



US Environmental Protection Agency Office of Pesticide Programs

Funding Opportunity Announcement:

**Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2)
Partnership Grants: Initial Proposals and Final Applications**

March 5, 2010

Funding Opportunity Announcement

Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2) Partnership Grants: Initial Proposals and Final Applications

Overview Information

The following list provides key information concerning this funding opportunity:

- A. Federal Agency and Office Name:
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (OPPTS), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP)
- B. Funding Opportunity Title:
Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act Partnership Grants
- C. Announcement Type: Initial Announcement
- D. Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-OPP-10-002
- E. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number:
66.716 - Surveys, Studies, Demonstrations, Educational Outreach, and Special Projects within the Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances
- F. Statutory Authority:
Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), Section 20.
- G. Dates:
Hard copies of initial proposals submitted via express delivery (e.g., FedEx, UPS, etc.) must be received by Todd Peterson on or before 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on **Monday, April 19, 2010**. EPA will not accept initial proposals submitted via fax or 1st class mail delivery by U.S. Postal Service. Initial proposals submitted by e-mail must be received by 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on **Monday, April 19, 2010**, at peterson.todd@epa.gov. All initial proposals received after the listed due date and time will **NOT** be considered for funding. If you do not receive an e-mail confirmation of your initial proposal from EPA within 10 business days of submission, or if you have questions regarding submission of your initial proposal by e-mail, please call Todd Peterson (703) 308-7224. See Section IV for further information.

Brief Description

EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) and Office of the Science Advisor (OSA) are soliciting initial proposals to advance partnerships that focus on pesticide risk management issues with a special focus on integrated pest management (IPM) approaches. Awards are intended to support a diverse set of project types, including, but not limited to demonstrations, transfer of innovative IPM technologies, outreach, and education. This announcement provides qualification and application requirements to those interested in submitting initial proposals for fiscal year 2010. The total amount of funding available for award is expected to be \$900,000 which is authorized by the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act and from the Science and Technology appropriation from the Office of the Science Advisor. The number of awards to be made under this announcement will depend on individual proposal costs, the availability of funds, and the quality of proposals received. This competition begins with a call for initial proposals from which

candidates will be selected and offered an invitation to submit full applications. This announcement contains information on the format and content for the initial proposals as well as criteria for the evaluation of invited applications. The maximum funding level is \$250,000 per project for Agricultural IPM and Community IPM; \$300,000 per IPM for Infectious Diseases; and, \$100,000 per Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM project. The project period of performance is limited to two years from the award date.

I. Funding Opportunity Description

A. History.

This program began with passage of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2). The Act provides for funding to support partnership grants in the amount of \$500,000 in FY2010, and \$500,000 in FY 2011. The total amount of FY 2010 funding available for award is expected to be \$900,000 which is authorized by the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act and from the Science and Technology appropriation from the Office of the Science Advisor. The Environmental Stewardship Branch (ESB) of the Office of Pesticide Programs' Biopesticides and Pollution and Prevention Division and the Office of the Science Advisor (OSA) are partnering to fund assistance agreements under this solicitation. The mission of ESB is to promote environmental stewardship nationally to protect human health and the environment by reducing risks of pests and pesticides through public-private partnerships, education, and other non-regulatory efforts. OSA provides leadership in cross-Agency science and science policy development and implementation. OSA manages an interdisciplinary Biodiversity and Human Health initiative to better understand the dynamics and mechanisms underlying the relationship between anthropogenic stressors, changes in biodiversity, and disease transmission to humans.

The goal of the assistance agreements is to develop public-private partnerships focused on reducing the risks associated with the use of pesticides through stewardship efforts. The assistance agreements under this solicitation are intended to help formalize and expand public-private stewardship and collaborative pesticide risk reduction efforts.

B. Authority

EPA expects to award assistance agreements under the authority provided in Section 20 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. 136r) which authorizes the Agency to issue assistance agreements for research, public education, training, monitoring, demonstration, and studies. Regulations governing assistance agreements are found at 40 CFR part 30 for institutions of higher education, colleges and universities, and nonprofit organizations; and 40 CFR part 31 for States and local governments. In addition, the provisions in 40 CFR part 32 governing government-wide debarment and suspension and the provisions in 40 CFR part 34 regarding restrictions on lobbying apply. All costs incurred under this program must be allowable under the applicable OMB Cost Circulars: A-87 (States and local governments), A-122 (nonprofit organizations), or A-21 (universities). Copies of these circulars can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/>. In accordance with EPA policy and the OMB circulars, as appropriate, any recipient of funding must agree not to use assistance funds for lobbying, fund-raising, or political activities (e.g., lobbying members of Congress or lobbying for other Federal grants, assistance agreements or contracts). See 40 CFR part 34.

C. Program Description

Integrated pest management (IPM) is a decision-making process that uses current and comprehensive information on the life cycles of pests and their interaction with the environment to manage pest damage in agricultural and nonagricultural settings by the most economical means, and with the least possible hazard, to people, property, and the environment.

EPA will segregate all proposals into four primary sectors: Agricultural IPM, Community IPM, IPM for Infectious Diseases and Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM.

1. Goals and Objectives.

The goals of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2) Partnership Grants are to:

- a. encourage partnerships between stakeholders, producers, commodity groups, scientists, extension, and local/state/federal government agencies to demonstrate, promote, and expand reduced risk/IPM practices, including increased adoption of biopesticides or reduced risk pesticides and/or those pest management techniques that do not employ chemical methods;
- b. utilize demonstration projects, outreach, and/or education to increase the adoption of reduced risk/integrated pest management (IPM) approaches, as well as, methods for documenting IPM adoption or the reduction of risks associated with changes in pesticide use;
- c. quantitatively measure and document the effects and impacts of using the reduced risk/IPM programs on the environment, human health and community;
- d. build business cases for the implementation and/or adoption of IPM approaches thereby providing pesticide users with solid business analyses of the costs of adopting IPM activities to help them make informed decisions and forward best practices;
- e. test the feasibility of new IPM strategies (i.e., environmentally-based) to control pests of public health importance; and,
- f. deliver modeling tools that can be used by decision makers to conduct integrated assessments relating IPM strategies to the provision of ecosystem services under current and expected future conditions of variable temperatures and rainfall patterns

2. Purpose and Scope.

Integrated pest management (IPM) is a decision-making process that uses current and comprehensive information on the life cycles of pests and their interaction with the environment to manage pest damage in agricultural and nonagricultural settings by the most economical means, and with the least possible hazard, to people, property, and the environment. The Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2) Partnership Grants will provide financial assistance to eligible applicants for projects focusing on pesticide risk management issues with an emphasis on integrated pest management (IPM). Awards are intended to support a diverse set of project types, including, but not limited to demonstrations, transfer of innovative IPM technologies, outreach, and education. Initial and invited proposals will be evaluated with respect to the following sectors:

a. Agricultural Sector:

- i. Agricultural issues involving pesticides for which IPM advancements are sought:
 1. Resistance management

2. Water quality and runoff issues
 3. Pollinator protection issues
 4. Endangered species protection
 5. IPM approaches for controlling rodents and predators in livestock operations
 6. Urban/rural interface and volatile pesticides
 7. Repeating emergency exemption requests on minor crops (including: Nematodes on Raspberry, Dodder on Cranberry), *Alternaria* and *Phytophthora* on Ginseng, Green Mold on Mushrooms, Blight on Walnut, Varroa Mite on Raised Honeybees, White Mold on Fruiting Vegetables, Broadleaf weeds on Strawberries and Flax, Liverwort on Commercial greenhouses and ornamentals, Thrips on Onions, and Fire blight on Apples.
 8. Emerging Pest Management Gaps: for Laurel wilt on Avacado and Bacterial blight on Tomatoes
- ii. Agricultural pesticides for which reduced risk pest management alternatives are sought, especially on [but not limited to] minor crops:
1. azinphos methyl (AZM) and Carbofuran alternatives
 2. soil fumigant alternatives
 3. Herbicide alternatives on leaf lettuce
 4. Aquatic herbicide alternatives
 5. Alternatives that support the Carbofuran phase-out on spinach seed

Projects for Agricultural IPM **MUST** have the following measures:

- acres impacted by the project under management that include pesticide risk reduction practices. If applicable, include those acres treated with biopesticides or reduced risk pesticides and/or those pest management techniques that do not employ chemical methods.
- percent reduction or pound per acre reduction expected in the use of conventional pesticide active ingredients.

b. **Community IPM Sector:**

- i. Pest management in private, commercial, and public landscaped areas such as lawns, parks, urban forests, recreational areas, and surrounding buildings.
- ii. Pest management in commercial and residential buildings used for human occupancy, including: schools, daycare centers, community centers, and hospitals.
- iii. IPM approaches for public health pests such as ticks and mosquitoes.
- iv. Vegetation management issues involving herbicides, noxious weeds, and invasive weeds in federal/state/public land areas including utility and highway rights-of-ways, rangeland, grazing areas, and public recreation areas for which integrated vegetation management (IVM) advancements are sought.

Projects for Community IPM **MUST** have the following measures:

- Landscaping acres or buildings (and affected populations therein) impacted by the project under management that include pesticide risk reduction practices. Where applicable, include those acres treated with biopesticides or reduced risk pesticides and/or those pest management techniques that do not employ chemical methods.

-- percent reduction or pounds per site reduction expected in the use of conventional pesticide active ingredients.

c. IPM for Infectious Diseases Sector:

Projects under this sector will characterize the environmental (i.e. land use, land condition, land cover change) factors affecting animals and pests that play a role in infectious disease transmission to humans. This knowledge can lead to the design of environmentally-based (nonchemical) strategies to reduce infectious-disease incidence. For example, sound land use practices can be part of IPM strategies under the authority of *FIFRA section 20(a)* to minimize the use of pesticides as a control method of infectious diseases and result in less pollution to land, air and water. Projects under this solicitation can produce tools that can be used to test the feasibility of new IPM strategies to control pests of public health importance.

Studies suggest that there is a connection between the abundance of animal hosts and vectors (that play roles in infectious disease transmission) and the landscape they inhabit. Allan et al. (2003, *Conservation Biology* 17:267-72) observed that the makeup of animal host communities is largely determined by how intact the forest habitat is. Forest fragmentation and destruction in the eastern U.S. have been shown to reduce mammalian species diversity and to increase populations of the white-footed mouse, the most efficient host of the Lyme disease bacterium, *Borrelia burgdorferi*. Greater numbers of efficient hosts and greater numbers of tick vectors that become infected from feeding on them could mean higher risk of Lyme disease for people. And, the relationship between forest cover and mosquito species abundance was studied in a malaria endemic area in the Peruvian Amazon. A statistically significant higher abundance and activity of *Anopheles darlingi* mosquitoes was observed in deforested areas compared to forested areas, independent of human population density (Vittor et al. 2006. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 74:3-11). These studies suggest that landscape features can help predict disease transmission risk, and that land use policies can be part of risk prevention or reduction strategies.

Projects focusing on the following are sought:

1. Research or demonstrations of the link between land use, land condition, or land cover change and the diversity (abundance, composition, distribution) of animals or pests of public health importance
2. Demonstration and/or outreach to apply environmentally-based strategies as part of IPM practices

Projects for IPM for Infectious Diseases **MUST**:

- Quantitatively measure the reduction of infectious disease risk expected in the use of environmentally-based IPM strategies
- Describe how the project results can be used by decision-makers to control disease-transmitting animals or pests of public health importance
- Describe the applicability of the environmentally-based approach to other spatial scales

d. Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM Sector

Land use practices can be part of IPM strategies that are used to protect and enhance ecosystem services related to agriculture such as food and fiber production. IPM strategies may also be appropriate in protecting ecosystem services such as safe drinking water, habitat provisioning for sensitive species, and nature-based recreation, which can become degraded in the course of agricultural land management.

There are ongoing efforts to identify and characterize ecosystem services and the benefits to human well-being that ecosystems provide (Kareiva et al. 2007. *Science* 316: 1866-9). In agricultural settings where pesticides are used, alternative strategies such as use of genetically modified crops that make their own pesticides that typically are less persistent in the environment than chemical pesticides are being increasingly grown to minimize contamination of air, water, land, and exposures to human populations that result from use of chemical pesticides such as thiocarbamates and organophosphates. Climate change also has great potential to significantly alter the provision of ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes (IPCC 2007). Changes in agricultural production are anticipated both in terms of the types of crops produced (e.g., projected increases in use of biofuels crops as renewable energy sources that can decrease our dependence on foreign petrochemicals), and where those types of crops are produced (e.g. on marginal farmlands). Changes in where crop production occurs can potentially impact weather and climate factors such as temperature, precipitation, carbon dioxide concentrations, and water availability and quality. Shifts in agricultural production can result in changes in the amounts or locations of pest pressure i.e. plant diseases and insects (Backlund et al. 2008. US Climate Change Science Program, Washington, DC), which in turn could result in an increase in pesticide applications and corresponding human exposure.

New models are needed to help inform decisions on pesticide use and to advance IPM strategies under expected conditions of extreme temperatures and precipitation so that risks of pesticide use to the environment and human health are minimized. Modeling tools can help assess the effects of agricultural practices on tradeoffs among multiple ecosystem services, such as food/fiber production and the provision of safe drinking water. Modeling tools may also help inform land use and development decisions to optimize the provision of ecosystem services while reducing risks to human health.

Projects can include, but are not limited to:

- Development or adaptation of models using existing datasets to assess the effects of multiple, interacting stressors, **particularly climate change and pesticide use**, on crop production, sensitive non-target species, water quality, and human exposure
- Evaluating the effect(s) of the adoption of IPM-based production systems compared with those from sole reliance on single pesticide-single crop practices

- EPA has a special interest in:
- Using existing datasets and developing empirical data to develop or adapt models to assess the effects of multiple, interacting stressors, **particularly climate extremes and pesticide use**, on crop production, water quality, sensitive non-target species, ecosystem services provided by non-agronomic plant communities, soil biota, pollinators, and human health
- Enhancing existing process-based ecohydrology models that simulate the integrated responses of vegetation, soil, and water resources to interacting stressors. Such models provide a means to clearly link effects to causes, and provide a framework for incorporating key processes applicable to IPM strategies for agricultural ecosystems. Examples of such ecohydrology models include VELMA (Stieglitz et al. 2006. *AGU Fall Meeting Suppl.* 87), RHESSys (Tague and Band 2004. *Earth Interactions* 8: 19, 1-42.) and SWAT (Bracmort et al. 2006. *Transactions of the ASABE* 49(2): 367- 74.), among others. Utilizing such models that can potentially be coupled to existing decision support platforms such as the *Envision* decision support platform (Bolte 2010. <http://envision.bioe.orst.edu>)
- Utilizing models that can be applied across multiple spatial (e.g. community, watershed) and temporal scales (days to years)
- Utilizing models that can be applied in U.S. agricultural areas with climates characterized as Mediterranean (dry summers and wet winters) (e.g. the Pacific Northwest of the U.S., Oregon's Willamette Valley)
- Enhancing these models for future environmental justice considerations (<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/faqs/ej/index.html#faq2>)

Project(s) under the sector “Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM” will be awarded as **cooperative agreements**. EPA can provide the decision support framework *Envision* (<http://envision.bioe.orst.edu/>) with a Willamette River Basin spatial structure (called Integrated Decision Units: IDUs) created from forestry data, agriculture data, and developed land uses plus other land covers. These land use/land cover data can be combined with hydrological catchments or hydrological cataloging units to form the IDUs. *Envision* will be available with models for computing (1) carbon storage and sequestration, (2) water quantity and quality, (3) greenhouse gases, (4) air quality, (5) habitat quality and fish and wildlife populations.

EPA can also provide soils data as a dataset which combines Soil Survey Geographic Data Base (SSURGO) polygons and State Soil Geographic Data Base (STATSGO) in the higher elevations where SSURGO is not available. Climate data can be downscaled from Global Climate Models (GCM) or interpolated from weather station data for precipitation and temperature. Topography data can be provided as 10 meter Digital Elevation Model (DEM) data. Crop types will be available from the USDA NASS Cropland Data Layer or from USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS). Hydrologic data from USGS and other sources describe stream flow and reservoir discharge, and nutrient and pesticide loadings to streams and groundwater.

Projects for Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM **MUST:**

- Deliver modeling tools that can be used by decision makers at the local, state, and/or regional levels to inform pesticide use by conducting integrated assessments relating IPM strategies to the provision of ecosystem services under current and expected future conditions of variable temperatures and rainfall patterns such that comparative health assessments can be performed in the future
- Specify the required partnerships (including end-users in the research team)
- Demonstrate how the tools can be used by decision makers at the local, state and/or regional levels to add-value and improve current decision-making, management or practice.

D. EPA Strategic Plan Linkage and Anticipated Outcomes/Outputs.

1. Linkage to EPA Strategic Plan/GPRA Architecture.

These assistance agreements will support EPA Strategic Plan Goal 4, Healthy Communities and Ecosystems; Objective 4.1: Chemical, Organism and Pesticide Risk; Subobjective 3 – Protect Human Health from pesticide Risk - Program/Project J1; and Subobjective 4 – Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk – Program/Project J2; and Objective 4.5: Enhance Science and Research, Sub-objective 4.5.2: Conduct Relevant Research. To see EPA's 2006-2011 Strategic Plan visit: <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>.

2. Outputs.

The term “output” means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work products 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 of the expected agreements may include: (1) educational and outreach materials; (2) pest management plans that include reduced-risk IPM program components; (3) training for producers and technical service providers; (4) partnerships established between federal and non-federal programs to provide reduced risk/IPM programs; (5) acres (or, for example, number of community buildings and people) impacted by the project under management that include pesticide risk reduction practices; (6) pounds of pesticide use reduced; (7) identification of the environmental factors (land use, land condition, land cover change) that affect the abundance, composition, or distribution of animals and pests involved in infectious disease transmission; and, (8) modeling tools that can be used by decision makers to conduct integrated assessments relating IPM strategies to the provision of ecosystem services under current and expected future conditions of variable temperatures and rainfall patterns

3. 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: (1) environmental, (2) behavioral, (3) health-related or (4) programmatic in nature, but must be quantitative. They may not necessarily be achievable within an assistance agreement funding period.

Expected outcomes from this program include, but are not limited to the following: (1) an increase in the average and/or number of growers (in agricultural settings), communities (including size of affected populations in buildings (commercial, residential), schools, daycare centers), and individuals using reduced risk/IPM tools and techniques; (2) a reduction in risks from exposure to pesticides through implementation of proven reduced risk approaches to pest management; (3) a quantitative measure or qualitative reduction in the use of higher risk pesticides or pesticides in general; (4) a business case that supports the adoption of a reduced risk pest management strategy; (5) the development of new, feasible, environmentally-based IPM strategies to control animals or pests of public health importance; (6) development of new tools to inform decision making on IPM practices that lead to multiple benefits; (7) and, increased partnerships between stakeholders, producers, EPA, other federal/state/local agencies to implement reduced risk/IPM programs or achieve quantitative and qualitative benefits to human health, environment and communities due to the adoption of reduced-risk IPM.

II. Award Information

A. Amount of Funding Available

Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2) Partnership Grants anticipates having \$900,000 in 2010 to award to eligible applicants. The maximum funding level is \$250,000 per project for Agricultural IPM and Community IPM; \$300,000 per IPM for Infectious Diseases project; and, \$100,000 per Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM project. The project period of performance is limited to two years.

B. Funding Restrictions

Indirect costs must be included in the funding amount. In accordance with 40 CFR 30.25 (f), "Recipients are authorized without prior approval or a waiver to: (1) Incur pre-award costs 90 calendar days prior to award. (i) Pre-award costs incurred more than 90 calendar days prior to award require the prior approval of the EPA Award Official. (ii) The applicant must include all pre-award costs in its application. (iii) The applicant incurs such costs at its own risk (i.e., EPA is under no obligation to reimburse such costs if for any reason the recipient does not receive an award or if the award is less than anticipated and inadequate to cover such costs). (iv) EPA will only allow pre-award costs without approval if there are sufficient programmatic reasons for incurring the expenditures prior to the award (e.g., time constraints, weather factors, etc.), they are in conformance with the appropriate cost principles, and any procurement complies with the requirements of this rule."

C. Funding Type

EPA will award funding in the form of assistance agreements according to FIFRA Section 20. Projects under the Agricultural IPM sector, Community IPM sector and IPM for Infectious Diseases sector will be awarded as grant agreements. Where appropriate, based on consideration of the nature of the proposed project relative to the EPA's intramural research program and available resources, the project(s) under the "Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM" sector will be awarded as **cooperative agreements**. Substantial Involvement may include:

1. collaboration during the performance of the scope of work
2. approval of various phases of the project

3. close monitoring of the recipient's performance to verify results proposed by the recipient

D. Total Number of Awards

The number of awards to be made under this announcement will depend on individual proposal costs, the availability of funds, and the quality of proposals received. Proposals to supplement existing projects are eligible to compete with proposals for new awards. EPA expects to make up to six awards under this solicitation.

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

EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement, consistent with Agency policy and guidance, if additional funding becomes available after the original selections are made. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than six months after the original selection decisions.

E. Start Date/Project Duration

Award funds for the selected proposals are expected to be available in October 2010. Proposed project periods may be up to two (2) years.

F. Disclaimer

EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards under this announcement, or make fewer awards than anticipated.

III. Eligibility Information

A. Eligible Applicants

Assistance under this program is generally available to States, U.S. territories or possessions, federally recognized Indian tribal governments and Native American Organizations, public and private universities and colleges, hospitals, laboratories, other public or private nonprofit institutions, local governments, and individuals and international entities. Nonprofit organizations described in Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that engage in lobbying activities as defined in Section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 are not eligible to apply. For-profit organizations are not eligible; however, ineligible groups are encouraged to work with an eligible organization to submit proposals.

B. Cost Sharing/Matching

Matching funds are not required. However, applicants are encouraged to leverage funds from other sources. This leveraging will be evaluated under Section V. B. 4 (Strengths of Partnerships). Leveraged funding or other resources need not be for eligible and allowable project costs under the EPA assistance agreement unless the applicant proposes to provide a voluntary cost share or match. If EPA accepts an offer for a voluntary cost share/match/participation, applicants must meet their matching/sharing/participation commitment as a condition of receiving EPA funding. Applicants may use their own funds or other resources for voluntary match/cost share/participation if the

standards at 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24, as applicable, are met. Only eligible and allowable costs may be used for voluntary matches/cost shares/participation. Other Federal grants may not be used as voluntary matches or cost shares without specific statutory authority (e.g. HUD's Community Development Block Grants). Any form of proposed leveraging that is evaluated under a section V ranking criteria must be included in the proposal and the proposal must describe how the applicant will obtain the leveraged resources and what role EPA funding will play in the overall project.

C. Threshold Eligibility Information

These requirements, if not met by the time of initial 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 the announcement. Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration as a result of the threshold eligibility review will be notified within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

1. Applicants must be eligible (See Section III. A) to receive funding under this announcement.
2. The maximum funding level requested for a project must not exceed \$250,000 per project for Agricultural IPM and Community ; \$300,000 per IPM for Infectious Diseases project; and, \$100,000 per Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM project..
3. The proposed project period of performance must not exceed two years.
4. Applications must substantially comply with the submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this announcement or else they will be rejected. However, where page limitations are established, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.
5. Hard copy of initial proposals submitted via express delivery (e.g., FedEx, UPS, etc.) must be received 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on **Monday, April 19, 2010**, to contact listed in Section VII.
6. Hard copy of initial proposals will only be accepted via an express mail delivery serviced. EPA will not accept proposals submitted via fax or 1st class mail delivery by U.S.Postal Service.
7. Initial proposals submitted by e-mail must be received by 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on **Monday, April 19, 2010**. Please note that if you choose to submit your materials via e-mail, you accept all risks attendant to e-mail submission including server delays.
 - i. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their initial proposal has reached the designated person/office, specified in Section VII, in accordance with the submission deadline.
 - ii. Initial proposals received after the submission deadline will be considered late and returned to the sender without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that the proposal was late due to EPA mishandling. Tracking information is required to qualify for the submission deadline and courier specific address is provided in Section VII. Agency Contact. Applicants should confirm receipt of their initial proposal with Todd Peterson at (703) 308-7224 or peterson.todd@epa.gov as soon as possible after the submission deadline—failure to do so may result in your initial proposal not being reviewed.
8. EPA will consider only the first proposal submitted by each individual investigator. Proposals from different investigators within the same organization are acceptable.

9. For **Agricultural IPM** projects, proposed projects **MUST** have the following measures:
 - i. acres impacted by the project under management that include pesticide risk reduction practices. If applicable, include those acres treated with biopesticides or reduced risk pesticides and/or those pest management techniques that do not employ chemical methods.
 - ii. percent reduction or pound per acre reduction expected in the use of conventional pesticide active ingredients.
10. For **Community IPM** projects, proposed projects **MUST** have the following measures:
 - i. Landscaping acres or buildings (and affected populations therein) impacted by the project under management that include pesticide risk reduction practices. Where applicable, include those acres treated with biopesticides or reduced risk pesticides and/or those pest management techniques that do not employ chemical methods.
 - ii. percent reduction or pounds per site reduction expected in the use of conventional pesticide active ingredients.
11. For **IPM for Infectious Diseases** projects, proposed projects **MUST**:
 - i. Quantitatively measure the reduction of infectious disease risk expected in the use of environmentally-based IPM strategies
 - ii. Describe how the project results can be used by decision-makers to control disease-transmitting animals or pests of public health importance
 - iii. Describe the applicability of the environmentally-based approach to other spatial scales.
12. For **Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM** projects, proposed projects **MUST**:
 - i. Deliver modeling tools that can be used by decision makers at the local, state, and/or regional levels to inform pesticide use by conducting integrated assessments relating IPM strategies to the provision of ecosystem services under current and expected future conditions of variable temperatures and rainfall patterns such that comparative health assessments can be performed in the future
 - ii. Specify the required partnerships (including end-users in the research team)
 - iii. Demonstrate how the tools can be used by decision makers at the local, state and/or regional levels to add-value and improve current decision-making, management or practice
13. Congress has prohibited EPA from using its FY 2010 appropriations to award grants to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or any of its subsidiaries 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. In addition, since this funding prohibition applies to subawards/subgrants and contracts awarded by grantees, applicants must consider it when preparing proposals.

IV. General Application Instructions

A. Content and Form of Submittals

1. Initial Proposal Submittals: Content and Format

Applicants should use the following format for initial proposal submission(s), and must include the information outlined below in their initial proposals. Initial proposals must be no longer than four pages (8 ½ x 11 inches, single-spaced, minimum font size of 11 point). Pages in excess of this page limitation will not be reviewed. Applicants must ensure that their initial proposal addresses the evaluation factors identified in Section V.A.1.

COVER PAGE	Page 0
Project Title	
Applicant Contact	Name, agency, e-mail address, telephone.
Sector	Identify which one sector applies to your proposal: 1) Agricultural IPM, 2) Community IPM, 3) IPM for Infectious Diseases or 4) Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM.
Funding Amount	(Total amount of federal funding requested.)
Period of Performance	(Indicate time length of project, e.g., 1 year, 2 year)
PROPOSAL	Pages 1 to 4 (not to exceed 4 pages)
Project Description(s)	<p>A. General summary statement of project goal & justification: Brief descriptions of 1) environmental significance of the project (what problem is addressed and why it is a priority at this time; specifically in relation to this announcement's Section I.C.1 and 2); 2) the proposed project, approach, goals, objectives; and 3) the anticipated outputs and environmental outcomes.</p> <p>B. Project descriptions: Characterization of the Issue: Describe how the project's approach is technically/scientifically sound and appropriate. Describe the geographic area, acreage, buildings, or sites impacted by the project and whether the project will have widespread applicability to other areas of the United States.</p> <p>Project Plan: Describe the proposed work to be accomplished, including: specific tasks, activities, and anticipated outputs/outcomes (quantifiable results) associated with major project components. Include in this section how this project utilizes partnerships; provides outreach (via demonstrations, education, and adoption of reduced risk/IPM approaches); documents measures,</p>

	<p>effects and impacts; and builds business cases as outlined in Section 1. C.1 above. For demonstration projects that employ biopesticides or involve new or experimental IPM technologies, methods, or approaches, explain how the results of the projects will be disseminated so that others can benefit from the knowledge gained by the demonstrations.</p> <p>For Agricultural IPM projects, proposed projects MUST have the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- acres impacted by the project under management that include pesticide risk reduction practices. If applicable, include those acres treated with biopesticides or reduced risk pesticides and/or those pest management techniques that do not employ chemical methods. -- percent reduction or pound per acre reduction expected in the use of conventional pesticide active ingredients. <p>For Community IPM projects, proposed projects MUST have the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Landscaping acres or buildings (and affected populations therein) impacted by the project under management that include pesticide risk reduction practices. Where applicable, include those acres treated with biopesticides or reduced risk pesticides and/or those pest management techniques that do not employ chemical methods. -- percent reduction or pounds per site reduction expected in the use of conventional pesticide active ingredients. <p>For IPM for Infectious Diseases projects, proposed projects MUST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Quantitatively measure the reduction of infectious disease risk expected in the use of environmentally-based IPM strategies -- Describe how the project results can be used by decision-makers to control disease-transmitting animals or pests of public health importance -- Describe the applicability of the environmentally-based approach to other spatial scales. <p>For Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM, proposed projects MUST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Deliver modeling tools that can be used by decision makers at the local, state, and/or regional levels to inform pesticide use by conducting integrated assessments relating IPM strategies to the provision of ecosystem services under current and expected future conditions of variable temperatures and rainfall patterns such that comparative health assessments can be performed in the future -- Specify the required partnerships (including end-users in the research team) -- Demonstrate how the tools can be used by decision makers at the local, state and/or regional levels to add-value and improve current decision-making, management or practice.
--	---

	<p>C. Description of environmental outcomes and plan for tracking and measuring progress towards achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes:</p> <p>See Section I D. EPA Strategic Plan Linkage and Anticipated Outcomes/Outputs</p> <p><i>Expected Deliverables as Outputs and Outcomes:</i> Provide a description of expected deliverables (examples include: summary report of research, study, or demonstration and means for disseminating the results, outreach publications, workshops conducted) expressed as outputs and environmental outcomes.</p> <p><i>Progress Reporting:</i> Explain how progress will be measured and reported</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Identify timeframes for achieving expected outputs and outcomes</p> <p>D. Budget: Provide costs for each project or phase broken down into major budget categories. Provide a brief narrative for budget justification.</p>
--	--

B. Submittal Instructions

Applicants have the option to submit their initial proposals in one of two ways: 1) Hard copy via express delivery (FedEx, UPS, etc.), or 2) electronically via email. Initial proposals will not be accepted via fax or standard 1st Class Mail delivery by U.S. Postal Service. All initial proposals must be prepared, and include the information, as described in Section IV.C. below, regardless of mode of transmission.

1. Instructions for Hard Copy Submissions

Applicants must submit two complete packages including all of the documents identified in Section IV. C. of this announcement. In addition, a CD containing separate Adobe PDF files corresponding to each of the documents identified in Section IV. C. of this announcement must be submitted.

Hard Copy Proposal Submission Deadline

Proposals must be received by 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on **Monday, April 19, 2010**, to EPA contact listed in Section VII. All initial proposals received after this due date and time will NOT be considered.

2. Instructions for Electronic Submissions

E-mail submissions to peterston.todd@epa.gov must be received by 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on **Monday, April 19, 2010**. All required documents listed in Section IV.C. of this announcement must be attached to the submission 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 initial proposal materials via hardcopy or else they may be received late and not considered for funding. Applicants submitting their initial proposal materials through e-mails should confirm receipt of the materials as soon as possible after submission

C. Proposal/Application Materials

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

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

Complete the form. There are no attachments. Please be sure to include organization fax number and email address in Block 5 of the Standard Form SF 424.

Please note that the organizational Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number must be included on the SF-424. Organizations may obtain a DUNS number at no cost by calling the toll-free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711.

Form SF424 can be obtained from the Agency Contact listed in Section VII or online at: http://www.epa.gov/ogd/forms/adobe/SF424_sec.pdf

II. Narrative Proposal/Initial Proposal

See IV A. 1, above, for content and format of the initial proposal.

The document should be readable in PDF or MS Word and consolidated into a single file.

3. Final Application Submittals

If your initial proposal is selected for further consideration of your proposed project, you will be invited to submit a final application. Further instructions for the submittal of the final application package will be provided to these applicants at the appropriate time. Final application submittals will be evaluated against the final application review criteria in Section V.A.2. In the final application submittal, applicants will be asked to provide certain information, including:

a. Program Capability Information

Submit a list of federally or other non-federally funded assistance agreements (for example, an assistance agreement is a grant or cooperative agreement and not a federal contract) similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than 3 agreements and

preferably EPA agreements), and describe (i) how you were technically able to successfully carry out and manage those agreements and (ii) your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements including submitting acceptable final technical reports. In evaluating applicants under these factors in Section V.A.2, 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 have no relevant or available past performance or past reporting history, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these item, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

In addition, provide information on your organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project, and your staff expertise/ qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

b. Environmental Results Past Performance

Submit a list of federally or non-federally funded assistance agreements (for example, an assistance agreement is a grant or cooperative agreement and not a federal contract) that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than 3 agreements 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 this factor in Section V.A.2, 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 proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these factors under Section V.A.2.

4. General Information

- a. **Coalitions.** Groups of two or more eligible applicants may choose to form a coalition and submit a single application for this assistance agreement. However, one entity must be responsible for the grant. Coalitions must identify which eligible organization will be the recipient of the cooperative agreement, and which eligible organization(s) will be sub-awardees of the recipient. Sub-awards or sub-grants must be consistent with the definition of that term in 40 CFR Parts 30.2(ff) and 31.3. The recipient must administer the assistance agreement, is accountable to the EPA for proper expenditure of the funds and reporting, and will be the point of contact for the coalition. As provided in 40 CFR Parts 30.2(gg) and 31.3, sub-recipients or sub-grantees are accountable to the recipient or grantee for proper use of EPA funding.

Coalitions may not include for profit organizations that will provide services or products to the successful applicant. For profit organizations are not eligible for sub-awards. Any contracts for services or products funded with EPA financial assistance must be awarded under the competitive procurement procedures of 40 CFR Parts 30 and 31. The

regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify contractors or consultants in the proposal. Moreover, the fact a successful applicant has named a specific contractor or consultant in the proposal EPA approves does not relieve it of its obligation to comply with competitive procurement requirements or consultant compensation limitations.

b. **Intergovernmental Review.** Applicants must comply with the Intergovernmental Review Process and/or consultation provisions of Executive Order 12372 or Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, if applicable, which are contained in 40 CFR Part 29. Further information regarding this requirement will be provided if your proposal is selected for funding.

c. **Allowable Costs.** EPA grant funds may only be used for purposes set forth in the assistance agreement, and must be consistent with the statutory authority for the award. Assistance agreements funds may not be used to match funds for other federal grants, lobbying or intervention in federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. In addition, federal funds may not be used to sue the Federal government or any other governmental entity. All costs identified in the budget must conform to applicable Federal Cost Principles contained in OMB Circular A-87; A-122; and A-21 as appropriate.

d. **Confidential Business Information**

By submitting an application in response to this solicitation, the applicant grants the EPA permission to make limited disclosures of the application to technical reviewers both within and outside the Agency for the express purpose of assisting the Agency with evaluating the application. Information from a pending or unsuccessful application will be kept confidential to the fullest extent allowed under law; information from a successful application may be publicly disclosed to the extent permitted by law.

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

e. **Pre-proposal/Application Assistance and Communications.** In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals, provide informal comments on draft proposals, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their applications/ proposals. However, consistent with the provisions in the announcement, EPA will respond to questions in writing from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the proposal, and requests for clarification about the announcement.

f. **Contracts and Subawards.**

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

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

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

Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or subawards to avoid requirements in EPA grant regulations for competitive procurement by using these instruments to acquire commercial services or products from for-profit organizations to carry out its assistance agreement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the subawardee or subgrantee must be consistent with the standards for distinguishing between vendor transactions and subrecipient assistance under Subpart B Section 210 of OMB Circular A-133 , and the definitions of subaward at 40 CFR 30.2(ff) or subgrant at 40 CFR 31.3, as applicable. EPA will not be a party to these transactions. Applicants acquiring commercial goods or services must comply with the competitive procurement standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR Part 31.36 and cannot use a subaward/subgrant as the funding mechanism.

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

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

- a. 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.
- b. 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.

g. DUNS

All applicants applying for funding, including renewal funding, must have a Dun and Bradstreet Universal Data Numbering System (DUNS) number. Applicants who do not already have a DUNS number may find instruction for obtaining one at the following website: <http://www.Grants.Gov/GetStarted>. A DUNS number may also be obtained by calling 1-866-705-5711.

h. Management Fees

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

V. Application Review Information

A. Evaluation Criteria

Initial and final proposals will be evaluated and scored by reviewers using the criteria listed below. Each initial proposal and final application may receive up to 100 points.

1. Initial Proposal Evaluation Criteria (100 points):

- a. Determine that the proposal contains the information described under Section IV. A. 1. of the announcement.

Under this criterion, applicants must demonstrate their ability to:

- 1) describe the environmental significance of the project (what problem will be addressed by this project and why it is a priority at this time; specifically in relation to this announcement's Section I.B.1 and 2) **(10 points)**

2)-describe in a technically/scientifically sound and appropriate approach (may include reference to methods) with clearly described project goals and measurable objectives **(20 points)**

3) describe anticipated outputs and environmental outcomes (i.e., reasonable for the proposed project, technical merit, and expected environmental improvements) **(10 points)**

- b. The proposal consists of activities within the statutory terms of Section 20 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. 136r).

Under this criterion, applicants must demonstrate their ability to:

1) (a)conducts research, performs studies, develops outreach, or offers training that advances the reduced risk/IPM programs on the environment, human health and community and (b) applicability (i.e., geographic area, acreage, buildings, or sites impacted by the project) **(15 points)**

2) Engages in partnerships, including with end-users of new knowledge, tools, or practices (local, state, regional, national) **(10 points)**

3) Conducts projects that involve new or experimental technologies, methods, or approaches (unique, creative or novel approaches) with widespread applicability to other areas of the United States and where the results of the projects will be disseminated so that others can benefit from the knowledge gained in the projects. **(10 points)**

4) Describes the quality of the applicant's plan for tracking and measuring progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes described in Section I on the announcement. **(10 points)**

5) Contains clear and quantifiable output and outcome measures, a timeline, and a description of the format in which these measurements will be reported. Describes how new knowledge, tools, or practices will be used by stakeholders to advance IPM **(10 points)**

6) Describes budget with a brief narrative justifying costs to conduct and complete the project. **(5 points)**

2. Final Proposals Review Criteria (100 points): Final applications will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Each invited application will be subjected to a technical and programmatic review. The following criteria will be used in the evaluation process:

A. Proposal Review.

All invited proposals will be evaluated by a panel of EPA staff using the selection criteria listed below.

- B. Selection Criteria.** Each eligible proposal will be evaluated according to the criteria set forth below. Applicants should directly and explicitly address these criteria as part of their final proposals package submittal. Each proposal will be rated under a points system, with a total of 100 points possible.

1. Strength of Partnerships. Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent of partnering (and if leveraging funds see criterion in next paragraph) with other organizations as part of the project activities to achieve transfer of reduced-risk IPM tools and techniques. Cooperation with, for example, scientists, extension officers, pest

control advisors, crop consultants, nonprofit organizations, community groups, local city or state officials, and other partners (for example, EPA Strategic Agricultural Initiative grantees, EPA Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program Regional Grant recipients, IR-4 Biodemonstration Program Grant recipients) is encouraged.

If Leveraging: Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate (i) how they will coordinate the use of EPA funding with other Federal and/or non Federal sources of funds to leverage additional resources-to carry out the proposed project(s) and/or (ii) that EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds or resources. Leveraged funding or other resources need not be for eligible and allowable project costs under the EPA assistance agreement unless the Applicant proposes to provide a voluntary cost share or match. If EPA accepts an offer for a voluntary cost share/match/participation, applicants must meet their matching/sharing/participation commitment as a condition of receiving EPA funding. Applicants may use their own funds or other resources for voluntary match/cost share/participation if the standards at 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24, as applicable, are met. Only eligible and allowable costs may be used for voluntary matches/cost shares/participation. Other Federal grants may not be used as voluntary matches or cost shares without specific statutory authority (e.g. HUD's Community Development Block Grants).

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

(10 points)

2. Technical Merit. Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to:
 - (a) address one or more of the following issues of special emphasis: See listing under Section I (B) 2 Purpose and Scope for either the Agricultural IPM, Community IPM, IPM for Infectious Diseases or Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM Sector.
 - (b) describe the environmental significance of the project
 - (c) describe a technically/scientifically sound approach with clearly described project goals and measurable objectives
 - (d) describe anticipated outputs and environmental outcomes (i.e., reasonable for the proposed project, technical merit, and expected environmental improvements, significance of environmental improvements) **(20 points)**

3. Target Audience. Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent to which they plan to reach their target audience(s). [DISTINGUISH TARGET AUDIENCE AND PARTNERS] **(5 points)**

4. Methodology and Objectives. Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the activities and methods used in the project for meeting proposed objectives and outcomes. This includes the ability to combine disciplines and conduct sound project management. Applicants will be evaluated based on their clarity and ability to explain the project objectives and the degree to which the proposed project will increase implementation of reduced-risk IPM programs and increase adoption of reduced-risk

alternatives and/or sustainable integrated pest management methods. Include a clear explanation of the methods (both quantitative and qualitative) that will be used to measure progress and impacts. Measures of success should be linked to reduction of pesticide risks, implementation of alternative pest management practices, and/or similar impacts. **(25 points)**

5. Environmental Measurement/Outputs and Outcomes (Medium and Long-term outcomes). Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated on their ability to achieve predicted environmental results, expected outcomes, project goals, and produce on-the-ground, quantifiable environmental change. And, evaluation will consider how new knowledge, tools, or practices will be used by stakeholders (e.g. partners, target or end-user groups) to advance IPM **(10 points)**
6. Programmatic Capability and Environmental Results Past Performance. Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account:
 - (i) their past performance in successfully managing and completing, and reporting under, federally and/or non-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 3 years. This includes whether they timely submitted required reports 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 the identified assistance agreements, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. (4 points)
 - (ii) their organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project. (3 points)
 - (iii) their staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. (3 points)

(10 points)

Note: In evaluating applicants under item i of this criterion, the Agency 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). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these subfactors (item i above-a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

7. Project Performance Measurement/Outcomes (Medium and Long-term outcomes). Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the following:
 - a. Extent to which the proposed project is projected to result in an increased use of reduced-risk products and/or IPM programs to address the identified critical pest management needs. (4 points)
 - b. Extent to which the project includes identified direct or surrogate measures of benefits to the environment and human health (i.e. benefits to water and/or air, soil quality, applicator and worker health, community) that show results from the use of the reduced-risk products or IPM program and that can be

tracked throughout the project. Direct measures identify actual environmental changes occurring with IPM program adoption. In contrast, surrogate measures identify changes in strategies or behavior that contribute to environmental changes. (4 points)

- c. Extent to which the measures assess the impact of the project (i.e., number of acres of crops affected by an agricultural project or the number of school children affected by an IPM in schools project). (4 points)
- d. Extent to which the project includes methods for tracking and measuring the applicants progress towards achieving the expected project outcomes and outputs including those identified in Section I. (3 points)

(Total = 15 points)

8. Budget

Applicants will be evaluated based on the budget plan (realistic, reasonable costs) and narrative of cost justifications. **(5 points)**

C. **Selection Process.**

All initial proposals received by EPA by the submission deadline will first be screened by the Agency Contact listed in Section VII against the threshold criteria in Section III.C of this announcement. Initial Proposals that do not pass the threshold review will not be evaluated further or considered for funding. Only those initial proposals that meet the threshold factors in section III, at the time of initial submissions, will be evaluated by a panel of EPA staff based on the criteria in section V.A.1

Initial proposals will be reviewed and ranked by a panel of EPA staff, based on the selection criteria cited above. Based on ranking, the panel will develop a list of proposals to be selected for further consideration. Only selected initial proposals will result in invitations for submittal of invited final applications.

A panel of EPA staff will review invited proposals based on the selection criteria listed in Section V.B. and assign scores to each proposal. EPA will segregate all proposals into four primary sectors: Agricultural IPM, Community IPM, IPM for Infectious Diseases and Ecosystem Modeling to Evaluate Benefits of IPM. During the final selection process, at least one and possibly more projects will be selected from each of the four sectors. Based on the review of proposals against the criteria above, the panel will develop a list of the most highly scored proposals to submit to the Selection Official. Final funding decisions will then be made by the Selection Official based on the evaluation conducted by the review panel. The highest ranked proposals will be selected for award.

VI. **Award Administration Information**

1. **Award Notices.** Once all of the final proposals have been reviewed, evaluated, ranked and selected, applicants will be notified of the outcome of the competition via email. The notification is not an authorization to begin performance on the selected project(s). The notice of award sent via U.S. Mail to the applicant's authorized representative and signed by the EPA award official is the authorizing document.

A listing of successful proposals will be posted on the EPA website (<http://www.epa.gov/pestwise>) at the conclusion of the competition.

EPA reserves the right to negotiate a decrease in the total amount of available funding, partially fund proposals, and reject all proposals and make no awards.

Quality Assurance Requirements: Awards involving the collection of environmental data will be subjected to the requirements of a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) and will require coordination with the Agency contact and Project Officer. A QAPP is not required at the time of submittal.

- 2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements.** The award and administration of these assistance agreements will be governed by the Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to states, tribes, and local governments set forth at 40 CFR part 31. In addition, the provision in 40 CFR part 32, governing government-wide debarment and suspension, and the provisions in 40 CFR part 40 regarding restrictions on lobbying, apply.

All costs incurred under this program must be allowable under the applicable OMB Cost Circular A-87. Copies of this circular can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/>. In accordance with the EPA policy and the OMB circular, any recipient of funding must agree not to use assistance funds for fund-raising, or political activities such as lobbying members of Congress or lobbying for other federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts. See 40 CFR part 34.

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

In accordance with 40 CFR 30.54 and 31.45, projects that include the generation or use of environmental data are required to submit a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). This includes efficacy and performance data, surveys and similar results. The award recipient must develop and implement quality assurance and quality control procedures, specifications and documentation that are sufficient to produce data of adequate quality to meet project objectives. The QAPP is the document that provides comprehensive details about the quality assurance/quality control requirements and technical activities that must be implemented to ensure that project objectives are met. The QAPP should be prepared in accordance with EPA QA/R-5: EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans. The QAPP must be submitted to the EPA Project Officer at least 30 days prior to the initiation of data collection or data compilation. Requirements for QAPP's can found at http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qa_docs.html.

If a conference or workshop is an element of the project, the applicant will be required to answer the following questions: Who is initiating the conference/workshop/meeting? How will it be advertised? Whose logo will be on the agenda and materials? What is the percentage of participants, i.e. federal, state, local or public? Will the grant recipient prepare the proceedings and disseminate the information back to the targeted community? Will program income be generated from this event?

If indirect costs are budgeted in the assistance application and the nonprofit organization

or educational institute does not have a previously established indirect cost rate, it agrees to prepare and submit its indirect cost rate proposal and/or cost allocation plan in accordance with the appropriate Federal cost principle, OMB Circular A-122, "Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations" or OMB Circular A-21, "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions" within ninety (90) days from the effective date of the award for this assistance agreement.

If a local government does not have a previously established indirect cost rate, it will need to prepare its indirect cost rate proposal and/or cost allocation plan in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, "Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments." The local government recipient whose cognizant Federal agency has been designated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) must develop and submit its indirect cost rate proposal for approval to its cognizant Federal agency within six (6) months after the close of the governmental unit's fiscal year. If the cognizant Federal agency has not been identified by the OMB, the local government recipient must still develop (and when required, submit) its proposal within that period.

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

Funding may be used to acquire services or fund partnerships, provided the recipient follows procurement and subaward or subgrant procedures contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as applicable. For profit organizations are not eligible for subawards or subgrants under this announcement but may enter into procurement contracts with recipients.

Successful applicants must compete contracts for services and products and conduct cost and price analyses to the extent required by these regulations. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify contractors or consultants in their proposal. Moreover, the fact that a successful applicant has named a specific contractor or consultant in the proposal EPA approves does not relieve it of its obligations to comply with competitive procurement requirements.

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

- 3. Human Subjects:** A grant applicant must agree to meet all EPA requirements for studies using human subjects prior to implementing any work with these subjects. These requirements are given in 40 C.F.R. § 26. Studies involving intentional exposure of human subjects who are children or pregnant or nursing women are prohibited by Subpart B of 40 CFR Section 26. For observational studies involving children or pregnant women and fetuses please refer to Subparts C & D of 40 CFR Section 26. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regulations at 45 CFR § 46.101(e) have long

required "... compliance with pertinent Federal laws or regulations which provide additional protection for human subjects." EPA's regulation 40 C.F.R. Part 26 is such a pertinent Federal regulation. Therefore, the applicant's Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval must state that the applicant's study meets the EPA's regulations at 40 CFR § 26. No work involving human subjects, including recruiting, may be initiated before the EPA has received a copy of the applicant's IRB approval of the project and the EPA has also provided approval. Where human subjects are involved in the research, the recipient must provide evidence of subsequent IRB reviews, including amendments or minor changes of protocol, as part of annual reports.

4. **Animal Welfare:** A grant recipient must agree to comply with the Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544), as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2131-2156. The recipient must also agree to abide by the "U.S. Government Principles for the Utilization and Care of Vertebrate Animals used in Testing, Research, and Training." (50 Federal Register 20864-20865 (May 20, 1985))
5. **Data Access and Information Release:** The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-110 has been revised to provide public access to research data through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) under some circumstances. Data that are (1) first produced in a project that is supported in whole or in part with Federal funds and (2) cited publicly and officially by a Federal agency in support of an action that has the force and effect of law (i.e., a regulation) may be accessed through FOIA. If such data are requested by the public, the EPA must ask for it, and the grantee must submit it, in accordance with A-110 and EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. 30.36.
6. **Reporting Requirements.**
The successful applicant(s) will be required to submit quarterly progress reports throughout the duration of the project. Progress reports are due 30 days post each quarter of the project period. Reports should include a description of project activities including accomplishments, successes and lessons learned along with any problems and/or delays. Environmental outcomes should be indicated in relation to the approved schedule and milestones. Data on performance measures should be reported in table format whenever possible. Quarterly Financial Status Reports (FSR's) will also be required. A final project report is also required 90 days following the end of the project period according to the same format. Related published reports and research publications on the project with analytical data should be attached when applicable. All reports can be submitted either electronically or by hard paper copy.
7. **Dispute Resolution Process.** 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 the EPA contact listed under section VII.
8. **Non-profit applicants** that are recommended for funding under this announcement 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

VII. Agency Contact

If you have questions or need additional information regarding this announcement, please contact:

Todd Peterson
EPA Office of Pesticide Programs
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (7511P)
Washington, DC 20460

Phone: 703-308-7224
Fax: 703-305-0118
e-mail: peterson.todd@epa.gov

Communications and Proposals sent through the postal service require the address above.

If using a **courier service**, use ONLY the following address:

ATTN: Todd Peterson
Office of Pesticide Programs/BPPD/ESB (7511P)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Room S-8946, One Potomac Yard
2777 South Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202

List of Subjects:

Environmental Protection, Grants, Pesticides, Pest Management, Integrated Pest Management, Partnerships.