AGENCY: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

TITLE: COMMUNITY ACTION FOR A RENEWED ENVIRONMENT (CARE) PROGRAM

ACTION: Request for Proposals (RFP)

RFP NO.: EPA-OAR-IO-10-04

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE (CFDA) NO: 66.035

CLOSING DATE: The closing date and time for receipt of proposal submissions, regardless of mode of submission, is March 9, 2010, 4:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST). All hard copies of proposal packages must be received by Marva King **by March 9, 2010, 4:00 p.m. EST** in order to be considered for funding. Electronic submissions must be addressed to CARE_2010_RFP@epa.gov and include the "Announcement title or #" – [name of applicant] in the subject line and be received **by March 9, 2010, 4:00 p.m. EST** in order to be considered for funding. Proposals received after the closing date and time will not be considered for funding.

EPA reserves the right to amend this solicitation as deemed necessary. Amendments could be administrative in nature (e.g., change of dates or location), technical (e.g., change in requirements), or changes which affect the anticipated funding. If this need occurs, EPA will post the amended solicitation on EPA's Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) grants announcement page http://www.epa.gov/air/grants_funding.html.

SUMMARY: This request for proposals (RFP) announces the availability of funds and solicits from eligible entities project proposals to receive financial assistance through the Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) grant program. CARE is a unique community-based, community-driven, multimedia demonstration program designed to help communities understand and reduce risks due to toxic pollutants and environmental concerns from all sources.

The CARE grant program works with the eligible entities to help their communities form collaborative partnerships, develop an understanding of the many local sources of toxic pollutants and environmental risks, set priorities, and identify and carry out projects to reduce risks through collaborative action at the local level. CARE's long-term goal is to help communities build self-sustaining, community-based partnerships that will continue to improve human health and local environments into the future.

The objective of the CARE grant program is to work collaboratively within the community to investigate the effectiveness of the CARE 4-step process (as described in the CARE brochure at http://www.epa.gov/air/care/library/2008CAREtrifold.pdf) which fosters a cross-Agency, multi-media approach to provide greater environmental benefits rather than either non-collaborative or traditional regulatory single media approaches.

Under this RFP, EPA will award CARE grants through cooperative agreements at two levels **(Level I and Level II)** that support different types of activities:

- Level I cooperative agreements will support the following types of activities: working with the funded entity to form community-based collaborative partnerships; identifying and developing an understanding of the many local sources of risk from toxic pollutants and environmental concerns; and setting priorities for the reduction of the identified risks and concerns of the community.

- Level II cooperative agreements will support activities to identify and implement actual "on the ground," community-based projects for the reduction of the prioritized risks and concerns in their community. Level II agreements are for communities that have already completed the actions typically taken in a Level I agreement. However, receipt of a Level I cooperative agreement is not a prerequisite to receiving a Level II cooperative agreement.

The CARE Web site at www.epa.gov/care links additional information about the CARE program, including an online grant writing tutorial to further educate potential applicants about this RFP.

FUNDING/AWARDS: For fiscal year (FY) 2010, the total estimated funding for all awards under this RFP is approximately $2 million. Each grant will be awarded as a two-year cooperative agreement, with an amount depending on the proposal level.

- EPA anticipates awarding 1 – 3 Level I cooperative agreements ranging in approximate value from $75,000 to a maximum of $100,000, with an average project funding of about $90,000. (See Section III.B. Threshold Eligibility Requirements).

- EPA also anticipates awarding 4 – 6 Level II cooperative agreements ranging in approximate value from $150,000 to a maximum of $300,000, with an average project funding of about $275,000. (See Section III.B. Threshold Eligibility Requirements.)

The CARE grant program is very competitive. In the 2009 competition, 235 eligible proposals were received and 9 projects were funded.

EPA reserves the right to increase or decrease (including to zero) the total number of cooperative agreements awarded for each level, or change the ratio of Level I to Level II agreements it awards. Such changes may be necessary as a response to the quality of proposals received by EPA, the amount of the funds awarded to the selected applicants, or budget availability.

CONTENTS BY SECTION

I. Funding Opportunity Description ……P. 3

II. Award Information ……..…. P. 17

III. Eligibility Information ……..……. P. 18

IV. Proposal and Submission Information ……P. 22

V. Proposal Review Information …….……. P. 29

VI. Award Administration Information ……..... P. 38

VII. Agency Contacts ……...……. P. 40

VIII. Other Information ……P. 41

IX. Appendixes: (Appendix A: CARE Required Performance Measures; Appendix B: Sample Budget Narrative; Appendix C: Suggestions for Writing Your Narrative Proposal)

SECTION I— Funding Opportunity Description

A. Background

EPA developed the CARE program in response to community requests for help in addressing environmental concerns and in recognition of the need for a new approach to help communities develop locally-led solutions to address these concerns. While national regulatory approaches have resulted in significant reductions in toxic releases and other environmental improvements, these methods have not always been effective in addressing specific community concerns and cumulative risks resulting from toxic releases from multiple and often diffuse sources.

CARE is designed to complement national regulatory approaches and meet community needs by building the capacity of communities to understand and take effective actions at the local level to address existing environmental concerns in all environmental media. The CARE program will provide funding, information, training, technical support, and help to build collaborative local partnerships, improved access to voluntary programs and address community environmental concerns.

This help will focus on building the communities' capacity to identify, understand, and reduce the risks from toxic pollutants and environmental concerns in all air, including indoor air, water and land. The EPA, through the CARE program, has provided over $12 million in funding for 77 projects in 68 communities: 47 Level I and 30 Level II cooperative agreements. Nine

communities have advanced from Level I to Level II cooperative agreements. Please visit the CARE Web site (www.epa.gov/care) to find descriptions of existing CARE projects.

B. Scope of CARE Projects

1. CARE Goals

The goals of the CARE program are to:

- Reduce exposures to toxic pollutants through collaborative action at the local level.
- Help communities gain an understanding of all the major potential sources of exposure to toxic pollutants and environmental concerns.
- Work with communities to set priorities for risk reduction activities.
- Create self-sustaining, community-based partnerships that will continue to improve the local environment.

2. CARE Strategies

To achieve its goals, the CARE program will use the following strategies:

- Build effective collaborative partnerships that include community organizations and residents, businesses, and governments and other appropriate partners.
- Provide information, tools, and technical assistance to help communities understand all major potential sources of exposure to environmental pollutants.
- Establish consensus in communities on priorities and effective action to reduce risks.
- Focus on action, mobilize local resources and utilize EPA voluntary programs to implement risk reduction activities.
- Facilitate networking among CARE communities to share experiences and lessons learned.
- Build long-term community capacity to continue improving the local environment.

3. Definition of "community" under the CARE program

CARE is designed to help geographic communities build collaborative partnerships that can work to understand and improve environments at the local level. Since the size of local level geographic place-based communities varies depending on the project, the CARE program is not strictly defining the term "community." A community is **all** the people living in the same area

sharing the same environment, including both residents and businesses. A community will often be in a relatively small area, but in rural locations a larger area such as a watershed would be considered a community. A tribal reservation would normally be considered a community. Eligible CARE partnerships can be formed at the neighborhood level or in larger place-based areas.

However, in order to ensure that an effective local partnership and capacity can be built, places such as New York City or watersheds the size of the Missouri or the Columbia Rivers would be considered too large to be a community. Sections of New York City or the watershed of smaller rivers would be considered communities. CARE is designed to get community residents involved in projects, therefore, the larger the CARE community proposed by the applicant the more time they should spend explaining how they will bring stakeholders together and involve the public. Moreover, a subpopulation of a community (e.g., all the schools in a specific area; or all the people of the same ethnic group; or all the people with a single occupation to the exclusion of the other people living in the same area), does not qualify as representing the entire community and a project addressing a subpopulation is not be eligible for a CARE grant. For additional information please refer to the CARE Web site: www.epa.gov/care.

4. Description of a community-based partnership and a collaborative stakeholder group

The key to the CARE process is the community partnership. One of EPA goals is to work in partnership with the funded entity to create a self-sustaining, community-based partnership that will continue to improve the local environment, even after the CARE cooperative agreement ends. The funded recipient will act as a catalyst to bring the community together and empower the community to help in the completion of the CARE projects.

The community-based partnership needs to include community residents, local businesses, and local government. These individuals must work together to allow a true community-wide consensus to be created and for sustainable solutions to be developed and implemented. These members work together to get information about environmental risks, disseminate that information out to the community, collect feedback, and use a consensus-based, collaborative process to make decisions.

Everyone in the partnership is committed to work together to identify and address their environmental problems of concern and not point fingers at potential responsible parties. All the participants are willing to look fairly at their contribution to risk and are willing to participate in voluntary and other programs to reduce that risk. The CARE program is only appropriate for a community where everyone is willing to work together and collaborate to produce long-term solutions.

Collaborative stakeholder groups are similar to community-based partnerships in that they should be as inclusive as possible including community residents, representatives of community organizations, small and large businesses, state, tribal, local government agencies, EPA and other federal agencies, colleges and universities, and other organizations and individuals as appropriate. When EPA asks for a list of the applicant's "partners," EPA is asking the applicant

to name the organizations/groups/local leaders/volunteers that will be part of the collaborative stakeholder group and/or those who will work to support and lead the project.

5. Meaning of communities gaining an understanding of all the major potential sources of exposure to toxic pollutants and environmental concerns

EPA wants stakeholder groups to investigate the various sources of local environmental risks and their related health impacts in their communities. The goal is not to get a detailed quantitative risk assessment of all the environmental risks in a community which would require much more time and resources than a Level I grant provides. The goal is to take a qualitative assessment of the major sources of local environmental risks and impacts, determine which ones, if any of them, require a more detailed analysis, and learn enough about them for the stakeholders group and community-based partnership to be able to come to consensus about the priority risks that are of greatest concern and should be the first to be addressed. The importance of this evaluation step in the CARE process goes beyond simply creating a list of risks. This step creates a common understanding of local environmental conditions to the partnership that will strengthen the partnership and create a foundation for future progress in the other steps of the CARE process.

For most communities, the major areas that should be considered are: air quality, drinking water, local surface water and ground water, waste disposal, and risks in the indoor environment including in schools. Environmental risks and impacts that are worth considering include: lead, pesticides and radon in homes, businesses that use or release hazardous chemicals, the use and disposal of hazardous chemicals in the home and schools. EPA has basic information on these risks and their health impacts that it will share with all the CARE communities. It is expected that most, if not all communities, will have additional environmental concerns that they will also consider. After considering all these major sources of potential concern, the partnership including the stakeholders group and the community may choose to get more detailed information about a subset of these or other related concerns.

EPA will help support communities by supplying EPA information about local risks. State, tribal and local governments, local colleges and universities and other stakeholders will also have useful information on local environmental concerns.

6. Meaning of setting priorities for risk reduction activities

The goal of a CARE Level I project is to come to consensus about a prioritized list of risks that the community wants to address with future risk reduction activities. These risk reduction activities could be undertaken by a CARE Level II project. In order to set priorities the community must first gain an understanding of all the major potential sources of exposure to toxic pollutants and environmental concerns. This would include looking at the routes of exposure to a particular pollutant, estimating cumulative impacts, and understanding sensitivities or vulnerabilities of the affected population. In most cases a qualitative comparison is the most that can be done because of the wide array of concerns that will be identified, data limitations, and time and money constraints.

In the risk prioritization stage, the partners consider not only the relative environmental and health risks but other factors in developing a consensus on the issues they will address first. Examples of the kinds of factors that could be considered include: feasibility, interest of key stakeholders to affect a particular change, the potential to leverage local efforts and new sources of funding, the momentum to be gained by a smaller and easier accomplishment, and the relevant EPA Partnership Programs (http://www.epa.gov/partners/) and other potential risk reduction activities that they could use to achieve environmental improvements. It is important to remember that even if a community had a perfect quantitative list of risks that it would still be appropriate for a community, if it so chooses, to consider these or other factors in their prioritization. Because the CARE program is community-driven, the consensus risk prioritization that the community develops is, by definition, the correct one.

7. Description of an effective CARE project

An effective CARE project would have a partnership that reflects all aspects mentioned in section 5 above. In addition, the grantee, or recipient of the CARE funds, would have the capacity and ability (and preferably successful experiences) to be a catalyst and convener for the community and the partnership working to bring about a consensus within the community and not trying to drive the community to their pre-determined risks and solutions. The grantee recognizes that the project is about empowering the community to improve their environment.

An effective CARE project has a sound plan and ability to achieve results in helping the community identify the major sources of exposure to local environmental pollutants and set priorities for risk reduction activities through a collaborative process (Level I); take action to reduce exposures to identified local environmental toxic pollutants through collaborative action (Level II); and create self-sustaining, community-based partnerships to continue to improve the local environment after the EPA cooperative agreement ends (Level I and II). The CARE program is focused on local environmental issues where the CARE community can make a measureable difference. While an applicant will not know in advance all the issues a community will raise and a CARE project can include work on environmental issues that are not local, such as climate change, the applicant should be clear about the local environmental issues that the community can address and non-local issues, such as climate change, should not start out as the major focus of the project.

8. Resources provided by EPA through the CARE program

When recipients receive a CARE cooperative agreement, in addition to funding they may also receive:

- EPA Project Officer Support: EPA will assign a Project Officer (PO) at the EPA regional level to work closely with the CARE partnership and serve as the EPA representative in the CARE partnership. The EPA PO will be the primary point of contact through which the following additional support will be provided.

- CARE Program Support: EPA will provide information about EPA programs and support to help CARE recipients use the EPA programs they select.

- EPA Technical Support: EPA will usually provide regional technical advisory staff who will work directly with the partnership group. These staff can provide scientific information, such as access to databases, models and other forms of technical support to evaluate and reduce risks, and community organizational support, such as how to make partnerships work better, consensus-building, strategic planning, becoming self-sustaining, among other skills. If specific staff can not be provided, EPA will find other means of providing technical support.

- CARE National Training Workshop: CARE cooperative agreement recipients will be required **to attend an annual multi-day, CARE training for each year of the cooperative agreement**. Some of the training objectives will be to help the recipient with strategic planning, cooperative agreement management, and afford numerous opportunities to network with other CARE community representatives. **Expenses for this annual national training (i.e., travel, lodging, etc.) must be included, for the effective period of the cooperative agreement, in the applicant's budget narrative proposal (see Appendix B).** We do not know, at this time, where the training location will be, so proposed travel costs can be considered estimates. Recent trainings have been held in major cities such as Atlanta, Chicago, and New York City.

- CARE-related Training Opportunities: CARE will, as funding resources allow, occasionally provide opportunities for training on skills and topics relevant to CARE at regional locations. The applicant may wish to reserve a small amount of travel funding to the regional office; participation in these training opportunities is entirely voluntary.

- CARE Community Network: All CARE communities are networked together through the CARE Connection listserv, conference calls and shared electronic workspace to allow for sharing of support, experiences, and problem-solving.

9. <u>Utilization of EPA partnership programs</u>

- CARE is designed to deliver partnership programs to communities. Partnership programs in EPA include a wide variety of programs, initiatives, and activities that are based on communities and citizens taking action not required by statute or regulation. Here are some of the EPA Partnership Programs that CARE communities have used:
    - Community Based Childhood Asthma Programs
    - Facilitation contract via EPA's Conflict Prevention and Resolution Center
    - Green Suppliers Network
    - Healthy Homes: Assessing Your Indoor Environment, Environmental Risk Assessment
    - Soot Patrols/Diesel Exhaust Education Project
    - Tools for Schools

- Water Wise

EPA's CARE Web site includes a Voluntary Program Guide which lists the national EPA voluntary partnership programs that could be of use to communities**.** The Guide provides information on where to find the requirements for each of the programs listed. **(http://www.epa.gov/air/care/library/guide_vol_progs_2008.pdf)**

10. Two levels of CARE funding

a. Level I CARE Funding

The goal of CARE Level I projects is to ensure, at completion, that the community has developed an effective problem solving partnership, has an understanding of environmental risks facing the community, and has reached consensus in prioritizing those risks.

CARE Level I cooperative agreement funding will:

- Provide assistance to grantees to create, develop, and or sustain a broad-based collaborative partnership dedicated to understanding toxic risks and environmental pollutant impacts in their community.

- Build local capacity and organizations (e.g., using the funds to develop local leaders, hold leadership-building workshops, build local networks that have long-term sustainability, build local environmental coalitions that can aid local environmental agencies, and environmental solution implementation.)

- Identify all major sources of local environmental risks and impacts in the community and work to determine community priorities for risk reduction. (CARE funding cannot be used for surveys of more than 9 people by the recipient. CARE funding can pay for the assessment of survey data.)

Two models for doing this prioritization are the CARE Roadmap (http://www.epa.gov/care/library/20080620roadmap.pdf) and the PACE-EH process **(http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/ehs/CEHA/background.htm**)**

Examples of suggested activities for Level I projects

- building, convening, facilitating, and providing environmental information to community stakeholder group(s);

- investigating different environmental problems in the different environmental media in the community and preparing education materials for the community regarding the results of the investigations;

- analyzing the environmental problems in the community and their relative risks and

potential solutions;

- setting priorities for action;

- providing information leadership seminars, skill development classes to the stakeholder group, community or the general public about any of the above activities and their results;

- evaluating and tracking the progress of the project, and communicating the lessons learned with their and other communities.

b. Level II CARE Funding

A CARE Level II project will ensure that the community-based partnership reduces identified toxic risks and environmental pollutants and builds healthier communities, even after the completion of the funded Level II project.

Applicants are not required to have been a recipient of a Level I cooperative agreement in order to receive a Level II cooperative agreement. However, they are designed for communities that have **already** established a broad-based, collaborative, problem-solving partnership that has developed an understanding of all or most of the toxic risks and environmental pollutants facing the community in multiple environmental media, and that has set community priorities for risk reduction.

CARE Level II cooperative agreement funding will:

- Help communities identify and accomplish risk reduction actions to address the community's priority risks (as identified before the Level II project was started). Risks will be addressed through the selection and use of EPA programs and technical assistance or other voluntary actions selected by the partnership.

- Help the community partnership become self-sustaining. (Please note: CARE assistance may include training and assistance in how to attract new resources and partners to support further risk reduction activities, but CARE funds cannot be used to pay for filling out grant applications or other fund raising activities.)

Examples of suggested activities for Level II projects

- reducing risks through activities including: identifying, choosing, and implementing options for risk reduction and mobilizing local resources to carry out new or existing partnership programs (e.g., Indoor Air Quality Tools for Schools, Design for the Environment, and the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program);

- convening, facilitating, and providing environmental information to community stakeholder group(s) that may hopefully lead to toxic risk reductions;

- finding additional partners and resources to make the project self-sustaining;

- evaluating and tracking the progress of the project, measuring results, and communicating lessons learned with their and other communities;

- providing information to the stakeholder group, community or the general public about any of the above activities and their results.

11. Timing of CARE funding (especially important for Level I applicants)

EPA expects that communities who receive CARE Level I cooperative agreements will successfully complete their project and continue by applying and competing for a CARE Level II cooperative agreement. All Level I projects should consider the timing of the CARE funding cycle in planning their projects. Applications for CARE grants will be due in the February to March timeframe. Successful applicants will receive their money in September or October of the same year. A CARE Level I project that wants to apply for a CARE Level II cooperative agreement will have to demonstrate that they have examined the environmental risks in their community and gone through a consensus process to prioritize those risks. In other words, they must complete most of their work before applying for a Level II cooperative agreement.

Level I cooperative agreements provide 24 months of funding. The applicant can complete the project more quickly to apply for a Level II cooperative agreement in 18 months, or plan to ask for a 12 months no-cost extension to then apply for a Level II cooperative agreement in 30 months after the CARE Level 1 project is awarded. In this way, the grant recipient can finalize or extend the project to match with EPA's funding cycle. Of course, the applicant can take a full 24 months on the project and then use other resources to keep the partnership together until they apply, compete, and hopefully receive a Level II cooperative agreement.

12. CARE program uniqueness from other EPA grant programs

The CARE cooperative agreements are designed to investigate and demonstrate the long-term value of the CARE program. Specifically, EPA has developed the CARE program as a different approach to address the problems of cumulative risk in communities. While CARE builds on the efforts of previous community-based programs, CARE does offer a different approach. The CARE approach combines all of the following factors (each of which may not be unique to CARE, but the combination of approaches and tools is unique):

- CARE is a multimedia program that takes a comprehensive view of the local environmental risks and impacts from environmental pollutants and is not limited to a single media (air, water, land) or source.

- CARE is based on providing the tools and information to communities so they can set their own priorities for risk reduction and select the voluntary programs that best fit their needs.

- CARE creates a network that includes all the CARE communities that allows them to learn from and support each other.

- CARE cooperative agreements allow communities to get organized, examine and prioritize environmental risks and impacts, and take voluntary actions to reduce those risks.

- CARE uses collaborative stakeholder processes and voluntary programs to bring the various sectors of the community together to solve problems.

- CARE mobilizes a network of EPA staff from across headquarters programs and regional offices to provide support, training, and tools to help communities achieve success.

- CARE establishes an effective mechanism to deliver the full range of the EPA voluntary partnership programs to the communities that need and want them.

- CARE helps develop community capabilities that will be self-sustaining, collaborative, and will hopefully continue improving the environmental health in the community even after the grant funding expires.

- CARE differs from other EPA programs by pulling people together with diverse interests and creating collaborations with partners who gain a new and better perspective than in their previous and sometimes adversarial relationships.

C. EPA Strategic Plan Linkage to CARE and Anticipated Outcomes/Outputs

Pursuant to Section 6a of EPA Order 5700.7, "Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements," EPA must link proposed assistance agreements to the Agency's Strategic Plan. EPA also requires that grant applicants and recipients adequately describe environmental outputs and environmental outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements (see EPA Order 5700.7, Environmental Results under Assistance Agreements, http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700.7.pdf).

1. Five goals of EPA's Strategic Plan 2006-2011 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/plan/plan.htm)

Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change
Goal 2: Clean and Safe Water
Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration
Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems
Goal 5: Compliance and Environmental Stewardship

Awards under the CARE program directly support progress towards EPA Strategic Plan's **Goal 4**: *Healthy Communities and Ecosystems*; **Objective 4.2**: *Communities Sustain, Clean Up, and Restore Communities and the Ecological Systems That Support Them*; and **Sub-objectives**: 4.2.1 (Sustain Community Health); 4.2.2 (Restore Community Health); and Objective 4.3 (Restore and Protect Critical Ecosystems); 4.3.1 (Wetlands).

2. CARE program support for other goals in EPA's Strategic Plan

In the CARE program, communities will select and carry out EPA partnership programs to reduce toxic exposures and protect the environment in their communities. While the partnership programs and other actions taken will differ from community to community, overall, the actions taken by communities through the CARE program will support a number of the other goals, objectives, and sub-objectives in the EPA Strategic Plan across all the environmental media. In addition to Goal 4 they are:

- **Goal 1** - Clean Air and Global Climate Change:
  Objective 1.1 (Healthier Outdoor Air)
  Sub-Objective 1.1.2 (Reduced Risk from Toxic Air Pollutants)
  Objective 1.2 (Healthier Indoor Air)

- **Goal 2** - Clean and Safe Water
  Objective 2.1 (Protect Human Health)
  Sub-objective 2.1.1 (Water Safe to Drink)
  Objective 2.2: Protect Water Quality
  Sub-objective 2.2.1: Improve Water Quality on a Watershed Basis

- **Goal 3** - Land Preservation and Restoration
  Objective 3.1 (Preserve Land)
  Sub-objective 3.1.1 (Reduce Waste Generation and Increase Recycling)

- **Goal 5** - Compliance and Environmental Stewardship
  Objective 5.2: Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Promote Environmental Stewardship,
  - Sub-objective 5.2.1 (Prevent Pollution and Promote Environmental Stewardship)
  - Sub-objective 5.2.2 (Promote Improved Environmental Performance Through Business and Community Innovation)
  - Sub-objective 5.2.3 (Promote Environmental Policy Innovation)

3. Anticipated Outcomes

The term "outcome" means the result, effect or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic in nature, but must be quantitative. They may not necessarily be achievable within an assistance agreement funding period.

Through the cooperative agreements expected to be awarded under this RFP, EPA expects to work with communities so they can:

- Create self-sustaining community-based partnerships that will continue to improve local environments. (CARE Level I and II projects)

- Develop an understanding of all major sources of risk from toxic pollutants and environmental concerns and set priorities for effective action. (CARE Level I projects)

- Demonstrate the reduction of risk from exposure to toxic and environmental pollutants through collaborative action at the local level. (CARE Level II projects)

4. Anticipated Outputs

The term "output" means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work product related to an environmental goal and objective that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period.

The anticipated outputs for awards expected to be made under this solicitation will vary from community to community and project to project. The main expected outputs are the following:

- CARE Level I project: The creation of a broad-based community stakeholder group that has developed an understanding of and has prioritized the list of the local environmental risks and impacts in their community and engaged the community through a consensus process.

- CARE Level II project: The community reaches consensus on the selection of partnership programs and/or other approaches to address the community's priority risks (to address the risks identified in a Level I or similar project) and these programs and

approaches are implemented to reduce risks in the community. While different communities will select different partnership programs or other solutions, they will be expected to achieve identified and specific results based on their activities.

5. Developing Performance Measures for CARE projects

To receive a cooperative agreement under the CARE program, the applicant must develop performance measures they expect to achieve through the proposed, funded activities. *The performance measures should focus on specific, quantitative actions related to the applicant's activities, outputs, and outcomes*. These performance measures will help gather insights and will be the mechanism to track progress concerning successful process and outcome strategies and will provide the basis for developing lessons to inform future CARE recipients.

During the two-year cooperative agreement period, every CARE grant recipient is encouraged to measure performance success in the environmental, economic, and social dimensions. While the CARE project may not lead to dramatic improvement in all three of these dimensions, the CARE applicant is encouraged to think about how the environmental, economic and/or social progress of the project could be monitored long-term through data collection.

Level II cooperative agreement recipients are encouraged to address actual environmental and/or human health improvement, whether it is through reduced environmental impact, a more effective use of materials, control of toxic pollutants and environmental concerns to promote healthier ecosystems (land, air, water), etc. (or other actions). In addition, Level II cooperative agreement recipients should collect and/or use data to measure and track both short and long-term progress and success.

See Appendix A for the Level I and Level II list of specific required performance measures that must be reported to EPA and examples of the kinds of measures projects could use.

D. Supplementary Information

1. National CARE Internet Seminar Question and Answer Web casts:

The CARE program will conduct three identical national informational sessions for potential applicants via a national Web cast seminar on the following dates and times:

February 2, 2010, 1:00 - 3:00 PM, Eastern Time

February 23, 2010, 1:00 - 3:00 PM, Eastern Time

February 26, 2010, 1:00 - 3:00 PM, Eastern Time

A national Web cast is an internet Web-based PowerPoint slide presentation with an embedded audio portion. The national Web cast provides an opportunity for potential CARE cooperative

agreement applicants to learn more about the program and ask questions about the 2010 CARE RFP. Please Note -- You only have to choose one date.

To register for the upcoming CARE national information sessions for one of the above dates, please go to http://www.cluin.org/studio/seminar.cfm#upcoming
and click on the registration link for the 2010 CARE National Web Cast.

After the three national training Web cast sessions are completed, a recorded version of the full Web cast will be available on: http://www.cluin.org/live/archive.cfm

2. Statutory Authorities for CARE Awards

EPA CARE cooperative agreements will be awarded under the following EPA research and demonstration statutory authorities:

- **Clean Water Act,** Section 104(b)(3);
- **Solid Waste Disposal Act,** Section 8001(a);
- **Clean Air Act,** Section 103(b)(3);
- **Toxic Substances Control Act,** Section 10(a) as supplemented by P.L. 106-74 (1999);
- **Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act,** Section 20(a) as supplemented by P.L. 106-74 (1999); and,
- **Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act,** Section 203;
- **National Environmental Policy Act,** Section 102(2)(F)

To be selected for funding, a project must consist of activities within the statutory terms of EPA's research and demonstration grant authorities; specifically, the statutes listed above. Generally, a project must address the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of water pollution, solid/hazardous waste pollution, air pollution, toxic substances control, pesticide control, or ocean dumping. Most, but not all, of the statutes authorize financial assistance for the following activities: "research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, and studies." These activities relate generally to the gathering or the transferring of information or advancing the state of knowledge. The application of established practices may qualify when they are part of a broader project which qualifies under the term "research." (See Section III. B., Threshold Eligibility Requirements).

Applicants must be aware that there are certain statutory restrictions related to EPA's annual Appropriation Acts**.** Therefore, EPA funds for cooperative agreements under this RFP **cannot** be used for projects within the scope of activities covered by other appropriation accounts within the EPA Appropriation Act. For example, CARE cooperative agreements **cannot** be used:

- To equip school buses with diesel retrofit technology or to replace older school buses in order to reduce diesel emissions.

- To develop and enhance state and tribal efforts to protect wetlands or to implement State and Tribal wetland programs**.**

- For the principal purpose of providing training, research, and technical assistance to individuals and organizations to facilitate the inventory of Brownfield sites, site assessments, remediation of Brownfield sites, community involvement or site preparation. (EPA funds those types of projects with State and Tribal Assistance Grant appropriations under the Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization's "*Brownfields Training, Research, and Technical Assistance Grants and Cooperative Agreement Program*", Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 66.814.)

- For Superfund related response actions and other associated activities (including Technical Assistance Grants) under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (CERCLA).

- To survey more than 9 members of the public without prior approval by the Office of Management and Budget of the survey instrument.

SECTION II—Award Information

A. Available funding

The total estimated amount of funding available under this RFP for FY 2010 is approximately $2 million. Cooperative agreements resulting from this RFP will be funded incrementally, as appropriate, over a two-year period.

B. Number of cooperative agreements expected to be awarded under this RFP

The EPA anticipates awarding approximately 1 to 3 Level I cooperative agreements ranging in approximate value from $75,000 to a maximum value of $100,000; and approximately 4 to 6 Level II cooperative agreements ranging in approximate value from $150,000 to a maximum value of $300,000. (See Section III. B., Threshold Eligibility Requirements).

EPA reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and make no awards under this solicitation. EPA also 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 six months after the original selection decisions.

C. Expected project period for award(s) under this RFP

CARE cooperative agreements are intended to last for two years. The estimated project period for awards resulting from this solicitation is October 2010 through September 2012.

D. Funding Type

The funding for selected projects will be in the form of a cooperative agreement that permits substantial involvement between the EPA Project Officer and the selected applicants in the performance of the work supported. Although EPA will negotiate precise terms and conditions relating to substantial involvement as part of the award process, the anticipated substantial federal involvement for this project may include:

- close monitoring of the recipient's performance;
- reviewing project progress reports;
- collaborating in the performance of the scope of work;
- reviewing proposed procurements, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. 31.36(g);
- approving qualifications of key personnel (EPA will not select employees or contractors employed by the recipient);
- reviewing and commenting on content of publications (printed or electronic) prepared under the cooperative agreement (the final decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient);
- aiding the recipient and the community in understanding various networking opportunities at the federal, state, and local levels.

SECTION III--Eligibility Information

A. Eligible Entities

To be an eligible entity to apply for financial assistance under this RFP, an applicant must fall within the statutory terms of EPA's research and demonstration grant authorities. Local, public non-profit institution/organizations, federally-recognized Indian tribal government, Native American organizations, private non-profit institution/organization, quasi-public nonprofit institution/organization both interstate and intrastate, local government, colleges, and universities could be eligible to apply for CARE funds.

A "non-profit organization", as defined by OMB Circular A-122, means any corporation, trust, association, cooperative, or other organization which: (1) is operated primarily for scientific, educational, service, charitable, or similar purposes in the public interest; (2) is not organized primarily for profit; and (3) uses its net proceeds to maintain, improve, and/or expand its operations. For this purpose, the term "non-profit organization" excludes (i) colleges and

universities; (ii) hospitals; (iii) state, local, and federally-recognized Indian tribal governments; and (iv) those non-profit organizations which are excluded from coverage of this Circular in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Circular. [Please note that while colleges and universities and tribes are not non-profits they are still eligible for CARE grants – see previous paragraph]

Non-profit organizations described in Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code can engage in lobbying activities as defined in Section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 and are not eligible to apply.

State governments or their agencies are not eligible to apply. EPA hopes CARE partnerships will work with State agencies as partners to support CARE community projects as appropriate.

B. Threshold Eligibility Requirements

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

1. Proposed projects must consist of activities within the statutory terms of EPA's research and demonstration grant authorities, as explained in Section I.D., Supplementary Information.

2. Proposals received for Level I projects in excess of the maximum value of $100,000 will not be considered.

3. Proposals received for Level II projects in excess of the maximum value of $300,000 will not be considered.

4. Applicants must apply for either a Level I or Level II agreement, **not both**, and they must state their Level I or Level II selection clearly in their proposal. An applicant that has already received a Level I cooperative agreement cannot apply for a second Level I cooperative agreement, an applicant that has already received a Level II cooperative agreement cannot apply for a second Level II cooperative agreement, and an applicant that has already received a Level II cooperative agreement cannot apply for a Level I cooperative agreement.

5. Only one proposal may be submitted per applicant organization. However, an applicant organization can be a partner for more than one CARE project proposal.

6. The proposal must be for a project in a community that meets the CARE definition in Section I. B.3., Definition of a CARE Community, and must be located in the United States or its territories.

7. Project proposals must be written in English. The minimum acceptable font size for the narrative proposal and the budget is 12 point; material in smaller font sizes will not be considered. Pages must have at least 1 inch margins on all sides.

8. Hard copy proposals will only be accepted by an **express delivery service.** EPA will not accept proposals sent by standard 1st Class Mail delivery by U.S. Postal Service or submitted via FAX.

9. a. Proposals must substantially comply with the proposal submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this announcement or else they will be rejected. However, where a page limit is expressed in Section IV with respect to the proposal, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.

   b. In addition, proposals must be received by the EPA [or "postmarked by" if applicable] as specified in Section IV of this announcement on or before the proposal submission deadline published in Section IV of this announcement. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their proposal reaches the designated person/office specified in Section IV of the announcement by the submission deadline.

   c. Proposals received [or postmarked if applicable] after the submission deadline will be considered late and returned to the sender without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling. For hard copy or e-mailed submissions, where Section IV requires proposal receipt by a specific person/office by the submission deadline, receipt by an agency mailroom is not sufficient. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposal with Marva King as soon as possible after the submission deadline—failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.

10. Congress has prohibited the use of federal funds to award grants to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations and therefore in order to be eligible for funding consideration under this competition all applicants must affirmatively indicate in their proposal that they are not subject to this prohibition. Since this funding prohibition applies to subawards/subgrants and contracts awarded by grantees, applicants must consider it when preparing proposals.

Threshold Factors for Level II Proposals **Only**: *There must be an established broad-based stakeholder group (as described in Section I.B.4) that has developed an understanding of most of the local environmental risks and impacts in the community and established priorities for risk reduction. A CARE Level I Grantee that has successfully completed its project is considered to have met this threshold factor.*

To be eligible for a Level II cooperative agreement, the applicant:

- Must be leading or representing an existing collaborative partnership that represents the various constituencies in the community: citizens, businesses, and local government (additional appropriate partners can also be part of the partnership). A majority of the

stakeholders in the partnership that did the prioritization must still be a part of the collaborative partnership that will be used for the Level II process. Specific commitments from the individual partners should be included in the proposal package. EPA expects that most of the community members or organizations that were part of the original work will continue to be part of the Level II partnership.

- The collaborative partnership must have completed an examination of all or most of the local environmental risks and impacts in the community including all environmental media (air, water, etc.), come to consensus on the specific community priorities for risk reduction and be prepared to choose a risk reduction activity to address the identified community priorities.
    - While EPA recognizes that it is possible for a community to look at a wide-range of environmental risks and media, and come to consensus that they will work in only one environmental media, we believe it to be unlikely. Therefore, any proposal focused on a single environmental problem or issue must include very clear evidence to demonstrate how the community-based partnership examined risks from a number of sources in a number of environmental media; and why the Level II proposal chooses such a limited focus. [CARE does allow communities to focus on only one issue provided they have examined multiple risks.]

- It is not acceptable to have a process in which several different, unrelated groups did separate analyses of different risks and then the applicant takes the results from the separate groups and simply puts them together. Somewhere in the process there must be a single broad-based stakeholder group that will examine the local environmental risks and impacts across media and come to community-based consensus on the priority risks.

A collaborative stakeholder group, no matter how broad its constituents, which was convened about a specific kind of toxic or environmental pollutant source or environmental media, must demonstrate that they did a detailed examination of more than that single source or class of toxic pollutants and environmental concerns. For example, a group called "Good People Against Diesel Emissions," cannot state that they looked at all multi-media impacts of diesel emissions and then decided that diesel emissions were the top priority in the community. EPA does not consider this to be an "examination of all or most of the local environmental risks and impacts in the community including all environmental media."

C. Matching funds requirement

A specific level of cost sharing or matching funds is not required as a condition of eligibility, or otherwise, for project proposals to be selected for award. If matched dollars/in-kind work are included in a Level I proposal, they will not be used as additional weight in the Level I projects evaluation. However, the ability to leverage additional resources, technical or financial, from other applicants or partners will be evaluated for Level II projects (See Section V.A, Evaluation Criteria). Additionally, it is recommended that if additional leveraged funds are included, they should only be mentioned in your narrative, and should not be included as a part of your formal, submitted budget. Any funds submitted as your federal budget must follow all federal

requirements.

SECTION IV--Proposal and Submission Information

A. Getting a Proposal Package

Applicants can download individual grant proposal forms from EPA's Office of Grants and Debarment Web site at: http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/how_to_apply.htm or http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/application.htm

To obtain a hard copy of materials, please send an email or written request to the Agency contact listed in Section VII of this RFP.

B. Modes of Proposal Submission

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

1. Hard Copy Submission

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

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

US EPA
Attn: CARE Program (Marva King)
Mail Code 5101T
3133 EPA West
1301 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202-566-0188

Hard Copy Proposal Submission Deadline: All hard copies of proposal packages must be received by Marva King by March 9, 2010 by 4:00 p.m., EST.

2. E-mail Submission

E-mail submissions must be submitted to CARE_2010_RFP@epa.gov and be received by the submission deadline stated in Section IV.F of this announcement. All required documents listed in Section IV.C of the announcement must be attached to the e-mail as separate Adobe PDF

files. Please note that if you choose to submit your materials via e-mail, you are accepting all risks attendant to e-mail submission including server delays and transmission difficulties. E-mail submissions exceeding 15MB will experience transmission delays which will affect when they are received by the Agency. For these size submissions, applicants should submit their application materials via hardcopy because if they are sent via e-mail they may be received late and not considered for funding. Applicants submitting their application materials through e-mail should confirm receipt of the materials with Marva King as soon as possible after submission.

C. Proposal Package Components

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

I. Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance
Complete the form (available at http://www.epa.gov/ogd/forms/forms.htm). 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 (available at http://www.epa.gov/ogd/forms/forms.htm). 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, 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 document should be readable in PDF for Windows, consolidated into a single file, and prepared in accordance as stated below.

Narrative Proposal Format – Narratives in excess of 10 pages will not be considered

- The Narrative Proposal (including sections 1 and 2 below) **cannot** exceed a maximum of 10 single-spaced typewritten pages. This information can be presented in both a paragraph and/or table format. Supporting materials, such as resumes and letters describing the role of a partner (e.g., in-kind support or technical assistance), can be submitted as attachments and will not be included in the 10-page limit.

- Applicants for Level II cooperative agreements are also allowed to include up to five (5) attachments of no more than 50 TOTAL pages of substantiating materials (e.g., membership lists, meeting notes, reports). These attachments should demonstrate that the Level 2 applicant has met the Level 2 threshold criteria for a Level II grant. The CARE Level 1 projects do not have to meet this criterion.

- If other information is included, it will be removed from the package and not considered.

- Pages must be numbered in order starting with the "Project Title" and continuing through the "Key Personnel" sections.

1. Title Page

The title page shall contain the title of the project, name, address and phone number of the organization applying, the name of a contact person, the location of the community (general information such as town/county and State not a long description, e.g., NE Metropolis, New York; Columbus and Lincoln Counties Florida; Springfield, Alaska), whether the application is for a Level I or a Level II cooperative agreement and the amount of money requested. The title page should have no other information.

2. Narrative Proposal Outline

The Narrative Proposal must explicitly describe how the proposed project meets the guidelines established in Sections I-III (including the threshold eligibility criteria in Section III.C) of this RFP, and must address each of the evaluation criteria set forth in Section V, and should conform to the following outline:

i. Project Title -- Please include the city, state/tribal identification in the title.

ii. Organization Overview -- An overview of the applicant's organization, its mission, and pertinent related experience.

iii. Community Profile -- A profile of the community served by the proposed project including political and geographical boundaries, description of the community, and other information that would be useful to understand the target population. Please specify how you are defining the community, whether by political boundary such as county, by geographical boundary such as watershed or valley, or by neighborhood or any other definition.

iv. Project Description -- A summary of the project and an explicit description of how the proposed project specifically addresses each of the applicable evaluation criteria in Section V. Applicants must submit information addressing and responding to each of the evaluation factors in Section V. To assist potential applicants in the preparation of their proposals, EPA has provided "suggested types of information" in Appendix C that will help the applicant respond to the requirements of the Evaluation Criteria elements specified in Section V.

PLEASE NOTE: For better efficiency and effectiveness these descriptions may be placed in table format instead of in a narrative.

Level I project description should include a reasonable level of detail on the:

- Project's purpose, in a brief concise paragraph
- Extent of environmental and public health problems affecting the community
- Project goals and performance plan with proposed timeline
- Community involvement/collaboration/partnership
- Alignment with the CARE strategies (as identified in Section I.B.2)
- Tracking and measuring environmental results, including a plan with milestones for tracking and measuring progress towards achieving the expected project's outcomes and outputs
- Applicant's programmatic capability

Level II project description should include a reasonable level of detail on the:

- Project's purpose, in a brief concise paragraph
- Environmental issues and community concerns including both those considered and the ones identified to be addressed by the project
- Project goals and performance plan with proposed timeline
- Names of the members of the broad-based stakeholder group (those who participated in Level I work and those who will be part of the Level II project)
- Results of the Level I work including the identified priority risks
- Ability to leverage new resources and sustain community efforts to understand and improve the environment
- Project's alignment with CARE strategies (as identified in Section I.B.2)
- Tracking and measuring of environmental results, including a tracking and measurement plan with milestones, that address the progress of achieving the expected project outcomes and outputs
- Applicant's programmatic capability

v. Key Personnel -- Brief biographical sketches of key project managers, community organizers or technical experts who will be involved in the proposed project.

vi. Budget – A detailed budget which reflects the tasks/activities proposed for the CARE project. In addition, please provide an approximation of the percentage of the budget designated for each major activity. The budget is part of the narrative project proposal. The budget cannot exceed two pages. (See Appendix B)

Please provide the following in your detailed itemized budget:

- Personnel Cost (if any)
- Fringe Benefits (if any)
- Contractual Costs
- Travel
- Equipment
- Supplies
- Other
- Total Direct Cots
- Total Indirect Costs*
- Do not include any leveraged funds in your formal budget request

***Selected applicant(s) will need to submit a copy of their current indirect cost rate that has been negotiated with a federal cognizant agency.**

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.

vii. Environmental Results—Outcomes and Outputs

Identify the expected quantitative and qualitative outcomes of the project **(See Section I)**, including what measurements will be used to track your progress towards achieving the expected outcomes and how the results of the project will be evaluated. Identify the expected project outputs and how progress towards achieving the expected outputs will be tracked and measured.

viii. Past Performance

a. Programmatic Capability: Submit a list of federally funded assistance agreements **(assistance agreements include federal grants and cooperative agreements but not federal contracts)** similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than five, and preferably EPA agreements) and describe (i) whether, and how, you were able to successfully complete and manage those agreements, and (ii) your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements including submitting acceptable final technical reports.

b. Reporting on Environmental Results--Outcomes and Outputs: Submit a list of federally funded assistance agreements **(assistance agreements include federal grants and cooperative agreements but not federal contracts)** that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than five, and preferably EPA agreements**),** and describe how you documented and/or reported on whether you were making progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outputs and outcomes) under those agreements. If you were not making progress, please indicate whether, and how, you documented why not.

In evaluating applicants under the above past performance factors in Section V, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current and prior federal agency grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available environmental results past

performance information, please indicate this in the narrative proposal and you will receive a neutral score for this factor under Section V. If you do not provide any response for this item, you may receive a score of 0 for this factor.

D. Use of funds to make subawards to acquire contract services or fund partnerships

EPA awards funds to one eligible applicant as the recipient of the financial assistance 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 (http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/retrieve.html) 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, (http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/rewrite/circulars/a133/a133.html) 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.

E. Evaluation of subawardees/subgrantees and contractors

Section V of the RFP describes the evaluation criteria and evaluation process that will be used by EPA to make selections of awardees. During this evaluation, except for those criteria that relate

to the applicant's own qualifications, past performance, and reporting history, the review panel will consider, if appropriate and relevant, the qualifications, expertise, and experience of:

(i) an applicant's named subawardees/subgrantees identified in the proposal/application if the applicant demonstrates in the proposal/application that if it receives an award that the subaward/subgrant will be properly awarded consistent with the applicable regulations in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31. For example, applicants must not use subawards/subgrants to obtain commercial services or products from for profit firms or individual consultants.

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

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

F. Submission of Final Application Packages

Final (full) grant applications will be requested only from those eligible entities whose proposals have been tentatively selected for award. Additional instructions for final application packages will be provided when the applicant is notified of the tentative selection.

G. Confidential Business Information

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their proposal package as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidential claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark proposals or portions of 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. However, the agency considers competitive proposals/applications confidential and protected from disclosure prior to the completion of the competitive selection process.

H. Pre-Proposal Assistance and Communications

In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1: http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/5700_5A1.pdf), EPA staff will not meet with individual

applicants to discuss draft proposal packages, provide informal comments on draft narrative proposals, or provide advice and/or guidance to applicants on how to respond to ranking criterion. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their proposals. However, EPA will respond to questions in writing from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criterion, administrative issues related to the submission of the proposal, and requests for clarification about the announcement.

SECTION V--Proposal Review Information

A. Evaluation Criteria

Each eligible applicant's proposal that meets the threshold criteria in Section III will be evaluated according to the criteria set forth below. **EPA strongly suggests that you refer to the guidance in Appendix C when writing your proposal.**

Applicants must clearly and explicitly address these criteria as part of their proposal submittal and must state whether they are applying for a Level I or Level II cooperative agreement.

Applicants' responses, if desired, may be written in a table format instead of narrative format.

Each proposal will be rated under the specific Levels' point system, with a total of 100 points possible.

LEVEL I PROPOSAL EVALUTION CRITERIA

For the award of Level I cooperative agreements, the proposals will be evaluated on the following criteria:

Level I Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points per criterion
1. Extent of environment and public health problems: Proposals will be evaluated based on the extent the community is: ▪ impacted by environment pollution in various environmental media (air, water, land, indoor environments, etc.), including significant community exposures to toxic pollutants and environmental concerns from multiple sources and/or multiple stresses to the local environment; and/or ▪ impacted by multiple stresses on economically disadvantaged communities and/or vulnerable communities and populations. ***Note***: Proposals that describe multiple environmental concerns, instead of a single environmental threat, may be given more weight in the evaluation process.	**15**
2. Project Goals and Performance Plan: The proposal will be evaluated on the extent and detail to which the project presents a comprehensive, well thought-out performance plan with activities, milestones, timelines (dates tasks will be carried out and outputs produced including a clear statement of the total expected length of the project) and responsible persons or organizations, to achieve the identified goals of the Level I CARE project (e.g., engaging partners and community members, gathering data, informing the public, ranking and prioritizing risks). Plan should include measurable outcomes and outputs, relate to the entire scope and size of the defined community and to the needs of the community, and remain in line with the project budget. See Appendix A for recommended Logic Model.	**25**

3. Community Involvement/Collaboration/Partnerships: The proposals will be evaluated based on the applicant's organizational capacity and its ability to organize and run an effective collaborative partnership (e.g., residents, businesses, governments, academic institutions, non-profit organizations) and any other appropriate partners. The plan must identify all parties in the partnership necessary to identify sources of toxic pollutants and environmental concerns, set priorities, and bring about solutions, including the process through which organizations will work together. Any gaps in membership representation (e.g., community organizations, personnel or residents not now participating), and how those gaps will be addressed, should be described. Proposals with detailed letters of specific commitment (explaining how the committed entity will act in partnership with the applicant) from partnership members and those from multiple stakeholders representing different types of interests, will be scored higher than proposals of general support and those representing a few types of interests.	**25**
4. Alignment with CARE Strategies: In the "Scope of CARE Projects" section (I.B.2) of this RFP, the CARE program has identified six strategies to achieve its goals. Proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate how they will address the following **three** CARE strategies: ▪ Provide information, and a variety of tools, and technical assistance to help communities understand and assess all major potential sources of exposure to environmental pollutants. ▪ Explain how you will utilize EPA resources (e.g. data, expertise, related voluntary programs) that will help your organization focus on action to carry out the L1 risk reduction activities. ▪ Build effective, long-term, collaborative partnerships that include community organizations and residents, businesses, and governments and other appropriate partners. Each strategy is worth five points.	**15**
5. Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results: The proposal will be evaluated on the effectiveness of the proposed plan for tracking and measuring of the expected environmental results, particularly documenting progress toward finalizing project activities and achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes; including those identified in Section I.C and Appendix A of the solicitation. The applicants should clearly specify the performance measures they will be tracking. The performance measures should focus on solid, quantitative measures related to the project activities, outputs, and outcomes.	**10**

6. Programmatic Capability/Reporting Environmental Results: Proposals will be evaluated based on the degree and detail to which they describe and demonstrate the applicant's ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account the following factors: ▪ its past performance in successfully completing and managing federally-funded assistance agreements similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project performed within the last three years (no more than five projects, and preferably EPA projects); ▪ its history of meeting reporting requirements under federally-funded assistance agreements similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project performed within the last three years and submitting acceptable final technical reports under those agreements; ▪ its organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project; ▪ its staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project; and ▪ the extent and quality to which they adequately documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) under federal agency assistance agreements performed within the last three years, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. ***Note***: In evaluating proposals under this factor, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). Applicants with no relevant or available past performance reporting history in the first, second, and last bullets will receive a neutral score (5 pts) for these factors. If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors. Each item is worth 2 points.	**10**

LEVEL II PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

For the award of Level II cooperative agreements, proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Applicant responses, if desired, may be written in a table format instead of narrative format.

LEVEL II PROPOSAL Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points per criterion
1. Environmental issues and concerns: Proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and detail they demonstrate the community is: ▪ impacted by environmental pollution in various environmental media (air, water, land, indoor environments, etc.), including significant community exposures to toxic pollutants and environmental concerns from multiple sources and/or multiple stresses to the local environment, and/or, ▪ impacted by multiple stresses on economically disadvantaged communities and/or underserved vulnerable communities and populations. Applicants should note the following: ▪ Additional points will be given to proposals that are able to factually detail their unique multi-media concerns and how those concerns were identified and prioritized through a community-based consensus. ▪ Information that is specific to the community served by the project will be given more weight than general information**.** ▪ Proposals that clearly describe the process by which the set of multiple environmental concerns went through the prioritization process may be given more weight in the evaluation process.	**10**
2. Project Goals and Performance Plan: The proposal will be evaluated on the extent to which ▪ the project presents a detailed, comprehensive, well thought-out performance plan with activities, milestones, and timelines to achieve the identified goals of the CARE project while remaining in line with the project budget, and how the project intends to continue a sustainable partnership to continue addressing the community environmental concerns.	**15**
▪ the goals of the project are based on and consistent with the risk prioritization identified through the collaborative stakeholder process (e.g., engaging partners and community members, gathering data, informing the public, ranking and prioritizing risks).	**10**

See Appendix A for recommended Logic Model.	
3. Past and Continued Success of Broad-Based Stakeholder Group: Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on the current and expected future inclusiveness, effectiveness, and overall success of the existing collaborative partnership and broad-based stakeholder group and the processes it used to acquire risk identification and prioritization information to build continued community-based consensus. ▪ Inclusiveness looks at how broad based the partnership is and whether the participants represent the various interests in the community and how it made consensus decisions. ▪ Effectiveness looks at the multi-media nature and depth of the examination of toxic pollutants and environmental concerns in the community and how the current group (or a new version of the group) will ensure progress and productive performance. ▪ Success looks at the group's ability to build consensus on priority risks and developing a sustainable partnership. The proposal should also explain why the applicant is the appropriate recipient of the CARE funds for the partnership. Proposals with detailed letters of specific commitment (explaining how the committed entity will act in partnership with the applicant) from partnership members, and those from multiple stakeholders representing different types of interests, will be scored higher than proposals of general support and those representing a few types of interests.	**20**
4. Ability to Leverage New Resources: Proposals will be evaluated based on the applicant's ability to leverage other resources including technical assistance and volunteer resources to expand and sustain their efforts to understand and improve the local environment and continue addressing the community's prioritized concerns.	**5**
5. Sustain Community Efforts to Understand and Improve the Environment: Proposals will be evaluated based on the demonstrated extent and detail to which the applicant can demonstrate its ability to continue the work and results of the CARE project and the broad-based stakeholder partnership.	**10**
6. Alignment with CARE Strategies: In the "Scope of CARE Projects" section (I.B.2) of this RFP, the CARE program has identified six strategies to achieve its goals. Proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate how the work proposed for Level II cooperative agreements will address the following **two** CARE strategies: ▪ Explain how you will utilize EPA resources (e.g. data, expertise, related voluntary	**10**

programs) that will help your organization focus on action to carry out the L2 risk reduction activities ; ▪ Build long-term community capacity to continue improving the local environment. Each strategy is worth 5 points.	
7. Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results: The proposal will be evaluated on the extent and detail of a comprehensive proposed plan for an effective tracking and measuring of the expected environmental results, particularly documenting progress toward finalizing project's activities and achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes; including those identified in Section I.C and Appendix A of the solicitation. The applicants should clearly specify the performance measures they will be tracking. The performance measures should focus on solid, quantitative measures related to the project's activities, outputs, and outcomes.	**10**
8. Programmatic Capability/Reporting Environmental Results: Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project and to the extent and quality to which they adequately documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outcomes and outputs) taking into account the applicant's: (i) past performance in successfully completing and managing federally-funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include federal grants and cooperative agreements but not federal contracts) similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project performed within the last three years; (ii) history of meeting reporting requirements under federally-funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include federal grants and cooperative agreements but not federal contracts) similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project performed within the last three years and submitting acceptable final technical reports under those agreements; (iii) organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project; (iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project; and (v) the achievement, documentation, and reporting of their environmental progress and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. ***Note:*** In evaluating applicants under this criterion, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information	**10**

supplied by the applicant). Applicants with no relevant or available past performance or reporting history (items i, ii, and v above), will receive a neutral score (1 point per item) for those elements of this criterion. If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors. Each item is worth 2 points.	

B. Review and Selection Process

Eligibility Determination and EPA Regional Review and Ranking

Step 1: All Level I and II proposals will first be evaluated by EPA Headquarters staff to see if they meet the threshold criteria identified in Section III. Those that do not meet the threshold criteria will be considered ineligible and will not be scored or considered further.

Step 2: An Evaluation Team in each EPA regional office will then evaluate the eligible proposals for projects located in states covered by their region based on the ranking criteria described in Section V.A. The appropriate regional office will be determined by the location of the community served by the project and not by the location of the applicant.

Step 3: After the evaluation is complete, the regional offices that reviewed proposals will forward to the National Selection Committee (described below) the two (2) highest ranked Level I and Level II proposals, or any combination of their four highest ranked proposals (e.g., three Level I and one Level II). Regions can forward up to four (4) proposals to the National Selection Committee, although they can send less than four (4) depending on the quality of proposals received and reviewed.

EPA National Selection Committee Determination

Step 4: As described above, the highest ranked proposals, based on their evaluation against the Section V.A. criteria, from EPA regional offices will be referred to the National Selection Committee for further evaluation. The National Selection Committee will consist of staff from a cross section of EPA programs and regional offices. The National Selection Committee will consider and review the highest ranking proposals received from the regions against the following other factors:

- Whether the project is consistent with the CARE model - does it include business, community, and local government in the partnership and whether it looks at the varied risks in the community and allows the partnership to prioritize environmental risks and impacts;

- An appropriate balance of Level I and Level II projects;

- Geographic balance of projects within each EPA region and throughout the nation - geographic diversity of all of the CARE funded projects collectively is preferable, so two projects in the same city or county are unlikely (see the listing of past funded CARE projects at http://www.epa.gov/care/community.htm

- The diverse environmental nature of the projects (different major environmental concerns addressed);

- Type of community (rural, urban, low-income, minority, vulnerable population, etc.);

- Type of grantee (tribe, community group, local government agency, university);
- The extent to which the projected use of funds will be spent to directly benefit the community;
- Projects whose environment and/or public health benefits will be sustained after the cooperative agreement is completed: and
- Projects that are consistent with the priorities established in the Regional Strategic Plans.

Step 5: Final proposal selection recommendations will be made by the National Selection Committee to the Selecting Official from among the highest ranked proposals and based on consideration of the other factors identified in Step 4 above.

Step 6: Final applications for cooperative agreement funding will be requested only from those eligible entities whose initial proposals have been tentatively selected for funding**.** EPA will notify selected applicants on or before October 1, 2010.

Step 7: The regional grants office will review the final application for cooperative agreement funding and will work with the regional project officer to finalize a project work plan. Once the final application and work plan are approved, the regional grants office will notify the applicant that it has been formally approved for selection and funding.

Section VI--Award Administration Information

A. Award Notices

Following final selections, all applicants will be notified regarding their application's status.

EPA anticipates notification to ***successful*** applicant(s) will be made via telephone, electronic or postal mail by October 1, 2010 by the corresponding EPA regional grants offices. This notification, which advises that the applicant's proposal has been selected and is being recommended for award, is not an authorization to begin performance. The award notice signed by the EPA grants officer is the authorizing document and will be provided through postal mail, and issues after the cooperative agreement is negotiated. At a minimum, this process can take up to 90 days from the date of selection.

EPA anticipates notification to ***unsuccessful*** applicant(s) will be made by the corresponding EPA regional office via electronic or postal mail by October 1, 2010. In either event, the notification will be sent to the original signer of the application.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

A listing and description of general EPA regulations applicable to the award of federal assistance

agreements may be viewed at:
http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/applicable_epa_regulations_and_description.htm.

This program may be eligible for coverage under Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs." An applicant should consult the office or official designated as the single point of contact in the state where the proposed project will be conducted for more information on the process the state requires to be followed in applying for assistance, if the state has selected the program for review (http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html). This review is not required with the initial proposal and not all states require such a review.

Grants and agreements with institutions of higher education are subject to 40 CFR Parts 30 and 40 and OMB circular A-122 for non-profits and A-21 for institutions of higher learning.

Programmatic terms and conditions in the cooperative agreements will be negotiated between EPA and the selected recipient.

C. Non-profit Administrative Capability

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

D. Reporting Requirement

Quarterly progress reports and a detailed final report will be required. These quarterly reports will be required to be written and sent electronically to the official EPA regional Project Officer. They will summarize the technical progress, planned activities for next quarter, and give a summary of expenditures. These quarterly reports should also include: a summary of performance progress-to-date, detailed expenditures-to-date, problems encountered, successes achieved, and lessons learned.

The final report shall be completed within 90 calendar days of the completion of the period of performance. The schedule for submission of quarterly reports and any additional specific information required in the reports will be established, by EPA, after award.

While the Agency will negotiate precise terms and conditions relating to substantial involvement as part of the award process, EPA expects to closely monitor:

- the successful applicant(s) performance;
- collaborate during the performance of the scope of work;

- approve the substantive terms of proposed grants;
- approve the qualifications of key personnel;
- review and comment on reports prepared under the resulting cooperative agreement; and
- evaluate the engineering improvements on an EPA demonstration project.

After award and during administration of the resulting cooperative agreements, the EPA Project Officer(s) expects to hold monthly telephone conference calls with all successful award recipients. A template will be furnished on those items to be discussed.

As part of EPA's efforts to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the CARE program, EPA or its contractors or future grantees may attempt to follow up with community stakeholders groups involved in the CARE program from time to time to ask a series of questions from the applicant regarding the accomplishments of the community after the end of the cooperative agreement. Such questions would be of a general nature such as to additional funding received and programs accomplished. EPA expects that the cooperative agreement recipients will be willing to provide such information when requested.

E. 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://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/resolution.htm. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting Dennis O'Connor at oconnor.dennis@epa.gov.

Section VII--Agency Contacts

We have prepared a Question and Answer document which can be linked from the CARE Web site (http://www.epa.gov/care/agreements.htm). Any additional questions or comments must be communicated in writing via postal mail, facsimile, or by using our Web site listed above. Answers will be posted, bi-weekly, until the closing date of this announcement at the OAR Grants/Funding Web page (http://www.epa.gov/air/grants_funding.html).

Send mail to:

US EPA
Attn: CARE Program (Dennis O'Connor)
Mail Code 6601J
Room 448
1310 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-343-9213

Send fax to: 202-566-0202 (attention CARE program).

Note that only questions and not proposals are accepted via fax.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Go to our Web site, and click on the words contact us at the bottom of the screen: www.epa.gov/care

Email: oconnor.dennis@epa.gov; Phone: 202-343-9213

Section VIII --Other Information

The EPA Grant Award Officer is the only official that can bind the Agency to the expenditure of funds for selected projects resulting from this announcement.

Appendix A
CARE Required Performance Measures

Why measure performance?

Measuring project progress is critical to achieving your desired goals. Targeting work toward specific project outcomes can help you manage your project to achieve these results. Measurement can tell you what is working with your project and what is not, and when it may be necessary to adapt your approach. It will give you the information to know that your efforts are having a positive impact on your community. It will help you remain sustainable, by giving you the information to demonstrate to EPA and other supporting organizations that you are achieving your project goals.

CARE Performance Measurement Requirements

To ensure the long-term viability of individual CARE projects it is critical that the program as a whole demonstrate strong results. As a part of each cooperative agreement, CARE requires grantees to provide performance information through quarterly progress reports and a final report. This information will help the CARE Team track the successes of the program and manage the program effectively.

"Output" and "Outcome" measures

Under EPA Order EPA Order 5700.7 "Environmental Results Under Assistance" (http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700.7.pdf), EPA requires that all of its grants and cooperative agreement programs ensure that grantee work plans contain not only well-defined outputs, but also, to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes.

The term "outcome" means the result that will occur from carrying out an activity that is related to a project goal. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic in nature, must be quantitative, and may not necessarily be achievable within an assistance agreement funding period.

The term "output" means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work products related to an environmental goal or objective, that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period. Outputs reflect the products and services provided by the recipient, but do not, by themselves, measure the programmatic or environmental results of an assistance agreement.

There are two major types of outcomes - end outcomes and intermediate outcomes. End outcomes are the desired end or ultimate results of a project or program. They represent results that lead to environmental/public health improvement. A change in water quality and resultant change in human health or environmental impacts are examples of end outcomes.

Intermediate outcomes are outcomes that are expected to lead to end outcomes but are not themselves "ends." Given that the end outcomes of an assistance agreement may not occur until after the assistance agreement funding period, intermediate outcomes realized during the funding period are an important way to measure progress in achieving end outcomes. For example, for an air pollution program, reductions in pollution emissions may be viewed as an intermediate outcome to measure progress toward meeting or contributing to end outcomes of improved ambient air quality and reduced mortality from air pollution.

The following examples illustrate the relationship between outputs and outcomes.

1. If a project goal is to meet regularly with partners to plan for and conduct business or other outreach activities to involve others in pollution prevention activities, you may wish to measure:
   Outputs: The frequency of these meetings, whether an outreach plan is developed.
   Outcomes: The percentage of targeted businesses involved in pollution prevention programs or efforts—before and after outreach, the results of the pollution prevention activities' contact (e.g., financial, technical, or in kind assistance).

2. If a project goal is to reduce idling at schools through an anti-idling campaign, you may wish to measure:
   Outputs: The number of schools that are a part of the campaign, the percentage of the target population reached with the anti-idling messages.
   Outcomes: Reductions in air toxic emissions at schools from buses and cars and based on the calculations of pre and post idling campaign estimates.

Developing Performance Measures for your Proposed Work Plan

The following are questions to consider when developing output and outcome measures of quantitative and qualitative results.

1) What are the measurable short term and longer term results the project will achieve?
2) How does the plan measure progress in achieving the expected results (including outputs and outcomes) and how will the approach use resources effectively and efficiently?

One tool that may be useful to you in developing output and outcome measures is a "logic model." A logic model is a visual model that shows the relationship between your work and your desired results. It communicates the performance story of your project, focusing attention on the most important connections between your actions and the results. A logic model can serve as a basic road map for the project, explaining where you are and where you hope to end up.

To learn more about logic models:

Take an online course: A University of Wisconsin Extension Service online course on enhancing performance using logic models (http://www.uwex.edu/ces/lmcourse/)

Read or download a manual: The Kellogg Foundation guide to developing logic models
www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub3669.pdf

Watch and listen to an online Web seminar:
An online Logic Model Webinar Sponsored by EPA and CDC
Available as an archived presentation and audio recording on the *Communities in Action for Asthma Friendly Environments* Network site
Developing a Logic Model and Focusing Your Evaluation (December 17, 2008)
http://www.asthmacommunitynetwork.org/webinars/program_evaluation_basics.aspx

Look at some examples:
EPA Region 10 Web page with sample logic models gives definitions and shows sample logic models for grant programs
http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/ECOCOMM.NSF/webpage/measuring+environmental+results

Data collection

There are various methods for collecting or tracking data. Those selected will depend on the specifics of the project.

Example 1: To measure the effectiveness of an educational training workshop, the applicant may want to administer a pre and post tests to those who attended.

Example 2: The pre and post tests may be appropriate for this element of the project, while another element of the project may want to document pre and post project behavioral changes by community members.

For your measures, think about what your data source will be (e.g., people, existing records, observation) and how you will collect the data (e.g., observing behavior changes, administering pre and post tests). Note that measures of environmental or human health benefits resulting from the project may be estimated or projected.

CARE Program Measures

The EPA CARE team has developed a set of measures to track the progress and results of all CARE projects. To develop this set of measures, EPA used a "logic model" approach. Using this approach, the EPA CARE tracking team first mapped out the relationships between the program's key activities and intended results, and then used this model to identify feasible and informative measures of progress. This information will be gathered primarily from grantee quarterly progress reports and final reports. EPA will use these measures to track and communicate program results.

The information that EPA is tracking for all of its CARE grantees is:

Level I Measures:

- Whether you form or focus a broad, results-oriented, collaborative, multi-stakeholder partnership to address toxic pollutants and environmental concerns within 18 months of beginning work;
- How many and which tools for raising awareness of and comparing environmental risks from environmental pollutants did the stakeholder group use;
- Whether the stakeholder group obtained consensus on a list of priority toxic concerns;
- The amount of reductions of toxic pollutants and environmental concerns and associated benefits achieved, if any;
- Whether you choose to apply for a CARE Level II cooperative agreement grant;
- The number and type of other organizations with whom you are partnering; and
- The resource contributions (dollar and other) the partnership has obtained from other organizations.

Level II Measures

- Whether the stakeholder group reaches consensus and produces a set of priority actions based on their priority environmental concerns within nine months of beginning work;
- Which voluntary programs you implement;
- The amount of environmental pollutant reductions and associated benefits achieved;
- Whether you are reaching your priority action targets;
- Whether you are meeting your milestones to achieve sustainability, as outlined in your work plan;
- The number and type of other organizations with whom you are partnering;
- The resource contributions (dollar and other) the partnership has obtained from other organizations; and
- Whether the partnership continues to exist after CARE grant funding ends.

Appendix B
Sample Budget Narrative

The budget narrative for the project should correspond to the project goals and performance plan. This is only one example and is for illustrative purposes only.

Personnel (these costs are for the CARE recipient employees, if any are hired)

$_____

Fringe Benefits (tied to any personnel costs identified above) $_____

Overhead Rate $_____

Travel

Meetings with Partners ___miles @ .45 $____

National Training Workshop

Airfare Estimated $550

Hotel 2 nights @$150= $300

Per Diem 3 days @$46 = $138

Total $988

Total Estimated Travel $_____

Equipment (only items over $5,000 should be included)

Supplies

To complete tasks for project goal (s) ____ to do _____requiring office supplies such as pens, staplers, notebooks, etc.

Paper $____

Computer and Printer Supplies $____

Envelopes $____

Pencils/Pens $____

Folders $____

Educational brochures on environmental issues related to project goal _____ to do____

5,000 brochures @ $____ each $_____

Total Supplies $_____

Other

Printing ___environmental education signs for project goal ___ to do____ $_____

Postage for 2500 mailings (issues of newsletter plus meeting announcements, other literature, and required documents) @ .37 each $_____

Telephone charges to conduct outreach for project goal _____ $_____

Total Other Costs $_____

Contractual*

Lead Abatement contractor to support project goal_____ $_____

XYZ Company to conduct ____ to support project goal ____. $_____

Total Contractual Costs $_____

Total Project Estimate $_____

- **Please note that any contract or grant you award with federal dollars is subject to federal competition rules. This means that you cannot guarantee funding to any specific contractor or organization. Whether they win the contract or grant will depend on the competition which will determine whether or not they receive any money.**
- **Also, any funds that you submit as a part of your formal budget request (including leveraged funds) will be defined/included as federal funds. All federal requirements will apply. It is recommended that if you are adding leveraged funds to your project, to mention them only narratively and not include them as a part of your federally funded budget.**

Appendix C

Suggestions for the Type of Information To Include in Your Narrative Proposal

Section V.A contains the evaluation criteria. EPA is providing Appendix C to give the applicant a more detailed description of some the types of material we are looking for in your narrative; In this appendix we are describing how we think the material could be written so it would be easier to review. But please keep in mind that the material in this appendix is advisory only. **Applicants' responses, if desired, may be written in a table format instead of narrative format.** The same numbering system is being applied that is used in the Evaluation Criteria to make it easier to follow.

The following list is applicable to Level I Projects only

1. Extent of environment and public health problems:

Level I projects should be designed to help communities understand and prioritize major sources of toxic pollutants and environmental concerns. Communities are not expected to present a quantitative risk assessment. Available information and community knowledge can be used to present a preliminary picture of community risk and impacts.

- Describe the environmental problems that cause the applicant to seek a Level I CARE cooperative agreement.
- Using available information, describe the nature of pollution in your community and, if you can, identify any health and/or environmental impacts that may be related to toxic pollutants and environmental concerns.

2. Project Goals and Performance Plan:

The Agency encourages applicants to use a one-page Logic Model to detail the project's plan. (See Appendix A for information on resources to help you develop a Logic Model)

- Specifically identify measurable project goals, outcomes and outputs;
- Describe how the project work planned will directly address the community's needs.
- Describe in brief the steps you will take to engage your partners and community members, how you will gather data, inform the public, and rank and prioritize your community's concerns (Level 1 work).
- Enumerate in the proposal tasks, and milestones (i.e. dates by which tasks will be carried out and outputs will be produced.)
- Identify what persons or organizations will have lead responsibility for tasks and milestones.
- The budget narrative should show support and alignment with the project goals and performance plan.
- The plan needs to explain the timeline the applicant will use to be ready to apply for a CARE Level II cooperative agreement. The explanation should clearly state whether they will be ready to apply for a CARE Level II in 18 or 30 months and how they will keep the partnership together until they receive additional funding.
- A Level I applicant should, to the extent possible, include a description of the plan to

identify risks by identifying possible data sources and potential ways of gathering information about possible risks, the ways those risks will be communicated to the stakeholders in the community, and to the extent possible, applicants should also discuss some options that you may employ to rank and prioritize those risks once identified. There are no required sets of data or required risk ranking tools and therefore applicants are encouraged to be as descriptive as possible as to their scope of work.

- The scope of the CARE work project need only reflect the federally funded work.

3. Community involvement/collaboration/partnerships:

- Describe what you will do to bring the stakeholder group together for the purpose of collaboratively identifying, and reducing environmental and health risks in the community.
- Be clear about how you will identify and prioritize risks.
- The narrative should explicitly describe what groups (i.e. community, business government and others as appropriate) the applicant will work with. The point of this is to allow us to evaluate your proposal in terms of whether you (1) understand who is needed, (2) understand who is missing and (3) have a plan to either get them to the table or deal with their absence.
- Explain how you not only will work with key community groups but how you will engage the community as a whole regarding the identification, ranking and prioritization of environmental risks and impacts.
- List all groups that have already agreed to work with you on this project and their reason for inclusion. Use of a table which includes the name of the partner, which part of the community they represent and what they bring to or will do for the group is a good way to make this clear to reviewers.
- If you have ever worked with any of these groups in the past, and that experience would be informative of how you are likely to work together in the future you should include it.

- Please understand that consultants who are going to be paid for working on the CARE project are not considered businesses when we look to see if you have businesses represented in your partnership.
- For any organization listed include a contact name with a phone number in order for EPA to consider that organization to be part of the partnership.
- Please include letters of commitment from your partners wherever possible. (The discussion of the organizations you will work with will count against your page total - the letter of commitment will not). Remember EPA gives more weight to letters of specific commitment over general support. EPA reserves the right to contact organizations to verify their involvement.
- Explain your plans for enabling meaningful stakeholder participation in decision-making, facilitating stakeholder meetings and how you will achieve consensus among a diverse group of stakeholders. Also, include (if known) partners within your community that may need to be involved but are not a part of this proposal. Explain why these partners are

not included.

4. Alignment with CARE Strategies:

Discuss the three specific CARE strategies listed in Section V.A, Evaluation Criteria 3 and the problems the CARE project is intended to address, the approach the applicant plans to use, and how the proposed work aligns with these strategies. EPA recommends a separate short write-up for each strategy.

5. Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results:

- Describe the applicant's plan for tracking environmental results and what performance measures will be used (outputs and outcomes). Outputs are what is done and what the level of effort is (i.e. will hold a number of meetings throughout the district). Outcomes are the quantitative and qualitative effects of the results from the actions taken (i.e. the meetings engaged four additional neighborhood groups to commit to the project).
- Identify indicators and performance measures the applicant will use to determine at the conclusion of the project if goals were achieved and if the project is a success.

For additional information regarding performance measures and tracking, refer to "Developing Performance Measures" Section I.C.5 for general information and Appendix A "CARE Required Performance Measures" for specific information.

6. Programmatic Capacity:

(Differs from evaluation criteria - Check)

- Describe other projects that have been successfully managed, or organizational features and controls that will help ensure the project can be effectively managed and successfully completed.
- Describe and provide substantiation of the applicant's ability to manage this CARE project. This includes organization systems in place to assure that the project will be managed properly.
- Explain how you have the resources and personnel to successfully complete your project.
- Your organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project;
- Describe the system(s) that will be used to appropriately manage, expend, and account for federal funds.
- If the applicant is, or has been, a recipient of an EPA grant/cooperative agreement in the last 3 years the applicant must provide information regarding compliance reporting measures, and annual financial status reporting.

<u>The following list is applicable to Level II Agreements *only*</u>.

1. Environmental issues and concerns:

- Include information from the stakeholder group's multi-media investigation of the environmental risks in the community.
- Specifically identify the extent of the environmental and human health toxic problems in the community.

- Describe the severity of the environmental and human health problems in the community.

2. Project Goals and Performance Plan and Budget Accountability:

The Agency encourages applicants to use a one-page Logic Model to detail the project's plan. (See Appendix A for information on resources to help you develop a Logic Model)

- Specifically identify measurable project goals and outputs;
- Describe how the planned project work will directly address the community's needs.
- Enumerate in the proposed tasks, each task's milestones (i.e. dates by which tasks will be carried out and outputs will be produced.)
- Identify what persons or organizations will have lead responsibility for tasks and milestones.
- The budget narrative should show support and alignment with the project goals and performance plan.
- The applicant must discuss the relationship between the risk prioritization process identified through the collaborative stakeholder process (Level I activities) and the current project goals and activities being proposed in this Level II project. The scope of the CARE work project need only reflect the federally funded work

3. Past and Continued Success of Broad-Based Stakeholder Group:

This criterion is designed to inform us about the work that you did in the past so we can judge if you are ready to be a CARE Level II community. Therefore, when answering this question you need to focus on what you have done and what you will do.

- Describe the community's risk reduction priorities and describe the process through which the community priorities were identified.
- Describe how broad-based the current stakeholder group is. Explain how the group represents all relevant constituencies in the community. Provide specific information on how all sectors of the community, especially community residents, were involved in the process. The point of this is to allow us to evaluate your proposal in terms of whether you (1) understand who is needed, (2) understand who is missing and (3) have a plan to either get them to the table or deal with their absence.
- Describe how consensus was built within the partnership and the community to determine the community's priorities.
- Describe how effective the stakeholder group has been in examining the environmental problems in the community?
- Describe how the community members and partnership have participated and will participate in the planning, performance, and evaluation of the Level II proposed project.
- Substantiate the group and it's accomplishments by submitting as attachments information about the already formed Stakeholder Group including membership, meeting notes and any reports or work products produced. You are limited to up to

five (5) attachments of no more than 50 TOTAL pages.

- Be clear about how you identified and prioritized risks. Be clear about how you have or will come to consensus on the actions you will take to reduce those risks.

4. Ability to Leverage New Resources and Sustain Community Efforts to Understand and Improve the Environment:

- Describe funds or other resources that have been committed, will be committed and/or have been sought to support the goals of this project (in addition to the EPA CARE proposal).
- Detail if there are current or future plans to solicit funding from any other EPA source(s) for work related to this proposal.
- Include letters of commitment from your partners wherever possible. Letters of commitment do not count toward the page limitation.
- Provide a plan for leveraging local and national funding resources to address community priorities and can describe how Level II CARE funds will be used as a part of this broader plan.
- Describe how the applicant will develop a partnership and community infrastructure so that the stakeholder group can continue the community-based environmental and health protection work in the future.

5. Alignment with CARE Strategies:

Discuss the two strategies listed in Section V.A, Evaluation Criteria #4, the problems the CARE project is intended to address, the approach the applicant plans to use, and how the proposed work aligns with the three strategies. EPA recommends, but does not require, a separate short write-up for each strategy.

6. Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results:

- Describe the applicant's plan for tracking environmental results and what performance measures will be used (outputs and outcomes). Outputs are what is done and what the level of effort is (i.e. will hold a number of meetings throughout the district). Outcomes are the quantitative and qualitative effects of the results from the actions taken (i.e. the meetings engaged four additional neighborhood groups to commit to the project).
- Identify indicators and performance measures the applicant will use to determine at the conclusion of the project if goals were achieved and if the project was a success.

For additional information regarding performance measures and tracking, refer to "Developing Performance Measures" Section I.C.5 for general information and Appendix A "CARE Required Performance Measures" for specific information.

7. Programmatic Capacity:

- Describe other projects that have been successfully managed, or organizational features and controls that will help ensure the project can be effectively managed and successfully completed.

- Describe and provide substantiation of the applicant's ability to manage this CARE project.
- Describe the system(s) that will be used to appropriately manage, expend, and account for federal funds.

If the applicant is, or has been, a recipient of an EPA grant/cooperative agreement in the last 3 years the applicant must provide information regarding compliance reporting measures, and annual financial status reporting**.**