

## **Request for Proposals (RFP) for 2013 Brownfields Area-Wide Planning (BF AWP) Program**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

<http://www.epa.gov/oswer/grants-funding.htm>;  
[http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/areawide\\_grants.htm](http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/areawide_grants.htm)

Sections:

- Definitions
- Use of Grant Funds & Administrative Cost Prohibition
- Applicant Eligibility
- General Guidelines Clarifications
- Threshold Clarification

### **DEFINITIONS**

#### **Q1. What is a brownfield site?**

A1. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Brownfields Law), defines a brownfield at CERCLA § 101(39) as "...real property, the expansion, redevelopment or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant" and may include sites contaminated by controlled substances, petroleum, or mine-scarred land.

#### **Q2. For the purposes of this RFP, what is meant by "EPA assistance"?**

A2. EPA will award assistance to successful applicants through grant funding. The grant will be administered by EPA via cooperative agreement with each recipient. Cooperative agreements permit substantial involvement between the EPA Project Officer and the selected applicants in the performance of the work supported.

#### **Q3. What is meant by a brownfields area-wide planning project area?**

A3. Brownfields area-wide planning activities must focus on a specific project area within a city, community or rural area (such as a neighborhood, downtown district, city block(s) or local commercial corridor) that is affected by one or more brownfield sites. Proposals that do not focus on a specific project area will be rejected. This grant funding is not for comprehensive, city-wide, or regional planning.

#### **Q4. Per the "Application for Federal Assistance" (SF-424), what is the "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number" and the "CFDA Title"?**

A4. The “Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number” is 66.814 (see pg 1 of the RFP) and the “CFDA Title” is Brownfields Training, Research, and Technical Assistance Grants and Cooperative Agreements.

## **USE OF GRANT FUNDS & ADMINISTRATIVE COST PROHIBITION**

### **Q5. What types of tasks and activities are considered eligible uses of EPA assistance under this RFP?**

A5. The BF AWP program provides grant funding for research, technical assistance and/or training to recipients to enable them to develop an area-wide plan for catalyst, high priority brownfield sites within the project area, and include strategies for specific next steps and resources needed for plan implementation.

The research, technical assistance and/or training activities that can be supported through the BF AWP Program for the brownfields project area generally include:

- evaluating existing conditions of the project area, such as local market potential, needed infrastructure improvements, existing environmental data and health risks;
- identifying community priorities related to near- and long-term brownfields cleanup, reuse and area revitalization;
- developing strategies for brownfields assessment, cleanup, reuse and related improvements and consolidating them into an area-wide plan;
- identifying resources or leveraging opportunities as implementation strategies, and incorporating them into the brownfields area-wide plan; and
- building the capacity of local communities to be effectively involved in the development of the brownfields area-wide plan.

At a minimum, the tasks or activities under the BF AWP program should include:

- facilitating community involvement activities to identify community priorities, and opportunities to meet those priorities through area brownfields cleanup and revitalization;
- conducting research into the existing conditions of the targeted brownfields area (such as brownfields economic research/market analysis, infrastructure studies, known environmental conditions of the brownfields area, coordination with community plans, local health issues and environmental justice concerns, etc.); and
- developing a detailed brownfields area-wide plan, complete with implementation strategies, which contains near-term and long-term actions that will shift momentum from the planning research process to on-the-ground results once the project concludes.

As part of their proposed BF AWP research and technical assistance or training activities, the EPA encourages applicants to consider how to connect brownfield(s) in the project area to:

- opportunities to address environmental justice concerns and promote sustainable and equitable development outcomes within the brownfield-affected project area;
- opportunities to facilitate the reuse of existing infrastructure (e.g. transportation systems,

utilities, waste water and drinking water systems, sewage systems, etc.), by taking into account infrastructure investments needed to support future uses of brownfield(s) properties as part of the assessment and cleanup process;

- strategies to involve different levels of government and community partners to ensure plan implementation occurs over time; and
- linkages to:
  - contaminated properties other than brownfields (e.g., high risk underground storage tanks sites, National Priorities List Sites, federal facilities sites);
  - other land uses within the BF AWP project area (such as housing, job centers, and transit/alternative transportation), and
  - regional sustainability or planning efforts.

All research, technical assistance and training for area-wide planning must be designed to identify reuses for brownfields that will meet community health, environmental and economic development goals. Site reuse strategies will inform how brownfields in the area need to be assessed and cleaned up. Plan implementation strategies must identify specific actions and resources available/resources needed to assess, cleanup and reuse brownfields and promote area-wide revitalization.

**Q6. What types of tasks or activities are considered ineligible uses of EPA Assistance under this RFP?**

A6. Under this RFP:

- EPA assistance cannot be used for conducting site assessments, actual cleanups, or area-wide plan implementation.
- EPA assistance cannot be used for marketing brownfields properties for redevelopment; any zoning activities unrelated to brownfields; area master planning, general community visioning, or comprehensive plan updates that are unrelated to brownfields cleanup and reuse in the project area; and survey design, distribution or collection.
- EPA assistance may not be used to conduct response activities often associated with cleanups (i.e., demolition, and groundwater extraction); construction and land acquisition; costs that are unallowable (e.g., lobbying, fund-raising, alcoholic beverages) under Cost Principles 2 CFR Part 220 (universities), 2 CFR Part 225 (state, tribal, and local governments), or 2 CFR Part 230 (nonprofit organizations), as applicable; matching any other federal funds unless there is specific statutory authority for the match (CERCLA does not provide this authority); proposal preparation costs; projects that duplicate grants awarded under other EPA Brownfields grant programs described in CFDA Nos. 66.818, “Brownfields Assessment, Revolving Loan Funds, and Cleanup Grants” and 66.815, “Environmental Workforce Development and Job Training Grant” or other federally-funded environmental training, research, or technical assistance programs in their target community or communities (projects may, however, complement community-wide planning activities EPA funds under CERCLA 104(k)(2) assessment grants); and administrative costs, penalties, or fines.

## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

- Any brownfields site-specific cleanup planning activities are ineligible unless they are specifically approved by the EPA. BF AWP grant recipients will need to discuss and initiate the approval process for site-specific cleanup planning with their EPA project officer. EPA approval for site-specific cleanup planning will be based on site eligibility and liability provisions under CERCLA § 101(39). Note that a recipient who is liable for contamination at a specific brownfields site is prohibited from conducting cleanup planning and any other response activities at that site using EPA grant funds under the BF AWP Program.
- EPA assistance cannot be used for tasks, activities or projects related to exploring, testing and implementing smart growth policies and applications, and projects EPA funds under CFDA No. 66.611, “Environmental Policy and Innovation Grants” or through EPA Sustainable Communities technical assistance.

For the purposes of the BF AWP Program, the tasks and activities performed using EPA assistance must inform the assessment, cleanup, and subsequent reuse of the brownfields properties within the proposed project area. Therefore, EPA assistance under this RFP cannot be used for developing a smart growth approach to an area-wide plan where that approach will not inform assessment/cleanup/ subsequent reuse of the brownfield sites. EPA assistance under this RFP may also not be used for other smart growth-only activities if there is not a nexus to key brownfield sites, such as:

- Training and technical assistance to communities to revise local and state development regulations, such as general zoning and building codes for the project area;
- General studies of regulatory or market barriers to infill redevelopment; and
- Development of screening or evaluation tools and programs that assess post cleanup redevelopment designs for overall consistency with smart growth principles.

### **Q7. Why does the EPA need to approve any site-specific assessment or cleanup planning activities prior to allowing the grantee to conduct them?**

A7. The EPA needs to approve any site-specific assessment or cleanup planning activities because assessment and cleanup planning are considered response activities under CERCLA. CERCLA limits federal grant funding for brownfields assessment and cleanup planning, and other response activities, to be used only at eligible brownfield sites, by recipients who are not liable for the contamination under CERCLA § 107.

### **Q8. What is the Administrative Cost Prohibition?**

A8. The Brownfields Law prohibits the use of any “part of a grant or loan” for the payment of an administrative cost. In implementing this prohibition, EPA has made a distinction between prohibited administrative costs and allowable programmatic costs. See Section 1.D. in the RFP for more information.

### **Q9. What are the allowable programmatic costs under this RFP?**

**A9.** The EPA has determined that the administrative cost prohibition does not apply to “programmatic” costs, (i.e., costs for activities that are integral to achieving the purpose of the grant), even if the Agency considered the costs to be “administrative” under the prior Brownfields Program.

1. The prohibition does not apply to direct costs for developing a brownfield site(s) area-wide plan to inform site assessment, cleanup, and subsequent reuse. For example, costs for program management salaries (to the extent that such costs are included in the scope of work for the BF AWP grant), materials and supplies for public meetings, necessary travel and transportation expenses are programmatic, not administrative.
2. Direct costs, as defined in the applicable OMB Cost Principle Circular, for the following programmatic activities are not subject to the administrative cost prohibition. These costs, however, must be allowable under the scope of work for the grant. Costs incurred for complying with procurement provisions of 40 CFR Part 30 and Part 31 are considered eligible programmatic costs only if the procurement contract is for services or products that are direct costs for training as described above. Costs for performance and financial reporting required under 40 CFR 30.51 and 30.52, and 40 CFR 31.40 and 31.41 are eligible programmatic costs. Performance and financial reporting are essential programmatic tools for both the recipient and EPA to ensure that grants are carried out in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements.

**Q10. If an applicant names a consulting or law firm as a “partner” in the proposal is it proper to award that firm a sole source contract on that basis?**

A10. No. All contracts for professional services must be awarded competitively to the maximum extent practicable and in compliance with requirements to consider small and disadvantaged businesses and cost or price analyses. The market for consulting and legal services is robust and it is unlikely that competition is impractical. Please refer to Section 2.F. and 2.G. in the RFP.

**Q11. May an applicant select a contractor or subawardee/subgrantee prior to submission of their proposal?**

A11. Yes. An applicant may select a contractor or subawardee/subgrantee in accordance with Section 2.F. and 2.G. of the RFP.

If awarding a subaward/subgrant, the applicant must demonstrate in its proposal that it will properly award the subaward/subgrant, 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.

If awarding a contract, the applicant must demonstrate in its proposal 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:

## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

- 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),
- efforts were made to provide small and disadvantaged businesses with opportunities to compete, and
- 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, or expertise of named subawardees/ subgrantees and/or named contractor(s) during the proposal evaluation process unless the applicant states within their proposal how they have complied with these requirements.

**Q12. If my organization is successful in obtaining an EPA BF AWP Program grant, will EPA reimburse me for the costs incurred for a consultant to prepare our grant proposal?**

A12. No. Costs for preparing proposals are an unallowable administrative cost. Additionally, post-selection grant application package preparation is administrative and is an ineligible cost.

**Q13. If my proposal is selected for EPA grant assistance, will EPA reimburse me for eligible programmatic costs I incurred prior to the award of the grant?**

A13. It depends. EPA may reimburse successful applicants for pre-award costs incurred up to 90 days prior to award, even if the applicant did not request prior approval to incur pre-award costs, provided the costs are eligible, allowable, and included in the approved budget and workplan for the grant. For example, costs for contracts are allowable only if the contract was entered into in a manner that complies with the competitive procurement provisions of EPA's grant regulations.

Please note that applicants incur pre-award at their own risk and that EPA is not obligated to reimburse applicants for pre-award costs that are not included in the workplan and budget the Agency approves. EPA is under no obligation to reimburse applicants for pre-award costs if the applicant does not receive an award or if the amount of the award is less than the applicant anticipates.

**Q14. If my proposal is selected for EPA BF AWP Program grant funding and I properly contract with a contractor to perform services within the scope of the grant (such as having a contractor assist with researching existing project area conditions, organizing the draft brownfields area-wide plan, and/or working with the community to develop key implementation strategies and next steps), does the prohibition on administrative costs prevent the recipient from using the grant money to reimburse the indirect costs of the contractor?**

A14. No. The administrative cost prohibition applies to the grant recipient's indirect costs and not to costs the grantee incurs under a contract for eligible programmatic costs.

**Q15. Is there a limit to personnel funds that can be included in the Cooperative Agreement Budget (per ranking criterion 2.ii. in the RFP)?**

A15. No. While there is no limit on the amount of grant funds that may be used for personnel costs, the overall budget will be evaluated on its cost-effectiveness and reasonableness in achieving the goals of the project.

**Q16. Is travel to EPA Brownfield conferences and workshops, etc. an allowable and eligible use of cooperative agreement funding under this solicitation?**

A16. Yes. Travel for Brownfield conferences and workshops for the recipient's personnel would be considered an allowable staff training expense under the BF AWP Program cooperative agreement. It is up to the applicant to use a reasonable portion of the grant to cover those types of trips.

**APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY**

**Q17. Who can apply for EPA assistance under the Brownfields Area-Wide Planning (BF AWP) Program RFP?**

A17. Entities eligible to receive grant funding through this RFP include:

- General purpose unit of local government.
- Land clearance authority or other quasi-governmental entity that operates under the supervision and control of, or as an agent of, a general purpose unit of local government.
- Regional council or group of general purpose units of local government.
- Government Entity Created by State Legislature.
- Redevelopment agency that is chartered or otherwise sanctioned by a state.
- A state that is serving in a fiscal and administrative capacity on behalf of a local community, where the local community leads the BF AWP process.
- Indian Tribe other than in Alaska. (The exclusion of Alaskan tribes from brownfields grant eligibility is statutory at CERCLA §104(k)(1). Intertribal Consortia, comprised of eligible Indian Tribes, are eligible for funding in accordance with the EPA's policy for funding intertribal consortia published in the *Federal Register* on November 4, 2002, at 67 Fed. Reg. 67181.)
- Alaska Native Regional Corporation, Alaska Native Village Corporation, and Metlakatla Indian Community. (Alaska Native Regional Corporations and Alaska Native Village Corporations are defined in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 and following). For more information, please refer to BF AWP FAQs at [http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/areawide\\_grants.htm](http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/areawide_grants.htm).)
- Nonprofit organizations, including institutions of higher education. Nonprofit organizations must meet the definition of that term in Section 4(6) of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, Public Law 106-107, 31 U.S.C 6101. For the purposes of the brownfields grant program, the term "nonprofit organization" means any corporation, trust, association, cooperative, or other organization that is operated mainly for scientific, educational, service, charitable, or similar purpose in the public interest; is not organized primarily for profit; and uses net

proceeds to maintain, improve, or expand the operation of the organization. Nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that lobby are not eligible for EPA grant funding.

Individuals, profit-making firms and the 23 FY10 EPA BF AWP Pilot Program recipients are not eligible to apply. State applicants that apply to this RFP and propose a project role other than providing grant management capacity (managing the fiscal and administrative grant matters) on behalf of a local community are not eligible under this RFP. See Section 3.A. of the RFP.

**Q18. How does EPA interpret “general purpose unit of local government” for the purposes of applicant eligibility under this RFP?**

A18. The Agency follows the definitions of “local government” under 40 CFR Part 31.3 which provides the following: Local government means a county, municipality, city, township, local public authority (including any public and Indian housing agency under the United States Housing Act of 1937) school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (whether or not incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), any other regional or interstate government entity, or any agency or instrumentality of a local government.

**Q19. Explain the circumstances under which a state would be considered an eligible applicant for EPA BF AWP Program grant funds.**

A19. A state may be considered an eligible applicant if they can demonstrate they are serving in a grant management capacity role, managing the fiscal and administrative grant matters, on behalf of a local community who would not otherwise have the resources to apply or manage the BF AWP grant. The state applying for the BF AWP must also demonstrate that the local community will be leading the BF AWP effort. This can be demonstrated by attaching to the proposal a memorandum of understanding between the state and the local community. State applicants that apply to this RFP and propose a project role other than providing grant management capacity to a local community will not be considered eligible under this RFP.

**Q20. What is an example of an appropriate role for a regional council or group of general purpose units of local government, given that the BF AWP grant funding cannot be used for regional planning?**

A20. A regional council, regional planning commission, or group of general purpose units of local government may appropriately conduct BF AWP activities by working with and on behalf of, or in partnership with, the local community where the BF AWP project will be conducted. However, the local community affected by the BF AWP project area must have a clear leadership role throughout the proposed BF AWP project. In those circumstances where it makes more sense for the regional organization to serve as the applicant for the proposed BF AWP project, it is the applicant’s responsibility to clearly articulate the reasons for that in their proposal and demonstrate the extent to which the local community will be leading the process.

**Q21. How does EPA interpret “nonprofit organization” for the purposes of applicant eligibility under this RFP?**



## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

A21. EPA uses the definition of nonprofit organizations contained in Section 4(6) of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, Public Law 106-107, 31 U.S.C 6101. This law defines nonprofit organizations to mean any corporation, trust, association, cooperative, or other organization that:

- is operated mainly for scientific, educational, service, charitable, or similar purpose in the public interest;
- is not organized primarily for profit; and
- uses net proceeds to maintain, improve, or expand the operation of the organization.

Nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that lobby are not eligible for EPA grant funding.

### **Q22. May a non-profit organization provide evidence other than 501(c)(3) documents to demonstrate they are an eligible entity applying for this assistance?**

A22. Yes. While 501(c)(3) documents are one way to demonstrate that an applicant is a non-profit, other evidence may be provided. The evidence an applicant provides must establish that it is recognized as a non-profit in its state of incorporation. Evidence of non-profit status must accompany the proposal.

### **Q23. Are public universities eligible to receive EPA assistance under this RFP?**

A23. Yes. Public universities who meet EPA's interpretation of "non-profit organization" described above or who are instrumentalities of a state or tribal government under applicable law are eligible to receive EPA assistance under this RFP.

### **Q24. My city, tribe, planning commission or nonprofit organization was one of the 23 recipients of the FY10 Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Pilot Program. Is my city, tribe, planning commission or nonprofit organization eligible for this new round of BF AWP grant funding?**

A24. No.

### **Q25. May an entity apply for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning grant funding if they are the recipient of another EPA grant (except the FY10 BF AWP Pilot Program)?**

A25. Yes. Applicants may apply for this round of BF AWP Program grant funding even if they have received another grant from EPA (unless they are a recipient of a FY10 BF AWP pilot grant – see question above). However, applicants cannot include within their brownfields area-wide planning proposal any duplicate tasks or activities that are part of another EPA grant.

### **Q26. Can two nearby communities apply together to receive one BF AWP Planning grant?**

A26. It depends. Two communities can apply together only if one community is named as the lead "applicant" and the other community is named a "partner" or "co-applicant." EPA will only award funds to one eligible applicant (the lead applicant) as the "recipient"-- see Section 2.F. in

## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

the RFP. The recipient is accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds and is also responsible for working closely with EPA throughout the grant project period.

If the lead applicant chooses, they may use their EPA funding 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.

Please also refer to FAQ question #41. The answer provides some additional information for applicants who will identify a multi-jurisdictional brownfields area-wide planning project area.

**Q27. Per ranking criterion 3.ii., is an applicant allowed to include a partner on their list of local community-based organizations, government entities, and other stakeholders that are or will be involved in the BF AWP project, but then also pay that partner like a consultant to assist with completing some of the eligible brownfields area-wide planning activities?**

A27. It depends. If an applicant's partner is eligible to receive EPA assistance under this RFP (see Section 3.A. Eligible Entities), then the partner may be eligible to receive a subaward/subgrant of financial assistance to perform some of the brownfields area-wide planning activities. The subaward/subgrant would be subject to the OMB Cost Principles and EPA's grant regulations. However, the partner could not function as a "consultant" to assist the applicant in a manner similar to that of a commercial vendor of professional services, such as providing consulting services on a profit-making basis in the commercial marketplace.

Applicants who include a "partner" who will provide consultant services to the BF AWP project on commercial terms must identify that partner as a contractor rather than a subawardee/subgrantee. Applicants must select contractors for the project using competitive procurement requirements. See RFP Sections 2.F and 2.G. Naming any entity providing commercial services as a "partner" in the proposal does not exempt the transaction from competition requirements.

**Q28. May my organization submit more than one proposal?**

A28. Yes. Applicants may submit more than one proposal so long as each one is for a different project and is submitted separately to EPA.

**Q29. Are Alaskan Native Regional Corporations and Alaska Native Village Corporations eligible to apply for EPA assistance under this RFP?**

A29. Yes.

**Q30. Are Alaskan native communities eligible to apply for EPA assistance under this RFP?**

A30. No. EPA may only award grants under CERCLA 104(k)(6) to an "eligible entity" as that term is defined in CERCLA 104(k)(1) or a "nonprofit organizations" as that term is defined in

Section 4(6) of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, Public Law 106-107, 31 U.S.C 6101. Alaskan native communities are not among the eligible entities listed in CERCLA 104(k)(1).

However, an Alaskan native community that:

- has formed a non-profit organization, or
- is a unit of local government, or
- other eligible entity under Alaska law with the capacity to enter into a legally binding financial assistance agreement with EPA

is eligible to apply through their designation as an eligible non-profit or unit of government.

**Q31. May an eligible entity partner with an ineligible entity within its sphere of influence (e.g., may an eligible city or Alaskan Native Regional Corporation partner with an ineligible Alaskan native community)?**

A31. Yes. Eligible entities may include areas which lie within the jurisdiction or boundaries of an ineligible entity (e.g., an Alaskan native community) within the proposed brownfields area-wide planning project area. The applicant may also propose to partner with the ineligible entity by involving it in the brownfields area-wide planning process. However, if the applicant is successful in receiving brownfields area-wide planning grant funding, the applicant may not make any subawards or subgrants with EPA funding to an ineligible entity.

**GENERAL GUIDELINES CLARIFICATIONS**

**Q32. What is the maximum amount of money that an applicant may be awarded?**

A32. An applicant may be awarded up to \$200,000 in EPA grant funding.

**Q33. How do I get help in understanding and responding to the RFP?**

A33. Applicants should first review information on the EPA's brownfields website at <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields> and at [http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/areawide\\_grants.htm](http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/areawide_grants.htm). EPA staff may provide pre-proposal assistance to individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility requirements only. Contact information for EPA staff is provided in Section 7 of the RFP. In accordance with EPA's Competition Policy, EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals. Agency personnel will not review or comment on proposals drafted by potential applicants.

**Q34. What are the important deadlines?**

A34. Proposals are due on November 30, 2012. Proposals submitted electronically must be received by [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) by 11:59pm Eastern Time on November 30 to receive consideration. Proposals submitted in hard copy and sent through the U.S. Postal Service or via commercial delivery service must be postmarked by November 30, 2012 to be considered.

Only one method – electronic or hard copy - should be used for submission of the complete proposal.

**Q35. What is the project period for awards?**

A35. The maximum project period is 24 months. Applicants should plan for project completion in 24 months per the cooperative agreement terms and conditions. At a time as specified in the cooperative agreement terms and conditions, the EPA will make a determination as to whether the recipient has made sufficient progress in implementing its BF AWP project.

**Q36. What project start date should an applicant use when compiling the Milestone Schedule (as requested in Section 4.C.3.2. of the RFP)?**

A36. Applicants may provide a project start date of May 2013 or later. However, keep in mind that projects should only last up to 24 months. If recipients have not received their grant award by May 2013, EPA will work with the recipients to appropriately adjust the Milestones Schedule if needed.

**Q37. What is the EPA’s anticipated schedule for making award decisions?**

A37. EPA anticipates making award decisions in April 2013. Applicants who fail to meet threshold criteria will be notified by January 2013.

**Q38. Why does EPA discourage binders and color printing?**

A38. Each proposal is photocopied and distributed to members of the evaluation panel. Graphics, binders, charts, color copies, etc., do not photocopy well and may distort information submitted for reproduction.

**Q39. Will photos, graphics and extraneous materials be considered if included in the proposal submission?**

A39. No. Photos, graphics, and extraneous materials will not be considered. See Section 4.C. in the RFP.

**Q40. How will my proposal be evaluated?**

A40. Your proposal will be evaluated by staff from EPA and staff from relevant federal agency partners. There are two different types of criteria-“threshold criteria” and “ranking criteria.” Threshold and ranking criteria are clearly indicated in the RFP. If a response fails to meet any of the threshold criterion listed in Section 3.C., the proposal will be disqualified from further consideration and the applicant will be notified. However, EPA representatives may seek clarification from an applicant regarding its response to a threshold criterion. EPA will not seek clarification of responses to any ranking criteria.

## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

For proposals that pass threshold criteria review, evaluation panels will assess how well each proposal meets the ranking criteria outlined in Section 5 of the RFP. These evaluation panels will be comprised of EPA staff and may include representatives from other federal agencies. The evaluation panels will determine which proposals have the potential to effectively use the limited funds EPA has available for awards. Scores on each ranking criterion will be totaled to determine the panel's recommended proposal rankings. EPA senior management will determine the final ranking of proposals, taking into consideration the recommendations of the evaluation panels. In making final selection and funding decisions, EPA's Selection Official may consider the following "Other Factors" if, and as, appropriate:

- Fair distribution of funds between urban and non-urban areas;
- Whether applicant's proposed BF AWP project area is rural, where the population of the overall community is 20,000 or less and not located in a Metropolitan Statistical Area;
- A balanced geographic distribution of grants across the EPA's ten regions (note: the EPA reserves the right to fund the top ranked proposal for each region contingent on the quality of the proposal and funding availability);
- Whether the applicant is, or applicant will primarily assist, a federally recognized Indian Tribe or an entity from a United States Territory;
- Whether the applicant proposes to serve an area designated as a federal, state or local Empowerment Zone or Renewal Community;
- Whether the applicant proposes to serve an area affected by recent (2005 or later) natural disaster(s);
- Whether applicant's proposed BF AWP project area contains recent (2007 or later) industry plant closures or other significant economic disruptions; and
- Whether applicant is a recipient or a core partner of a HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities (PSC) grant that is directly tied to the BF AWP project area, and can demonstrate that funding from a PSC grant has or will benefit the proposed BF AWP project area.

Applicants must complete and submit the Other Factors Checklist and attach supporting documentation as needed, as described in the RFP (Appendix 2), as part of their proposal submission. This information will not be considered in the grant selection process unless appropriate documentation is attached to the proposal. The EPA may verify these disclosures prior to selection and consider this information during the evaluation process.

### **Q41. Can BF AWP Program grant funds be used to complement other brownfields or related funding provided by the state for work in the same project area?**

A41. Yes. EPA assistance can complement state funding for brownfields or related work within the same project area. However, the applicant cannot charge the same costs for the same activities or tasks to both the state funding and federal funding, or duplicate activities under state funding and federal funding. The applicant must clearly distinguish how state funding and federal funding will be used in order to be sure the funds are complementary and not duplicative. Additionally, federal funds cannot be used to manage state funds.

**Q42. Can BF AWP Program grant funds be used as a match for a proposed project whose purpose, design and location match the EPA's program, but which would be funded primarily by a state?**

A42. It depends on the laws of the state. There is no barrier in federal law for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Program grant funding being used as match for a state grant. Applicants need to determine if the state law allows for federal funding to serve as a match for the proposed project.

**Q43. If the project area affected by brownfield(s) (such as the neighborhood, district, city block, or local commercial corridor) is part of multiple jurisdictions, is the project area still eligible to receive a BF AWP Program grant?**

A43. Yes. A multi-jurisdictional project area that is affected by brownfields is eligible to receive EPA assistance.

**Q44. May an applicant use a brownfields inventory they created under a prior EPA grant to help identify and describe the proposed brownfields area-wide planning project area and/or specific catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s)?**

A44. Yes.

**Q45. Must the applicant own the catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) around which they propose to conduct the grant activities and develop the brownfields area-wide plan?**

A45. No. The applicant does not need to own the catalyst, high priority brownfield site or sites for the purposes of conducting research, training or technical assistance to develop the brownfields area-wide plan.

**Q46. May an applicant propose to develop an area-wide plan for an area affected by brownfields which happens to also be part of the same area covered by a different EPA grant (such as a Brownfields Assessment grant)?**

A46. Yes. An applicant may propose a brownfields area-wide planning project area that covers the same, or overlaps with the same, area as another EPA grant (e.g., a Brownfields Assessment grant). Applicants cannot include within their brownfields area-wide planning proposal any duplicate tasks or activities that are part of another EPA grant.

**Q47. May an applicant cite other EPA grants they have received for projects that lie within the same brownfields project area as leveraged funds?**

A47. Provided there is a strong nexus between the other EPA grant(s) to the proposed BF AWP project, the applicant may list other EPA grants they have (as well as other sources of funding) within the same brownfields project area as leveraged funding if they desire. However, applicants cannot include within their BF AWP proposal any duplicate tasks or activities that are part of another EPA grant. Please closely review ranking criterion 6, Leveraging, and Section 3.B. in the RFP.

**Q48. Will the EPA impose any deadlines on awardees for implementation of the brownfields area-wide plans developed using this EPA assistance?**

A48. No. The EPA will not impose deadlines on the awardees for brownfield area-wide plan implementation. Since EPA is not funding implementation of the brownfield area-wide plans, EPA cannot impose a deadline on when the plans would actually be implemented.

**Q49. What does EPA mean by “assistance agreements” under Programmatic Capability and Past Performance (Ranking criterion 5 in the RFP)?**

A49. The EPA uses the term "assistance agreement" to describe a federal grant or cooperative agreement. When EPA transfers funds for a public purpose, it uses a legal instrument called an assistance agreement, which may be in the form of a grant or cooperative agreement. Under this criterion, the EPA is requesting applicants to submit a list of up to five grants or cooperative agreements, from the last three years that were funded by federal agencies, where the funding received was similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project. If your organization has not received federal funding before, you may include information regarding projects funded by non-federal entities such as state, tribal or local governments or private foundations.

**Q50. Are past or current recipients of EPA Brownfields funds more likely to be considered for BF AWP Program grant funds than applicants who have not been awarded any Brownfields funding?**

A50. All applicants will be evaluated based on the criteria listed in the Section 5.B. of the RFP. The criteria include "Programmatic Capability and Past Performance" of managing past or current Federal or non-Federal assistance agreements similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that the organization performed within the last three years. As such, current and past recipients of Brownfields grants will be evaluated on "Programmatic Capability and Past Performance" on their history of managing past or current Federal grants. Those applicants who do not have relevant or available past performance or past reporting information (and so indicate that in the proposal) will receive a neutral score in this area to avoid prejudice. EPA's Selection Official may also consider additional factors, such as a fair distribution of funds between applicants who have never had a brownfields assessment grant and previous brownfields assessment grant recipients, in making final funding decisions.

**Q51. How should applicants answer question 19 on the "Application for Federal Assistance" (SF-424)?**

A51. Question 19 on the SF-424 (a required proposal attachment per pg 22 of the RFP) references Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. This review is not required with the initial application and as such, applicants should not answer question 19. However, this intergovernmental review may be applicable to awards resulting from this solicitation. Applicants selected for funding may be required to provide a copy of their proposal to their State Point of Contact (SPOC) for review, pursuant to Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. Not all states require such a review.

**Q52. If my organization is selected to receive a grant, will the EPA project officer be in my EPA Regional office or in EPA’s Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization in Washington, D.C.?**

A52. EPA grant projects officers will be in the appropriate EPA Regional office. EPA Regional project officers will coordinate with the EPA Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization.

**Q53. Is the EPA BF AWP Program grant considered part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) – Department of Transportation (DOT) - EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities?**

A53. Yes. This EPA funding opportunity for brownfields area-wide planning is part of the HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities. Please visit [www.sustainablecommunities.gov](http://www.sustainablecommunities.gov) for more information.

**Q54. Per the RFP section describing the “Link to the HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities” (pg 6), can you clarify what is meant by “adherence to the Livability Principles”, “connection to existing local and regional planning processes”, and “inclusion of strong and broad-based community participation in project execution”? Can you briefly discuss where these items are accounted for in the ranking criteria?**

A54. Adherence to the Livability Principles – The HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities Livability Principles are described below. When discussing how your proposed project adheres to the Livability Principles, applicants should provide clear and specific information on how the proposed project activities advance one or more of the following principles:

1. Provide more transportation choices -- Develop safe, reliable, and economical transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce our nation’s dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.
2. Promote equitable, affordable housing -- Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation.
3. Enhance economic competitiveness -- Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services and other basic needs by workers, as well as expanded business access to markets.
4. Support existing communities -- Target federal funding toward existing communities— through strategies like transit-oriented, mixed-use development and land recycling—to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.
5. Coordinate and leverage federal policies and investment -- Align federal policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration, leverage funding, and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth, including making smart energy choices such as locally generated renewable energy.



## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

6. Value communities and neighborhoods -- Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods—rural, urban, or suburban.

As part of ranking criterion 4, proposals will be evaluated on the degree to which the BF AWP project clearly advances one or more of the above-mentioned principles.

Connection to existing local and regional planning processes: Applicants should describe the connection between the proposed BF AWP project activities and any applicable integrated neighborhood, local, city or regional land use planning efforts. The proposal narrative should include the degree to which the planning process includes sustainability (or livability) as one of the primary goals, and specifically describe how the community planning effort includes one or more of the following characteristics: integrated consideration of housing, transportation, health and environmental impacts from development alternatives; use of environmental, health and economic data to forecast the impacts of different development approaches; involvement of multi-jurisdictional partnerships that commit to adopting integrated plans, strategies, and management tools emerging from the planning process; greater transparency and accountability in planning and implementation efforts; and commitment by strong alliances of residents and local/regional interest groups to maintain a long-term vision for the community/region over time while supporting progress through incremental sustainable development practices.

As part of ranking criterion 2, proposals will be evaluated on the degree to which the project clearly demonstrates consistency and integration with existing community planning efforts. It is incumbent on the applicant to describe how the BF AWP process complements, and does not duplicate, previous efforts.

Inclusion of strong and broad-based community participation in project execution: In the proposal narrative, applicants should provide information on how community residents, including historically underrepresented and overburdened populations, will be active participants throughout the BF AWP project. The manner of community involvement may include but is not limited to: participation in public information sessions, brownfields site preparation charrettes, or other BF AWP project meetings; engagement of broad-based community associations that represent housing, mobility, health and/or environmental concerns in the design or execution of the project; or as primary beneficiaries of the project, especially those in which the project is meant to improve community access to jobs, housing, transportation options, health care, health amenities or open space. Projects that are able to describe these approaches and their ability to strengthen the involvement, engagement, and quality of life of historically underrepresented and overburdened populations, communities that bear disproportionate negative impacts from development and pollution, or traditionally disenfranchised residents may be most favorably considered. Support letters from representative organizations should be included as evidence of active community involvement.

As part of ranking criterion 1, proposals will be evaluated on the degree to which the project will serve minority and/or low-income residents in the project area. As part of ranking criterion 3, proposals will be evaluated on the effectiveness of the applicant's engagement with the community affected by the BF AWP project area, and on their approach for incorporating

community input throughout the BF AWP process to ensure meaningful involvement and community ownership of brownfields cleanup and reuse decisions.

**Q55. For the purposes of ranking criterion 1 (Community Need), what are examples of demographic information I could provide about my community? Where do I find demographic information about my community?**

A55. The EPA does not require that applicants use specific types of demographic information, nor does it require that applicants include the “sample format for demographic information” found in ranking criterion 1. To assist applicants with finding potentially relevant and appropriate information, however, the EPA is providing the following weblinks as authoritative sources of health, environmental and demographic information which may be useful to consider in preparing your proposal. Applicants should select the type of demographic information to support their proposals based on their assessment of what information will make the best case that their community needs BF AWP grant funding. The below are examples only. Applicants may choose to provide different or additional information. The applicant is responsible for assessing the importance of types of demographic information that will best describe the specific challenges of the community being served.

Economic & Social data examples include:

- Low property values
- Low tax base for the community
- Percentage of the community unemployed/underemployed
- Percentage of the community below the poverty line
- Factors that make leveraging funds for the project difficult
- Percentage of community on welfare

Tools for locating this information for your community:

- Fedstats.gov
  - This website provides links to all relevant agencies based on your search criteria, such as income, health, labor, education, and crime levels and allows you to search by state as well.
- Census.gov
  - This website is the home page of the U.S. Census Bureau and provides statistics on economics, employment, health, housing, employment, and other categories. You can search by state, and find detailed reports on each state.
- Factfinder.census.gov
  - This webpage provides information on a more specific area than Census.gov. You can search by state, but also by zip code to find statistics on your specific community.
- US Census Bureau, US Department of Commerce
  - American Community Survey, <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/>
  - Maps county level data based on the 2000 Census (some 2010 Census data available) and 2005-2011 American Community Survey estimates.

## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

- Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor, <http://www.bls.gov/>: Provides national, state and local unemployment and employment data. <http://www.bls.gov/bls/unemployment.htm>

Health/Welfare/Environment data examples include:

- Asthma rates among children
- The incidence of illness amongst the population in contact with the site
- Cancer, diabetes, obesity rates in the community
- Health care access
- Teen pregnancy rate
- Number of vulnerable inhabitants (women of child-bearing age, children, the elderly)
- Information showing that the targeted community is disproportionately impacted by the environmental issues of the site (e.g. sizes and numbers of brownfields sites, suspected or known level of contamination, past uses of the site, etc.)
- Crime rate
- Education levels and other education statistics (e.g. graduation rate, drop out rate)

Tools for locating this information for your community:

While not exhaustive, many authoritative public health information sources from the Department of Health and Human Services Agencies, US EPA, US Census and other sources are listed below.

Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA): Provides state profiles for medical professional shortage areas and grants for health care <http://datawarehouse.hrsa.gov/>

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR): ATSDR has toxicity profiles, health consultations and education tools at: <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) : CDC has a National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) that includes national birth and death statistics. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss.htm>. A FastStats section provides summary statistics and links to State and territorial data sources on:

- Asthma, (<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/asthma.htm>)
- Diabetes, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/diabetes.htm>
- Heart disease, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/heart.htm>

National Institutes of Health (NIH), National Cancer Institute (NCI): NCI has a webpage that provides State specific cancer statistics, <http://statecancerprofiles.cancer.gov/> Cancer trends and maps can also be found at that site.

NIH, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases: NIDDK compiles and presents national diabetes statistics on the following website: <http://diabetes.niddk.nih.gov/populations/index.htm>

## FAQs for Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant RFP

Office of Minority Health, Department of Health and Human Services: General health and racial, and health disparities data can be found at: <http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/>  
Indian Health Service, Health Promotion Disease Prevention, <http://www.ihs.gov/hpd/index.cfm>

US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD): Grants for community lead hazard abatement, training and to support creating healthy homes. <http://www.hud.gov/offices/lead/> and other community programs [http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/cpd\\_programs.cfm](http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/cpd_programs.cfm)

### US Environmental Protection Agency

- Air Quality Index, <http://www.airnow.gov/>
- America's Children and the Environment, <http://www.epa.gov/economics/children/index.html>
- Cleanups in My Community, <http://iaspub.epa.gov/Cleanups/>
- Environmental Indicators Gateway, <http://www.epa.gov/igateway/>
- Fish/ Shellfish Advisories, <http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/fishshellfish/fishadvisories/states.cfm>
- Radon Zone Map, <http://www.epa.gov/radon/zonemap.html>
- Toxic Release Inventory, <http://www.epa.gov/tri/>
- State and Territorial Environmental Agency links, <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/state.htm>
- Water, Where You Live map. <http://water.epa.gov/type/location/states/>

### **Q56. Please describe some of the ways the EPA is expecting BF AWP grant recipients to prepare implementation strategies as part of their brownfields area-wide plan.**

A56. As part of the brownfields area-wide plan, EPA expects grantees to identify specific next steps, resources already available and those needed, leveraging opportunities, and key partnerships/steering committees, that will endure over the implementation timeframe, and lead to on-the-ground brownfields cleanup/reuse and community revitalization transformation. Examples of questions that should be considered for the implementation strategies section include: What is the plan for investment/investment strategy for the short, medium and long-term (e.g., 1, 5, and 10-year) timeframes? What are the strategies for obtaining the right type of funding for this area, and how do you put together the funding pieces for the priority investment area? Which of the key partners will be taking responsibility for leading specific implementation activities for specific parts of the brownfields area-wide plan?

### **Q57. How many letters of support are applicants required to submit?**

A57. In order to pass threshold review (threshold criterion 5), applicants are required to submit one letter of support. The letter must be attached to the grant proposal. The letter must be from a relevant governmental entity if the applicant is a nonprofit entity. The letter must be from a relevant nonprofit entity if the applicant is a government or quasi-governmental entity.

### **Q58. How many other letters of support are to be submitted per ranking criterion 3.ii., (Community Involvement and Partnerships)?**

A58. Submit letters of support from each of the organizations, government entities and stakeholders you list in your proposal when responding to this criterion. Letters of support must be attached to your proposal or they will not be considered.

**Q59. To whom should the letters of support, as required in threshold criterion 5 and requested in ranking criterion 3, be addressed?**

A59. The letters of support should be addressed to the applicant, as the support letters are being written to support the applicant's proposed project. Please note the letters of support must be submitted with your proposal. Letters of support submitted separately from your proposal will not be accepted.

**Q60. Per ranking criterion 3, what if an applicant's community has already engaged in an existing, inclusive and collaborative community revitalization effort within the proposed BF AWP project area, but has not labeled it specifically as a "brownfields area-wide planning" (or BF AWP)?**

A60. The applicant should clearly describe in the proposal how the existing, inclusive and collaborative effort underway in the project area is consistent with the goals and objectives of the EPA Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Program, and include the effectiveness of the effort to-date, including recent accomplishments. The applicant should also describe how the BF AWP grant funding requested will further prepare the community to implement the brownfields area-wide plan once completed.

**THRESHOLD CLARIFICATIONS**

**Q61. Must an applicant fill out and submit the Threshold Criteria Worksheet?**

A61. No. The example Threshold Criteria Worksheet (Appendix 1) is provided to assist applicants in organizing and submitting the information required for threshold review. An applicant is not required to complete and submit the worksheet. However, the applicant must still provide all the information required for threshold criteria review as an attachment to the narrative proposal. Any information included on the threshold criteria worksheet will be considered as part of the applicant's response to the threshold criteria. EPA will not consider the threshold responses on the worksheet when evaluating proposals against the ranking criteria.

**Q62. Why is a map of the project area required per threshold criterion 2?**

A62. An applicant must submit a small but legible black and white map, with scale and street-level detail, to clearly show the size/shape of the proposed brownfields area-wide planning project area, and provide a visual to how this project area fits into the larger city or community context. A small black and white map is all that is allowed (for ease with photocopying); oversized or specialty maps cannot be considered.

A small but clear map, for the purposes of helping to describe or clarify the proposed project area affected by brownfields, is not the type photo/graphic artwork that the Agency meant to exclude, as per Section 4. C. of the RFP.

**Q63. Per threshold criteria 2 and 3, what is an appropriate project area size, and an appropriate number of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites, that an applicant should identify for their BF AWP project?**

A63. It depends. Neighborhoods, downtown districts, city blocks, and local commercial corridors vary in size, as do the brownfields that affect them. It is the responsibility of the applicant to carefully and thoughtfully delineate and describe in their proposal an appropriate project area size and a reasonable project approach, given the specific project area/community challenges, project goals, stakeholders involved, number/size of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites, and amount of EPA and/or other leveraged funding available for the project.

Applicants must describe the project area in their proposals (per threshold criterion 2) and demonstrate that the area is affected by a single large or multiple brownfields sites. Catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) are the specific site(s) already identified by the community which, once remediated and reused, have the strongest potential to spur additional revitalization within the area. The proposal must describe why and how these specific site(s) are the properties around which the applicant will focus the grant-funded BF AWP project efforts. Applicants must identify specific catalyst, high priority brownfield sites per threshold criterion 3 and ranking criterion 2.

Successful applicants will have identified and described a reasonable number of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites and a more focused BF AWP project approach, given project area size and limited amount of grant funding available. It is incumbent on the applicant to make the case that the number of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites they put forward is reasonable, given the project budget, cost effectiveness of their project approach, and the unique characteristics of their project area. If the applicant cannot effectively describe a focused BF AWP project and a reasonable number of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites because the project area size is too large, they are encouraged to designate only a portion of this large district, neighborhood, or corridor when submitting their BF AWP proposal.

BF AWP grant funding cannot be used for city-wide, comprehensive or regional planning.

**Q64. Per threshold criterion 3, do I need to provide the requested information (a-d) for each of the catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) identified in my proposal?**

A64. Yes.

**Q65. Do the catalyst, high priority brownfield sites identified in threshold criterion 3 need to be the same sites described in ranking criterion 2.i.?**

A65. Yes. The same catalyst, high priority brownfield sites identified in threshold criterion 3 must be the ones described in ranking criterion 2.i.

**Q66. Clarify why at least 50% of the catalyst, high priority sites identified per threshold criterion 3 must meet the definition of a “brownfield site” per CERCLA § 101(39).**

A66. EPA’s Brownfields Area-Wide Planning grant funding must be used for project areas affected by one or more eligible “brownfield sites” (per the CERCLA definition of a “brownfield site”). In order to demonstrate that the grant funding will be used in project areas affected by one or more brownfields, applicants must provide the information as requested in threshold criterion 3 (a-d) for each of their catalyst, high priority sites. Providing this information to EPA for each catalyst, high priority site enables EPA to make a determination for whether the project area is affected by eligible brownfield site(s). By insisting as a threshold matter that at least 50% of the catalyst, high priority sites are eligible “brownfield sites”, EPA is responsibly ensuring that federal funding provided for brownfields area-wide planning is being used to develop assessment, cleanup and subsequent reuse strategies for eligible brownfield sites.

**Q67. For example - if an applicant identifies seven catalyst, high priority sites per threshold criterion 3, but the EPA finds that only three of those sites meet the definition of a “brownfield” per CERCLA § 101(39) during evaluation of the information provided, will the proposal pass threshold review?**

A67. No. At least 50% of the catalyst, high priority sites identified per threshold criterion 3 must meet the definition of a brownfield. Applicants are encouraged to contact their Regional Brownfields Coordinator (per Section 7.C. of the RFP) very early in the proposal process if they have questions about the information required for each catalyst, high priority site.

**Q68. If an applicant identifies a catalyst, high priority site under threshold criterion 3 that does not meet the definition of a “brownfield site” per CERCLA § 101(39), may the applicant substitute another site in the project area?**

A68. No.

**Q69. If an applicant identifies a brownfields area-wide planning project area that contains a National Priorities List (NPL), federally-owned, or other site ineligible for funding under this RFP, will the proposal be disqualified?**

A69. No. The project area affected by brownfields may contain a NPL, federal facility, and/or other site that does not meet the definition of “brownfield site” – although such non-brownfields sites are ineligible for funding under this RFP. Therefore, while the project area may contain such sites, EPA’s assistance for brownfields area-wide planning cannot be used to for any site reuse planning activities, such as site reuse visioning, programming, design charrettes, etc., at any ineligible site.

**Q70. If an applicant identifies a petroleum-contaminated (or potentially contaminated) site as one of their catalyst, high priority sites under threshold criterion 3 and has requested the state to make a determination regarding petroleum site eligibility, what happens if the**

**applicant does not receive the petroleum site determination letter back from its state prior to the proposal deadline?**

A70. For instances where the applicant has requested the state to make a petroleum determination but does not receive a determination letter prior to proposal due date, the applicant must attach a copy of the request submitted to the state and indicate the date applicant submitted the request to the state. EPA will then coordinate with the state, and the Agency will make the petroleum site determination if necessary.

**Q71. Please explain how my proposal will be evaluated for ineligible activities under threshold criterion 4.**

A71. EPA assistance under the Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Program cannot be used for any site assessment, site cleanup, or plan implementation activities; as well as any of the tasks/activities included in the list under Section 1.C. of the RFP. Under this RFP, costs for these tasks/activities are ineligible and will not be funded. During threshold review, the EPA will evaluate the proposal for ineligible tasks/activities, and make a determination that any proposal that contains over 50% of the project budget for such ineligible tasks/activities is ineligible for funding, and the proposal will not be further reviewed.