

Fiscal Year 2024
Instructions for Requesting Brownfields
Revolving Loan Fund Grant Supplemental Funding

Approximately \$60,000,000 in Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) funds may be available to supplement existing Brownfields Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) Cooperative Agreement Recipients (CARs or recipients) who 1) have an open RLF cooperative agreement as of **March 15, 2024**, 2) made loan(s), and 3) substantially depleted their pool of grant funds. Eligible recipients of RLF supplemental funding are only current CARs awarded under CERCLA Section 104(k) and those originally awarded under CERCLA Section 104(d) that have transitioned a grant(s) to Section 104(k) as provided in Section 104(k)(3)(D). RLF CARs requesting supplemental funding must address the considerations identified in Part [III](#) and content identified in Part [IV](#), below.

EPA expects that supplemental funding awarded to existing CARs will advance President Biden’s Justice40 Initiative¹. EPA will award this funding in accordance with the Administration’s Justice40 Initiative, which aims to deliver 40 percent of the overall benefits from key federal investments to disadvantaged communities. Options for identifying whether sites are located in/near underserved communities² (including disadvantaged communities) are provided in Appendix A. Note: If a CAR is using EJScreen in their RLF supplemental funding request to demonstrate a site has positively impacted an underserved community, the CAR must select the EPA Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) Disadvantaged Communities map in EJScreen. **EJScreen results which are not based on the EPA IRA Disadvantaged Communities map will not be accepted (see Appendix A for details).**

All EPA supplemental funding decisions are subject to the availability of appropriations and Agency budget priorities and EPA reserves the right to reject all requests and make no awards. Note that although EPA has provided a sample form for applying for funding (Appendix B), CARs will not be denied supplemental funding or otherwise penalized during the application review process for not using the sample form.

I. Background

CERCLA 104(k)(3)(A)(i) and 104(k)(5)(A)(ii), among other things, authorizes EPA to:

- award grants of up to \$1,000,000 per eligible entity to be used to capitalize RLFs and provide subawards for brownfields cleanup; and
- make an additional grant to RLF CARs for up to \$1,000,000 for any year after the year for which the initial grant is made (noncompetitive RLF supplemental funding).

¹ Justice40 Initiative information can be found at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/01/27/fact-sheet-president-biden-takes-executive-actions-to-tackle-the-climate-crisis-at-home-and-abroad-create-jobs-and-restore-scientific-integrity-across-federal-government/>. For more information on Environmental Justice, see <https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice>.

² When EPA uses the term “underserved communities” it has the meaning defined in Executive Order 13985: *Advancing Racial Equity And Support For Underserved Communities Through The Federal Government*, which defines “underserved communities” as “populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life....”. As described in the Executive Order, “underserved communities” include communities such as Black, Latino, and Indigenous and Native American persons, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and other persons of color; members of religious minorities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) persons; persons with disabilities; persons who live in rural areas; and persons otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality. It also includes “communities environmentally overburdened,” that is, a community adversely and disproportionately affected by environmental and human health harms or risks, and “disadvantaged, communities” as referenced in Executive Order 14008, *Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad*, and defined in Office of Management and Budget’s Memo M-21-28: Interim Implementation Guidance for the Justice40 Initiative.

In addition, subsection (8)(A)(iv) of the CERCLA 104(k) line-item in the IJA authorizes EPA to use the specified IJA appropriations “notwithstanding funding limitations” in the codified version of CERCLA 104(k) for “...grants under sections 104(k)(3)(A)(i) and 104(k)(5)(A)(ii) of CERCLA for capitalization of revolving loan funds in amounts not to exceed \$10,000,000 per grant”.

II. Process

Notification of Supplemental Funding Availability

- Information regarding the availability of RLF supplemental funding has been posted on the EPA Brownfield Program’s website at <https://www.epa.gov/brownfields/current-and-upcoming-funding-opportunities>. In addition, eligible CARs will be notified of the availability of RLF supplemental funding for Fiscal Year 2024 (FY24) by EPA Regional RLF program staff.

Requests for Supplemental Funding

- FY24 RLF supplemental funding decisions will be based upon specified considerations defined in Part [III](#) below. The requester of supplemental funding must be the CAR of an open RLF Grant as of **March 15, 2024**. Submittals must note the dollar amount requested. Due to high demand and limited resources, supplemental funding awards have typically been between \$200,000 and \$500,000, in total. However, due to the availability of IJA funds, EPA anticipates awarding up to \$5,000,000 per grant for FY24 RLF supplemental funding. Each CAR will receive a new cooperative agreement that is separate from its existing RLF cooperative agreement, unless it has already received an RLF cooperative agreement with IJA funds. In that case, the CAR would receive an amendment to its IJA-funded cooperative agreement.
- To be eligible for an FY24 supplemental funding award of **up to \$1 million**, CARs must meet the following general criteria by **March 15, 2024** when supplemental funding requests are due:
 - CARs must demonstrate that they have executed at least one loan.³
 - CARs must demonstrate that they have significantly depleted funds (includes EPA funds, monetary cost share⁴, and any available program income from open, post-closeout, or closed RLF Grants) and that they have a clear plan for quickly utilizing the additional requested funds. Program income refers to the funds generated or earned by all open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants, including principal repayments, interest earned on outstanding loan principal, interest earned on accounts holding RLF program income, loan fees and loan-related charges received from borrowers, and other income generated from RLF operations.
- For FY24, EPA defines “significantly depleted funds” as follows:
 - **For RLF CARs who have received more than \$1 million in EPA funding for their RLF program:** The balance of uncommitted funding can equal no more than 35% of the total amount of RLF funds under all of the CAR’s open, post-closeout, and closed grants. Uncommitted funding is the amount of available funding and is defined as the amount of

³ As was indicated in the FY22 Supplemental Funding Instructions, in FY23 and beyond the criteria now requires execution of a loan (i.e., a CAR who has executed only a subgrant no longer meets supplemental funding criteria).

⁴ See Appendix C for an explanation of the differences between monetary cost share and program income, as provided in EPA’s response to a question from an RLF Listening Session held on March 11, 2022.

Unspent RLF Funds minus the amount of Committed RLF Funds (see Part [IV](#) below for more details to include how Total RLF Funds is defined).

- **For RLF CARs who have received \$1 million or less in EPA funding for their RLF program:** The balance of uncommitted funding can equal no more than 50% of the total amount of RLF funds under all of the CAR’s open, post-closeout, and closed grants.
- EPA uses the following RLF Grant status definitions:

OPEN	The cooperative agreement is open (i.e., period of performance has not ended).
POST-CLOSEOUT	The cooperative agreement period of performance has ended and the RLF Grant has accrued or expected program income that has not been expended or returned to EPA (i.e., a Closeout Agreement is active or still needs to be executed).
CLOSED	The cooperative agreement period of performance has ended and the RLF Grant has no accrued or expected program income (e.g., loan repayments). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The remaining program income balance must be \$0, with no expected change, for an RLF Grant to be Closed.

- For calculation of the uncommitted balance, see Part [IV](#), below. For the purposes of this requirement, committed funds refers to funding designated for:
 - Pending loans and subgrants which are defined as loans/subgrants that have been approved through the applicant’s decision process (e.g., board or committee) but have not been awarded with a fully-signed agreement as of the date of the request for supplemental funding;
 - Unreimbursed costs for a cleanup that is completed or underway through an executed loan or subgrant, which is defined as a loan/subgrant with a fully-signed agreement and award date that precedes the supplemental funding request; and
 - Estimated costs for personnel, travel, contracts, or other programmatic costs necessary to maintain the RLF for the next 5 years.

NOTE: Do not include potential loans and subgrants that have not been approved through the applicant’s decision process (e.g., board or committee). To count as committed funds, the loan or subgrant must be executed or pending, as defined above.

- To be eligible for an FY24 supplemental funding award of more than **\$1 million - \$3 million**, CARs must meet all of the following criteria by **March 15, 2024** when supplemental funding requests are due:

1	CAR must meet general supplemental funding criteria identified above and have an uncommitted funding balance that does not exceed \$750,000.
2	CAR’s RLF program (open, post-closeout, and closed grants) must have at least 3 sites which are in process or have achieved cleanup.
3	CAR must have revolved program income generated from open, post-closeout, and/or closed RLF Grant(s) into at least one <u>executed</u> loan or subgrant.
4	CAR’s RLF program (open, post-closeout, and closed grants) must have at least 2 sites that positively impacted underserved communities.

- To be eligible for an FY24 supplemental funding award of **more than \$3 million and up to \$5 million**, CARs must meet criteria 1, 2, and 4 above as well as the following for criteria 3 by **March 15, 2024**, when supplemental funding requests are due:

3	CAR must have revolved <u>at least \$100,000</u> of program income generated from open, post-closeout, and/or closed RLF Grant(s) into at least one <u>executed</u> loan or subgrant.
---	---

- Potential for a waiver: If a large loan repayment is made after January 1, 2024 which causes the CAR not to meet these supplemental funding criteria (e.g., those funds are designated for a particular site but cannot be committed/expended by the date supplemental funding requests are due), the CAR may request a waiver to the criteria by providing justification with its supplemental funding request.
- EPA expects that RLF supplemental funding awarded to CARs will advance the Biden Administration’s Justice40 Initiative. EPA will award this funding in accordance with the Justice40 Initiative, which aims to deliver 40 percent of the overall benefits from key federal investments to disadvantaged communities. RLF CARs should consider whether a site is located in an underserved community when selecting subgrantees (see Appendix A for ways to determine this).
- A request for supplemental funding must be in the form of a letter (transmitted electronically) addressed to your Regional Brownfields Project Officer with a copy to U.S. EPA Headquarters at brownfields@epa.gov. The letter must include the information identified in Part [IV](#), below.

Note that the submitted request can be submitted as either 1) a letter which provides all the requested information in Part [IV](#), or 2) a very brief cover letter, with the sample format provided in Appendix B attached (see Part [IV](#) for an explanation of Appendix B). Requests for supplemental funding will not be rejected or reviewed unfavorably if an applicant chooses not to use Appendix B as long as the applicant provides the information identified in Part [IV](#).

Regional Input on Requests

- EPA Regions will review request letters from RLF CARs. The Regions will screen the request for eligibility and submit an evaluation of the request to the EPA Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization as it relates to the considerations in Part [III](#) below.

Deadlines

- Request letters must be submitted via email to your Regional Brownfields Project Officer by **March 15, 2024**. If an RLF CAR is not able to submit its request by this deadline, it may have opportunities to request supplemental funding in a future year, subject to funding availability.

Selection/Award

- Upon selection by the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM), award of supplemental funds will be made by the Regional Administrator, or other delegated regional award official.
- Upon selection to receive an award of supplemental funds, RLF CARs will be required to work with their EPA Region to award a new cooperative agreement (or modify an existing IJA-funded cooperative agreement), create/revise their workplan, and follow applicable award procedures.
- All new RLF cooperative agreements awarded will include a revised Closeout Agreement (COA) based on EPA’s [FY22 COA Template](#) (see [Fact Sheet](#) for more details). EPA will require the CAR to operate the RLF program under a single COA based on the FY22 COA

Template. That is, for CARs that have existing COAs, all post-closeout program income the CAR currently has (from past RLF Grants where the period of performance has ended) or will have in the future (from any open RLF Grants when the period of performance ends), will be combined and governed by a single COA with a COA tracking number that is usually based on the oldest, original grant number.

- **IMPORTANT NOTICE:** Although the CAR will have up to 30 days after award to sign the new COA, if the CAR has post-closeout program income in its RLF program and is selected for an FY24 supplemental funding award, the CAR must be prepared to complete post-closeout reporting requirements for FY24 per the new COA. That is, no later than October 31, 2024, the CAR must submit its annual Post-Closeout Report and complete ACRES reporting of post-closeout program income balances as of September 30, 2024. EPA provided recorded webinar training on this new process on January 12, 2023 (recording and training materials are available [here](#)) and September 21, 2023 (recording and training materials are available [here](#)).
- In addition, CARs with large amounts of post-closeout program income may want to update to the FY22 COA sooner, in order to take advantage of the new eligible uses of funds and other programmatic flexibilities. By doing so, a CAR may be able to lower its post-closeout program income balance quicker, thereby allowing the CAR to meet the supplemental funding criteria identified above. Contact your EPA project officer if you are interested in updating to the FY22 COA now.

III. Considerations

- In addition to the depletion of funds, supplemental funding requests will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which the CAR's RLF program reflects the following considerations:
 - 1) The number of imminent and potential projects in the RLF program pipeline, demonstrating the program's ability to make loans and subgrants for cleanups that can be started and completed, as well as quickly lead to redevelopment;
 - 2) Community benefits from executed and pending loan(s) and/or subgrant(s), with particular consideration given to CARs who can demonstrate benefits to underserved communities; and
 - 3) The ability to administer, preserve, and revolve the capitalization funding in the RLF Grant.
- The IJJA does not require cost share from grant recipients. Therefore, for this IJJA-funded cooperative agreement, no cost share is required for the entire RLF Grant award. Note that a 20% cost share is still required under existing cooperative agreements for RLF Grants which were not awarded using IJJA funds.
- EPA encourages innovative approaches to maximizing revolving and leveraging with other funds, including use of grant funds as a loan loss guarantee, or by combining with other government or private sector lending resources.
- EPA may also consider relevant information from other sources including information from EPA files and/or from other federal or non-federal grantors to verify or supplement information provided by the applicant.
- All FY24 supplemental funding recipients will have the following FY22 policy changes apply to their new awards via terms and conditions:

- The allowable subgrant limit has increased from \$350,000 to \$500,000, with the limited possibility of a waiver of an amount above \$500,000.
- The discounted amount in a discounted loan has increased from a maximum of \$200,000 to \$500,000 and from up to 30% of the loan to up to 50% of the loan, with the limited possibility of a waiver for either condition. Note that the discounted amount will still apply towards the non-loan portion of the 50/50 split (i.e., the discounted amount cannot apply towards the 50% of EPA funds + cost share that must be spent on loans and associated eligible programmatic expenses).
- Program income should not be included in the calculation of the 50/50 split or in the subgrant or discounted loan caps.

IV. Content of Supplemental Request

CARs requesting supplemental funding must provide sufficient information to demonstrate the eligibility for supplemental funding and to allow for evaluation of the considerations above. The request must, therefore, include all of the following information. CARs may, but are not required to, use the optional sample format in Appendix B as an attachment to your cover letter request so that the information is complete and in the correct order. EPA’s preference is for CARs to submit Tables 1, 2, and 3 in the Excel file provided in Appendix B so EPA can easily see if the math is correct. **However, CARs that do not use the sample formats and tables below and in Appendix B will not be denied supplemental funding or otherwise penalized during the application review process.**

1. **A demonstration of CAR’s eligibility for supplemental funding, to include the significant depletion of funds.**

Data and Calculations for Significant Depletion of Funds Determination

- A. TOTAL RLF FUNDS (sum of three bullets below) = _____
- Total amount of EPA funds awarded to CAR under all open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants = _____
 - Total amount of monetary cost share under all open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants = _____
 - Total amount of program income generated under all open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants = _____
- B. UNSPENT RLF FUNDS (sum of three bullets below) = _____
- Total amount of unspent EPA funds awarded to CAR for all open RLF Grants = _____
 - Total amount of unspent (unmet) monetary cost share for all open RLF Grants = _____
 - Total amount of unspent program income generated under all open and post-closeout RLF Grants = _____
 - NOTE: Please consult with the appropriate Region for the amount of unspent EPA funds reported in the EPA’s Financial Management System.
- C. COMMITTED RLF FUNDS (sum of four bullets below) = _____
- Total amount of committed funds under all open and post-closeout RLF Grants for loans = _____

- Total amount of committed funds under all open and post-closeout RLF Grants for subgrants = _____
- Total amount of committed funds under all open and post-closeout RLF Grants for contracts = _____
- Total amount of committed funds under all open and post-closeout RLF Grants for eligible program management costs (e.g., personnel, fringe, travel, supplies, indirect charges) for the next 5 years = _____
- NOTES:
 - Do not include any expenses that you have already drawn down.
 - Do not include funds for potential loans or subgrants that have not been approved through the applicant's decision process (e.g., board or committee); those funds should be included in [B above](#).

D. UNCOMMITTED FUNDS = UNSPENT RLF FUNDS ([B above](#)) – COMMITTED RLF FUNDS ([C above](#)) = _____

E. UNCOMMITTED BALANCE PERCENTAGE = UNCOMMITTED FUNDS ([D above](#)) ÷ TOTAL RLF FUNDS ([A above](#)) x 100 = _____

F. Significant depletion of funds determination:

- Has the CAR been awarded more than \$1,000,000? Yes/No
 - If yes, does the uncommitted balance exceed 35% of total RLF funds (i.e., is [E above](#) greater than 35%)? Yes/No
- Has the CAR been awarded less than or equal to \$1,000,000? Yes/No
 - If yes, does the uncommitted balance exceed 50% of total RLF funds (i.e., is [E above](#) greater than 50%)? Yes/No
- Note on potential for a waiver: If a large loan repayment is made after January 1, 2024 which causes the CAR not to meet these supplemental funding criteria (e.g., those funds are designated for a particular site but cannot be committed/expended by the date supplemental funding requests are due), the CAR may request a waiver to the criteria by providing justification with its supplemental funding request.
 - Has the CAR included a waiver request with justification in the supplemental funding request? Yes/No

Additional Supporting Information

G. Number of loans and/or subgrants under all open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants

- Number of executed loans = _____
- Number of executed subgrants = _____
- Number of pending loans = _____
- Number of pending subgrants = _____
- NOTE: Executed means the CAR has a fully-signed loan or subgrant agreement with an award date that precedes the supplemental funding request. Pending means a loan or subgrant has been approved through the applicant's decision process (e.g., board or committee), but there is no fully signed loan or subgrant agreement as of the date of the request for supplemental funding. Do not include potential loans or subgrants that have not been approved through the applicant's decision process (e.g., board or committee).
- Consider using the following table to justify the numbers provided in the bullets above:

Table 1

Sample Format for Executed and Pending Loans and Subgrants

(Note that applicants for supplemental funding that do not use this table will not be penalized.)

Name of Borrower or Subgrantee	Loan or Subgrant	Executed or Pending	Amount of Loan or Subgrant	Amount of Program Income Used	If Executed, Award Date	For Loans		
						Repayment Period Length	Interest Rate	Repayment Status (not started, in progress, or complete)

H. A list of projects and associated costs that demonstrate the current funding commitments, associated leveraging, and anticipated outcomes:

The list should account for your total committed funds amount listed above and include, at minimum, the following information: project name, location, form of commitment (loan, subgrant, or combination of the two), the dollar amount, project status (current status and projected timeline for completion of project), the amounts and sources of associated leveraged funding and whether the funding is firm (secured), proposed cleanup actions, and other anticipated outcomes (including anticipated reuse of property, the estimated number of cleanup and redevelopment jobs that will be created, and other anticipated outcomes that have a direct benefit to the community such as public health and environmental benefits). **Table 2** below provides examples of the level of information required for this demonstration.

2. **A list of imminent and potential projects in your pipeline that are most likely to use the requested funding to demonstrate the likelihood that the supplemental funding will be used expeditiously, lead to preservation of the fund, promote reuse of sites, and provide community benefits.**

Include, at minimum, the following information: project name, location, form of anticipated commitment (loan, subgrant, or other), the estimated dollar amount, project status and projected timeline for completion of project, the amounts and sources of leveraged funding and whether the funding is firm (secured), proposed cleanup actions, and other anticipated outcomes (including anticipated reuse of property, the estimated number of cleanup and redevelopment jobs that will be created, and other anticipated outcomes that have a direct benefit to the community such as public health and environmental benefits). **Table 3** below provides examples of the level of information required for this demonstration.

Note: Potential projects must maintain a 50/50 split between loan and non-loan costs. That is, at least 50% of the total award amount (EPA funds + cost share) must be spent on loans and associated eligible programmatic costs. Program income should not be included when calculating the 50/50 split.

Will the 50/50 split still be met with potential loans and subgrants shown in Table 3? Yes/No

Table 2
Sample Format and Examples for Committed Funds
 (Note that applicants for supplemental funding that do not use this format will not be penalized.)
 (Supplement as appropriate using additional rows or text.)

Project Name	Location	Estimated Amount (\$)	Form of commitment (Loan, Subgrant, or Other)	Status/Timeline	Firm Leveraging Commitments and Estimated Leveraging	Proposed Cleanup and Anticipated Reuse and Outcomes
E.g., Site A	City of Wherever, State	\$300,000	Loan	Executed RLF loan, cleanup underway and anticipated to be complete by end of summer 2024, redevelopment spring of 2025.	Firm: \$300,000 of private funding escrowed by private party for cleanup. County Parks and Rec has approved plan and committed to upkeep and maintenance of complex. Potential: Up to \$500,000 from national sports organization.	Cleanup of former landfill, expected reuse as a sports complex, creating 1 full time and 3 part-time jobs.
E.g., Site B	Unincorporated County of Anyplace, State	\$200,000	Subgrant	Approval from City Council; Subgrant to be executed in Fall 2024 & cleanup in Spring 2025.	Firm: \$500,000 for cleanup and redevelopment from local health organization. Potential: HUD Funding for affordable housing	Cleanup of abandoned hospital, affordable housing, 2 full-time jobs and the ability for aging residents to remain within neighborhood.
Programmatic Costs for Sites A & B and management of RLF for the next five years	Not Applicable	\$10,000 \$10,000 \$10,000	Personnel Environmental Professional Contract Fund Manager Agreement	Internal set-aside for personnel, contract and MOA with fund manager. To be expended during cleanup of sites A & B and on an ongoing basis for management of program income.		Successful implementation of RLF, Preservation of the RLF funds
Total Committed Funds		\$530,000				

Table 3
Sample Format and Examples for Potential Projects
 (Note that applicants for supplemental funding that do not use this format will not be penalized.)
 (Supplement as appropriate using additional rows or text.)

Project Name	Location	Estimated Amount (\$)	Form of commitment (Loan, Subgrant, or Other)	Status/Timeline	Firm Leveraging Commitments and Estimated Leveraging	Proposed Cleanup and Anticipated Reuse and Outcomes
E.g., Site D	City/Town, State	\$500,000	Loan	Developer has completed cleanup planning and is preparing RLF application. Anticipated schedule starting from date of supplemental award (12 months total): Application Submittal, Approval and Processing (3 months); Cleanup (1 month); Redevelopment Complete within 8 months.	Firm: \$1,000,000 from developer	Cleanup of a former foundry will make way for a new Nursing Home allowing elderly to remain within their community. Proposed project will create 30 jobs for both skilled and unskilled workers.
E.g., Site E	City/Town, State	\$100,000	Subgrant	Local non-profit submitted a preliminary application. Anticipated schedule starting from date of supplemental award: Application submittal (4 th Quarter FY24); approval, processing and cleanup (1 st Quarter, FY25); Cleanup Complete (2nd Quarter, FY25); Redevelopment Complete (by end of FY25).	Potential: up to \$200,000 from State DOT	Cleanup of a former railroad that will be redeveloped into a new bike path and greenspace to improve the quality of life for community residents.
Programmatic Costs for Sites D & E and management of RLF	City/Town, State	\$5,000 \$5,000 \$5,000	Personnel Environmental Professional Contract Fund Manager Agreement	Internal set-aside for estimated personnel, environmental contract and MOA with fund manager. To be expended during cleanup of sites D & E and on an ongoing basis for management of program income.	Additional Personnel Costs from City	Compliance with Award Conditions and Revolve of Funds
Total for Potential Projects		\$615,000				

3. **A summary of major RLF accomplishments for projects where RLF funding has been expended to further demonstrate the CAR’s ability to award and manage loans/subgrants, preserve the fund, successfully promote reuse of sites, and provide community benefits.**

The summary may include, at a minimum, the following information although applicants who choose to summarize their major RLF accomplishments in a different format will not be penalized. (NOTE: Your regional EPA project officer will confirm that appropriate accomplishments are reported in ACRES.):

- The geographic boundary where the RLF operates = _____
- The number of loans executed (open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants) = _____
- Cumulative dollar amount of executed loans = _____
- The number of subgrants executed (open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants) = _____
- Cumulative dollar amount of executed subgrants = _____
- The total amount of program income generated from CAR’s open, post-closeout, and/or closed RLF Grant(s) = _____
- The total amount of program income generated from CAR’s open, post-closeout, and/or closed RLF Grant(s) that has been **revolved** into executed loans and/or subgrants = _____
- The number of ongoing cleanups (open and post-closeout RLF Grants) = _____
 - Provide names of sites as they appear in ACRES.
- The number of cleanups completed (open, post-closeout, and closed RLF Grants) = _____
 - Provide names of sites as they appear in ACRES.
- The number of sites in CAR’s RLF program (open, post-closeout, and closed grants) that have positively impacted underserved communities = _____
 - Provide names of sites as they appear in ACRES and include/attach a description and/or supporting documentation (e.g., report from EPA’s EJScreen tool or data from other EJ-focused geospatial mapping tools) to help characterize and describe the affected communities/populations and area(s). (See Appendix A for more information on options for identifying sites in/near underserved communities in your request for RLF supplemental funding. **If using EJScreen, provide EJScreen Community Report that shows the answer for “Selected location contains an EPA IRA disadvantaged community” is Yes - see Appendix A for details.**) = _____
- The significant outcomes to date (including leveraged cleanup and redevelopment funding, cleanup and redevelopment jobs created, number of properties reused and other outcomes that have a direct benefit to the community) = _____

4. **A discussion on the management of the RLF to demonstrate the CAR’s competency in managing an RLF program.**

This shall include, at a minimum:

- Information regarding the timeliness of submission of required reports and work products (including Quarterly Performance Reports and ACRES data);
- Completion of critical work plan tasks;
- Compliance with terms and conditions of the grant, and, if applicable, closeout agreement requirements for post-closeout and closed grants;

- Compliance with established loan review/approval process, or discussion of updates/changes to this process;
- Ability to meet the 20% cost-share requirement, when required; and
- Other information that further supports this demonstration. If RLF grant management issues occurred, such as milestones weren't met or submittals delayed, please explain how these were identified and corrected, and how they will be prevented in the future.
- **Note: If the CAR is requesting more than \$1,000,000 in supplemental funding and does not have sufficient potential projects in Table 3 for that amount (i.e., the total amount in Table 3 is lower than the amount requested), the CAR should include information on the process employed to justify a supplemental funding award of the requested amount (e.g., how the CAR's past performance demonstrates its ability to execute the requested amount and what steps will be taken in marketing to ensure the funds are used and not sitting idle in the RLF account).**