

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

AGENCY: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

TITLE: Local-Scale Air Toxics Ambient Monitoring

ACTION: Request for Application (RFA)

RFA NO: OAR-EMAD-05-16

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE (CFDA) NO: 66.034

DATES: The closing date for receipt of applications is August 22, 2005, 4:00 p.m. EDT. Applications may be submitted via postal or express overnight mail, or electronically (See Section IV). Applications submitted via postal or express overnight mail must be received in the Program Office by the closing date and time. Electronic applications must be submitted in Microsoft Word, Word Perfect, or PDF format to jones.mike@epa.gov - electronic submissions will be considered timely upon receipt, not transmission. An e-mail response confirming receipt of electronic proposals will be provided. Hand delivery, facsimile and late submissions will not be accepted.

To allow for efficient management of the competitive process, EPA requests submission of an informal notice of "Intent to Apply" by July 22, 2005. Submission of Intent to apply is optional; it is a process management tool that will allow EPA to better anticipate the total staff time required for efficient review, evaluation, and selection of submitted proposals.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of funds and solicits applications for projects designed to assist state and local communities in identifying and profiling air toxics sources, developing and assessing emerging measurement methods, characterizing the degree and extent of local air toxics problems, and tracking progress of air toxics reduction activities.

FUNDING/AWARDS: The total estimated funding available under this competitive opportunity is approximately \$6,250,000. EPA anticipates award of 15 cooperative agreements resulting from this announcement, subject to availability of funds and the quality of applications received.

CONTENTS BY SECTION

- I. Funding Opportunity Description
- II. Award Information
- III. Eligibility Information
- IV. Application and Submission Information
- V. Application Review Information
- VI. Award Administration Information
- VII. Agency Contacts
- VIII. Other Information

Section I - Funding Opportunity Description.

A. Background

EPA is soliciting grant applications for demonstration projects designed to assist state and local communities in identifying and profiling air toxics sources, characterizing the degree and extent of local-scale air toxics problems, tracking progress of air toxics reduction activities, and developing and assessing emerging measurement methods. The National Air Toxics Monitoring Program is being developed in conjunction with both the National Ambient Air Monitoring Strategy (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/amtic/monitor.html>), to include the Air Toxics Component (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/amtic/airtoxpg.html>), and the Agency's Urban Air Toxics Strategy (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/urban/fr19jy99.pdf>). As the air toxics and general ambient air monitoring strategies are further developed, a common set of needs is being addressed on behalf of the ambient air monitoring community.

The National Ambient Air Monitoring Strategy has provided a basic framework under which the air toxics program is well integrated. The linkage to the national strategy is illustrated by two dominant principles that emerged from the national strategy.

First, monitoring programs must have an appropriate balance between national prescriptive measurements (e.g. trends) and more flexibility to address local issues that are not well handled through a national design given the diversity of toxics issues across the nation. The balance between the National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS) network and the emerging community monitoring assessments reflects adherence to this principle.

Second, the national strategy is directing a movement toward multiple measurements across numerous pollutant groups, recognizing the fact that most air pollution issues are well integrated from a scientific perspective, and enormous economies of scale are realized from integrating program management efforts across pollutant groups.

While the NATTS program is intended to gather and assess priority Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) data on a national scale, a primary objective of this solicitation is to identify and more accurately define the extent of local scale HAP impacts. To meet this objective, consideration of the National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) in planning and executing the prospective projects is appropriate. NATA is a valuable tool for identifying those air toxics which are of greatest potential concern, in terms of contribution to population risk. The assessment includes compiling a national emissions inventory of air toxics emissions from outdoor sources, estimating population exposures across the contiguous United States, and characterizing potential public health risk due to inhalation of air toxics including both cancer and non-cancer effects. On national and regional scales, NATA found ambient levels for several pollutants at or above inhalation health levels of concern to significant portions of the population. NATA results also indicate significant local risk levels at many communities nationwide.

B. Scope of Work

To be considered for funding under this RFA, each project proposal in response to this RFA must be clearly and explicitly designated for inclusion in one, and only one, of the following four categories or bins: source identification and characterization, methods development, methods evaluation and comparison, and community-scale monitoring. An individual agency may submit separate proposals in more than one category. Ideally, the aggregate of projects should provide some typical examples that can be relied upon without duplication by communities in other areas as a basis for initial HAP situation assessments. An example might be characterization of wood smoke that allows for either direct translation of results to other locations or provides directions for similar studies in areas experiencing common problems.

1. Source Identification and Characterization. The objective of this category is to characterize near-source concentrations from specific sources, such as transportation facilities, refineries, or other industry sectors. The emphasis in this category will be to obtain information regarding substantially elevated ambient concentrations of toxics relevant to the source being investigated, including data on the pollutant profiles or source signatures. These measurements assist regulators in their efforts to assess the impact of emission reduction measures (e.g., accountability) and to characterize risk and its causes for the most highly impacted populations. Examples of relevant sources include those related to the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards Residual Risk and Area Source programs (e.g., coke ovens, dry cleaning operations, wood smoke, gas distribution facilities), as well as on-road and non-road mobile sources (e.g., rails, ports, bus terminals, etc.), and utilities.

2. Methods Development. There exists a clear need for development of new (or improvement of existing) methods for sampling and analysis of select priority HAPs. The list of 25 priority HAPs are those that emerged as national or regional drivers as a result of the 1999 National Air Toxics Assessment; State, Local, and Tribal (SLT) preview at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/nata1999/> is anticipated during June 2005. HAPs for which methods work is most critical are those which 1) account for a significant contribution to the National risk, and 2) have no approved routine method, or an existing method's detection limit is higher than the concentrations established for one in a million cancer risk or non-cancer hazard quotient of one. This information is available at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/amtic/airtoxpg.html> in a table entitled "1999 NATA Priority HAPs Monitoring Method Availability."

3. Method Evaluation and Comparison. This category allows for applicants to evaluate available advanced HAP monitoring technologies that can potentially operate on a routine basis. The target result of projects in this category is to ascertain the cost-effectiveness and accuracy (i.e., practical value) of existing innovative monitors, samplers, or analytical methods. For example, comparison of different types of differential optical absorption spectroscopy (DOAS) open path equipment, or assessing passive monitoring for VOCs as a cost effective way to capture spatial gradients for exposure modeling, site selection, and design or general characterization of concentrations.

4. Community-Scale Monitoring. This category is intended to assist state and local agencies in assessing the degree and extent to which air toxics problems impact their respective communities. Successful proposals will demonstrate a clear and compelling need or justification, examples of which may include:

- a. Supporting health effects assessments. The data collected from the National Air Toxics Monitoring Program can in some situations provide a valuable database for health scientists to investigate the relationship of ambient toxic concentrations and health impacts. In some instances opportunities may arise for health studies to be conducted in conjunction with National Air Toxics Monitoring efforts, though direct linkage to an ongoing health study is not a pre-condition for project selection.
- b. Evaluating and improving air quality models that in turn are used for exposure assessments. Air quality models are an important tool for exposure assessments. However, they require supporting observations to instill confidence in model results, or to direct needed improvement in underlying model formulations or related emission inventories.
- c. Developing a baseline reference frame of air quality concentrations that support estimates of community exposure and provide the basis for the longer term measuring of progress of a planned emissions strategy program (e.g., characterization of base concentration levels which will inform the Residual Risk assessment process and provide a basis for measuring improvement for promulgated Residual Risk standards).
- d. Characterizing pollutants that are not ubiquitous (e.g., ambient /divalent mercury emissions, or pollutants from source categories that will be considered in future residual risk determinations (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/rrisk/residriskpg.html>)), yet present local or regional scale concern.
- e. Delineating local scale HAP concentration gradients that are driven by factors such as proximity to, and influence by, sources and other factors unique to particular communities. While gradient delineation isn't a purpose unto itself, it may be an integral part of a larger purpose such as conducting an exposure assessment or source characterization.

C. EPA Strategic Plan Linkage and Anticipated Outcomes/Outputs

1. Linkage to EPA Strategic Plan. These projects support progress towards EPA Strategic Plan Goal 1 (Clean Air and Global Climate Change), Objective 1.1 (Healthier Outdoor Air), Sub-Objective 1.1.2 (Reduced Risk from Toxic Air Pollutants). These projects support EPA efforts to reduce public exposure to Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) by analyzing data from local-scale ambient air monitoring.

2. Outcomes. Through these projects EPA anticipates increased state and local Air Pollution Control Agency (APCA) ability to characterize the sources and local-scale distribution of HAPs, and assess human exposure and risk at a local scale. This increased ability will facilitate APCA adoption of control measures that will reduce HAP emissions and public exposure.

3. Outputs. The anticipated output for these projects are increased public availability of HAP data in a central repository (EPA's Air Quality System Database), source profiles associated with transportation, refineries, and other industry sectors, improved ambient HAP monitoring methods at levels and time intervals useful to exposure and risk assessment professionals, and individual community assessments of air toxics problems.

D. Quality Assurance.

If selected for award, the applicant will be required to develop and implement an EPA approved Quality System, consisting of systematic procedures and tests that allow the recipient the ability to ascertain the uncertainty of the data. Specifically, the components of a Quality System are:

1. Quality Management Plan (QMP) and a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). These documents must be approved by the cognizant EPA Regional Office before monitoring can commence. The model QAPP which all recipients must use as their template is available at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/amtic/airtxfil.html> under the file name "Quality Assurance Document - Quality Assurance Project Plan for the Air Toxics Monitoring Program," EPA-454/R-01-007.

2. Data Quality Objectives (DQOs). The DQOs result from a structured, systematic planning process that provides statements about the expectations and requirements of the data user (such as the risk assessor and/or decision maker). Using a risk assessment example, monitoring being performed to estimate exposure at the neighborhood scale should briefly describe the systematic planning process that was followed to identify the number and types of monitors that will be needed to spatially estimate exposure across the study area as well as the number and types of samples collected at those monitors that are needed to estimate exposure temporally (including requirements for assessing chronic exposures, acute exposures, or both), within specified limits of uncertainty. The DQO process is described in document EPA/600/R-96-055, available at http://www.epa.gov/quality/qa_docs.html.

E. Supplementary Information.

The statutory authority for this action is Clean Air Act, Section 103(b)(3) which authorizes the award of grants for research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, surveys, and studies related to ambient air monitoring, specifically local-scale efforts to better characterize the distribution and sources of hazardous air pollutants, as well as improved ambient air monitoring methods to achieve characterization and human exposure assessment goals.

Section II - Award Information.

A. What is the amount of funding available?

The total estimated funding expected to be available for awards under this competitive opportunity is approximately \$6,250,000.

B. How many agreements will EPA award in this competition?

EPA anticipates award of approximately 15 cooperative agreements resulting from this announcement of between \$50,000 to \$500,000 total funding per agreement. Anticipated approximate funding allocations by category or bin, as described in Section I, Part B, are \$2,000,000 for source identification and characterization, \$750,000 for methods development, \$750,000 for methods evaluation and comparison, and \$2,750,000 for community-scale monitoring. The number and amount of awards, and projected categorical funding allocations, are subject to both funds availability and the quality of proposals submitted.

EPA reserves the right to partially fund proposals/applications by funding discrete activities, portions, or phases of the proposed project. If EPA decides to partially fund the 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 that maintains the integrity of the competition and the evaluation/selection process.

EPA will not incrementally fund any awards resulting from this competition.

EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this RFA if additional funding materializes. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than 6 months after the original selection decisions.

The awards resulting from this solicitation will be in the form of cooperative agreements, thus allowing for substantial involvement between the EPA Project Officer and the selected applicants in the performance of the work supported. Although EPA will negotiate precise terms and conditions relating to substantial involvement as part of the award process, the anticipated substantial Federal involvement for this project will include:

1. close monitoring of the successful applicant's performance to verify the results proposed by the applicant;
2. collaboration during performance of the scope of work;
3. approving substantive terms of proposed contracts;
4. approving qualifications of key personnel (EPA will not select employees or contractors employed by the award recipient);
5. review and comment on reports prepared under the cooperative agreement (the final

decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient).

C. What is the project period for awards resulting from this solicitation?

The estimated project period for awards resulting from this solicitation is 18-24 months. All projects must be completed within the negotiated project performance period.

D. Are matching funds required?

No.

E. Can funding be used to acquire services or fund other partnerships?

Funding may be used to acquire services or fund partnerships, provided the recipient follows procurement and sub-award or sub-grant procedures contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as applicable. Successful applicants must compete contracts for services and products and conduct cost and price analyses to the extent required by these regulations. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify contractors or consultants in their proposal, but must indicate the portion of the proposed work that will be performed by contractors / consultants, and by any partnering agency. 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 sub-awards may be used to fund partnerships with universities, non-profit organizations, or another eligible entity as described in Section III. Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or sub-awards 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 sub-grantee 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.

Section III - Eligibility Information.

A. Eligible Entities.

State, Local, and Federally-Recognized Indian Tribal Agencies are eligible to apply.

B. Cost Effectiveness.

While cost matching is not required, applicants proposing cost-effective programs which leverage federal resources through a voluntary financial or in-kind commitment of resources may improve their scoring under the applicable evaluation criterion of this RFA. (Refer to Section V(A), Evaluation Criteria).

Section IV - Application and Submission Information.

A. How to Obtain Application Package.

The complete grants application package can be downloaded from EPA's Office of Grants and Debarment website at: (http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/how_to_apply.htm).

B. Content and Form of Application Submission.

Please note that only the signed Standard Form 424 "Application for Federal Assistance" (one page) needs to be included in the application, along with the narrative portion of the application (work plan and budget). If the application is selected for funding, the entire grants package will need to be completed.

Applications must contain the following information, preferably in the sequential order shown:

1. SF-424 Application for Federal Assistance (with original signature)
2. Narrative Workplan. This document, a maximum of 12 pages in length, must conform to the following outline:
 - a. Project Title.
 - b. Category. Each project proposal must be clearly and explicitly designated for inclusion in one, and only one, of the four categories or bins defined in Section I, Part B of this solicitation. Project proposals designated for more than one category / bin will not be considered for award.
 - c. Applicant Information. Include applicant (organization) name, address, contact person, phone number, fax and e-mail address.
 - d. Funding Requested. Specify the amount you are requesting from EPA.
 - e. Total Project Cost. Specify total cost of the project (EPA funding and cost-share). Identify funding from other sources including any in-kind resources.
 - f. Project period. Provide beginning and ending dates (for planning purposes, applicants should assume funds will be available in October 2005).
 - g. Explicit description of how the proposed project meets the category-specific guidelines established in Section I, Part B, Scope of Work, to include:
 1. a detailed project summary, description of specific actions and methods to be undertaken and the responsible institutions, including estimated time line for each task;
 2. the associated work products to be developed;
 3. an explanation of project benefits to the public;
 4. an explanation of how project outcomes (e.g., source and local-scale ambient HAP characterization) will be transferable / applicable to other like scenarios in different locations;
 5. a plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the

expected environmental outputs/outcomes identified in Section I of this announcement;

6. an explanation of how project success will be evaluated;

7. a description of the roles of the applicant and partners, if any;

8. biographical information of the key personnel.

9. to the extent not covered above, information to address the ranking factors listed in Section V.

3. Detailed Itemized Budget. Provide a budget for the following categories, specifying unit costs:

- a. Personnel
- b. Fringe Benefits
- c. Contractual Costs
- d. Travel
- e. Equipment
- f. Supplies
- g. Other
- h. Total Direct Costs
- i. Total Indirect Costs: must include documentation of accepted indirect rate
- j. Total Cost

4. Quality Assurance Narrative: The applicant should provide a short narrative on how their agency will implement the requisite Quality System (an EPA approved Quality System is discussed briefly in Section I, Part D of this solicitation). The applying agency must state clearly that a Quality System will be implemented and that the Quality System will be described in detail in their quality documentation (i.e., QMP and QAPP). If an applying agency is performing existing monitoring, the agency must state clearly that it will develop the quality documentation to include the project, if selected for award.

Applicants are strongly advised to avoid submission of superfluous materials. Pages exceeding the maximum length specified above for the narrative workplan will not be considered. The maximum page length for the narrative workplan shall include any pieces that may be submitted by a third party (e.g., references or letters confirming commitments). All application materials must be completed in English and presented in a clear and readable font size to be considered for award under this solicitation.

C. Submission Dates and Times.

1. To allow for efficient management of the competitive process, EPA requests eligible entities submit an informal notice of "Intent to Apply" by July 22, 2005, to the agency contact identified under Section VII, Agency Contact. Submission of Intent to apply is optional; it is a process management tool that will allow EPA to better anticipate the total staff time required for efficient review, evaluation, and selection of submitted proposals. Eligible entities not submitting "Intent to Apply" are still eligible to apply by the deadline. The written notice of "Intent to Apply" may be submitted via electronic mail. Please provide the name of your organization, a point of contact, phone number, email

address, the project title, and corresponding category / bin.

2. The deadline for submission of completed application packages is 4 p.m. EDT on August 22, 2005. All application packages must be received in the program office listed below by the deadline. Applications received after the deadline will not be considered for funding.

3. Applications may be submitted by postal or overnight express mail (see no. 5 below), or electronically. If submitted electronically, the electronic application must be submitted in Microsoft Word, Word Perfect, or PDF format to: jones.mike@epa.gov. Applications will be considered timely upon receipt, not transmission. An e-mail response confirming receipt of electronic applications will be provided. Note that hand delivery and facsimile applications will not be accepted.

4. **Confidential Business Information.** In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their application/proposal as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidential claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark applications/proposals or portions of applications/proposals they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204 (c)(2) prior to disclosure.

5. Because of the unique situation involving U.S. mail screening, EPA highly recommends that applicants who do not submit their application electronically use an express mail option to submit their applications. Please provide original proposal and four copies - no binders or spiral binding - plus one signed and completed application should be addressed to:

Regular Mail Delivery Address (U.S. Postal Service)

Michael N. Jones
U.S. EPA (D243-02)
EMAD/AAMG
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711

Express Delivery Address (FedEx, UPS, DHL, etc.)

Michael N. Jones
U.S. EPA (D243-02)
4930 Page Road
Durham, NC 27703

Phone: (919) 541-0528

Section V - Application Review Information.

Each eligible application will be evaluated according to the criteria set forth below. Applications which are best able to directly and explicitly address these criteria will have a greater likelihood of being selected for award. Each application will be rated under a points system, with a total of 100 points possible, and be evaluated based on the following criteria:

A. Evaluation Criteria.

Criteria	Points
<u>Narrative Workplan.</u> Other than those items explicitly addressed below (e.g., project outcome transferability, plan for tracking / measuring progress, etc.), to what degree does the applicant comply with the content requirements specified in Section IV, Part B of this solicitation? These items will be evaluated in terms of both content and descriptive quality rendered.	20
<u>Background / Basis.</u> To what extent has the applicant demonstrated familiarity with related prior / ongoing work? Has that information been appropriately considered in developing the proposal?	10
<u>Description of Objectives.</u> How well does the applicant describe the particular situation the proposed study is intended to address, the objectives of the study, and whether their proposed monitoring network/project design will enable them to achieve the study objectives?	10
<u>High Priority HAPs.</u> To what extent does the applicant's proposed work address those HAPs, or an appropriate subset thereof, identified in the 1999 NATA as National and/or Regional drivers?	10
<u>Data Analysis.</u> Has the applicant well-described the data analysis plan, including information on how the study design will support the data analysis objective(s), and how the data analysis will be used? Potential data analyses include source apportionment / source signature identification, exposure assessment / risk characterization, evaluation of new or emerging monitoring method utility and practical value, model evaluation and improvement, risk mitigation efforts, etc.	10
<u>Transferability.</u> To what extent does the proposed project's expected outcome(s) have potential for transferability / applicability to other like scenarios in different locations?	8
<u>Qualifications.</u> To what degree does the applicant agency (and/or its' partners, if applicable) possess direct, relevant expertise in performing the proposed work?	8
<u>Quality Assurance Narrative.</u> To what degree does the applicant describe their intent and plan to implement a Quality System (Section IV, Part B, Item 4 of this solicitation)?	8

<p><u>Leveraging of Other Resources.</u> Does the applicant’s project plan incorporate additional resources beyond the requested funding? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of measurements from PM, ozone, Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS), or NATTS, to assist in interpreting air toxics source-receptor and other characterization needs. - Use of staff expertise, community support, other funding. - Cooperation with concurrent studies (e.g., other ambient monitoring programs or exposure or health studies) that could be leveraged to enhance project results. 	8
<p><u>EPA Strategic Plan Linkage and Anticipated Outcomes/Outputs:</u> Has the applicant identified an effective plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving expected outputs and outcomes identified in Section I of this announcement?</p>	8
<p>Total</p>	100

B. Other Factors.

In addition to evaluating applications against the evaluation factors detailed in Section V (A), Evaluation Criteria, in making selection recommendations EPA may also consider the following factors:

1. Capacity building – whether the applicant proposes to retain a large fraction of the project budget within their agency or a partner air pollution agency, the extent of air toxics monitoring infrastructure the applicant possesses, and whether the applicant has received recent supplemental funding.
2. Community-scale monitoring proposals for areas deemed as high risk per the 1999 NATA (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/nata/>);
3. Geographic dispersion (i.e., the value added of a proposed project in relation to the aggregate to minimize redundant efforts nationwide and within Regions, and optimize total value of the program).

C. Review and Selection Process.

Each application will be evaluated by a team chosen to address the range of activities associated with air toxics monitoring, in particular relative to the proposal categories cited in Section I, Part D (Scope of Work). The evaluation will be based solely on the selection criteria disclosed in this announcement.. The highest numerically-ranked proposal(s), *subject to availability of funds and based on the consideration, if any, of the factors disclosed in Section V, Part B (Other Factors)*, will be recommended for award.

Section VI - Award Administration Information.

A. Award Notices.

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

1. EPA anticipates notification to successful applicant(s) will be made via telephone, electronic or postal mail within 15 calendar days of the selection decision. This notification, which advises that the applicant's proposal has been selected and is being recommended for award, is not an authorization to begin performance. The award notice signed by the EPA grants officer is the authorizing document and will be provided through postal mail. At a minimum, this process can take up to 60 days from the date of selection.
2. EPA anticipates notification to unsuccessful applicant(s) will be made via electronic or postal mail within 15 calendar days of the selection decision. In either event, the notification will be sent to the original signer of the application.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements.

1. A listing and description of general EPA Regulations applicable to the award of assistance agreements may be viewed at:
http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/applicable_epa_regulations_and_description.htm
2. Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, may be applicable to awards resulting from this announcement. 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. This review is not required with the Initial Proposal and not all states require such a review.
3. All applicants are required to provide a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number when applying for a Federal grant or cooperative agreement. Applicants can receive a DUNS number, at no cost, by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at 1-866-705-5711, or visiting the D&B website at:
<http://www.dnb.com>.
4. Programmatic Terms and conditions will be negotiated with the selected applicants.

C. Reporting Requirement.

1. Quality assured ambient monitoring data must be reported to the EPA's Air Quality System (AQS) Database (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/index.htm>) on a quarterly schedule within 120 days of completing a data collection quarter. For example, if data collection begins on February 15, the first data collection quarter is complete on May 15,

and quality assured data is due to AQS by September 15.

2. Quarterly progress reports and a detailed final report will be required. Quarterly reports will summarize technical progress, planned activities for next quarter and summary of expenditures. The schedule for submission of quarterly reports will be established by EPA, after award. The Final report shall be completed within 90 calendar days of the completion of the period of performance. The Project Officer may require clarifications of the final report before the report is considered acceptable. Although there are no page restrictions on the final report, EPA does not expect a final report of great length. However, this document should include a discussion of 1) project activities over the entire period of funding, describing the recipient's achievements with respect to the stated project purposes and objectives, and 2) complete details of all technical aspects of the project, both negative and positive, the recipient's findings, conclusions, and results, including the associated quality assurance results.

3. While the Agency will negotiate precise terms and conditions relating to substantial involvement as part of the award process, EPA expects to closely monitor the successful applicant(s) performance, collaborate during the performance of the scope of work, approve the substantive terms of proposed contracts, approve the qualifications of key personnel, review and comment on reports prepared under the cooperative agreement, and evaluate the engineering improvements on an EPA demonstration project. EPA will not select employees or contractors employed by the recipient(s).

D. Disputes.

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

<http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20051800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2005/05-1371.htm>. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting Michael Jones at 919-541-0528.

Section VII - Agency Contact.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael N. Jones, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Monitoring and Analysis Division, Ambient Air Monitoring Group, (919) 541-0528, jones.mike@epa.gov.

All questions or comments must be communicated in writing via postal or express mail, facsimile, or electronic mail to the contact person listed above. Answers will be posted, weekly, until the closing date of this announcement at the OAR Grants/Funding webpage (http://www.epa.gov/air/grants_funding.html).

Section VIII - Other Information.

EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals or applications and make no award as a result of this announcement.

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