
Email: melwood.holly@epa.gov

VIII. Other Information

Applicants should note that this is a one-time initiative and there will likely not be a future solicitation for this program.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT