

OVERVIEW INFORMATION

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Science Advisor, Policy and Engagement
Office of Research and Development
Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Program

COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH FOR EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS, POLICIES, AND DECISIONS TO MITIGATE CUMULATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DISPARITIES IN UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES

This is the initial announcement of this funding opportunity.

Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-G2023-STAR-G1

Assistance Listing Number: 66.509

Solicitation Opening Date: *June 20, 2023*

Solicitation Closing Date: *August 31, 2023: 11:59:59 pm Eastern Time*

Table of Contents

I. [FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION](#)

- A. [Introduction](#)
- B. [Background](#)
- C. [Authority and Regulations](#)
- D. [Specific Research Areas of Interest/Expected Outputs and Outcomes](#)
- E. [References](#)
- F. [Special Requirements](#)
- G. [Additional Provisions for Applicants Incorporated into the Solicitation](#)

II. [AWARD INFORMATION](#)

III. [ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION](#)

- A. [Eligible Applicants](#)
- B. [Cost Sharing](#)
- C. [Other](#)

IV. [APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION](#)

- A. [Grants.gov Submittal Requirements and Limited Exception Procedures](#)
- B. [Application Package Information](#)
- C. [Content and Form of Application Submission](#)
- D. [Submission Dates and Times](#)

- E. [Funding Restrictions](#)
- F. [Submission Instructions and Other Submission Requirements](#)
- V. [APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION](#)
 - A. [Peer Review](#)
 - B. [Relevancy Review](#)
 - C. [Past Performance History Review](#)
 - D. [Human Subjects Research Statement \(HSRS\) Review](#)
 - E. [Evaluation of the Scientific Data Management Plan](#)
 - F. [Funding Decisions](#)
- VI. [AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION](#)
 - A. [Award Notices](#)
 - B. [Administrative and National Policy Requirements](#)
- VII. [AGENCY CONTACTS](#)

I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

For Updates and Additional Information see <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-funding-opportunities>.

View research awarded under previous solicitations at <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-grant-areas>.

A. Introduction

Environmental Justice (EJ) is an integral part of EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment. The goal of EJ may be achieved when all people have the same degree of protection from environmental and human health risks or hazards and have equitable access to decision-making processes to maintain a healthy environment. Underserved communities¹ are often faced with disproportionate cumulative impacts from environmental stressors.

In January 2021, President Biden signed Executive Orders (EO) [13985](#) and [14008](#) to advance racial equity and support for underserved communities and to address the climate crisis. These EOs provide a framework for stimulating action across the federal government to achieve environmental justice for all by addressing disproportionate and adverse human health, environmental, climate-related and other cumulative impacts on communities; especially communities with environmental justice concerns that may often suffer poorer health outcomes and have lower life expectancies because they are underserved as compared to individuals in

¹ When EPA uses the term “underserved communities” it has the meaning defined in Executive Order 13985: *Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government*, which defines “underserved communities” as “populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life....” Underserved communities may include people/communities of color, low income, tribal and indigenous populations, and other vulnerable populations such as the elderly, children, and those who have pre-existing medical conditions.

other communities. Recognizing the need to bolster the scientific basis for identifying actions that can improve community health and well-being, and to select, implement, and evaluate these actions, EPA has made cumulative impacts research a priority.

Environmental health disparities or inequities caused by cumulative impacts from disproportionate exposures to pollutants (chemical stressors) and various environmental, social, economic, and psychological non-chemical stressors² in underserved communities are of particular concern. There is substantial scientific evidence indicating that non-chemical stressors such as social determinants of health [1] (e.g., socioeconomic status, education access and quality, health care access and quality, neighborhood and built environment, social and community support) and racial/ethnic factors (e.g., discrimination, marginalization) significantly modify the health impacts (e.g., diseases, premature aging, increased allostatic load) from exposure to pollutants [2-23]. For example, racial/income disparities in access to municipal water supplies have been documented [24, 25] along with the impacts of exclusion from municipal water service on water availability and childhood blood lead levels [26-29]. The EPA Report, *Supplement to the 2019 Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter*, confirms evident environmental exposure and health disparities for PM_{2.5} in underserved communities of predominantly minority populations with low socioeconomic status [30].

EPA has identified cumulative impact assessment as one means to address environmental injustice. Chemical and non-chemical stressors may accumulate over time, from one or more sources in the built, natural, and social environments, affecting individuals and communities in positive, negative, or neutral ways (Fig. 1) [31]. Solving longstanding, persistent environmental health problems, including health disparities exacerbated by racial and social injustices, will require sound and thorough scientific understanding of the combined effects of key stressors on health outcomes. This understanding will serve as the basis for accurate cumulative impact assessments that can be used to shape effective policies, programs, or decisions at tribal, state, local, and community levels, all in the context of eliminating environmental health disparities. For example, explicit inclusion of cumulative impact assessments in decision-making to support regulatory, permitting, equitable development, compliance monitoring and enforcement activities are necessary to achieve equitable health outcomes across communities and tribes. Another example may be targeted place-based and proactive policy making in which cumulative impact screening is used to map, characterize, and target underserved communities for interventions that improve existing conditions and prevent future harm [32].

Figure 1 represents the complex interrelationships among components describing cumulative impacts [31]. The linked and overlapping circles suggest that all components are multidirectional and interactive within the total environment. Health, well-being, and quality of life at each life stage throughout the life course are influenced by all other components.

² Non-chemical stressors cannot be considered alone, but applicants are asked to include them as secondary or modifying variables to the primary contaminant(s)/chemical stressor(s).

Chemical and non-chemical stressors can come from the built, natural, and social environments, collectively referred to as the total environment. Additionally, activities, behaviors, and lifestyle considerations, as well as systems biology (to include genetic and epigenetic considerations), interact with the stressors to influence health, well-being, and quality of life. Figure 1 also shows that factors we control and don't control should be considered in understanding how cumulative impacts influence health, well-being, and quality of life at the individual, geographically defined community, or definable population group levels [31].




Figure 1. Combined influences on the total (built, natural, social) environment for individuals, geographically defined communities, or definable population groups [31].

To the extent possible, the research results should produce innovative yet practical outputs that are applicable or generalizable to other underserved communities across the nation. All research projects will be required to include a Community Engagement Plan to address community-engaged problem identification (such as community-led assets and vulnerabilities mapping), translation, and community-driven solutions to bring about desired outcomes. The description of the Community Engagement Plan is provided in Sections I.D and IV.C.5.iii.e.

The Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Program's goal is to stimulate and support scientific and engineering research that advances EPA's mission to protect human health and the environment. It is a competitive, peer-reviewed, extramural research program that provides access to the nation's best scientists and engineers in academic and other nonprofit research institutions. STAR funds research on the environmental and public health effects of air quality, environmental changes, water quality and quantity, hazardous waste, toxic substances, and pesticides.

EPA recognizes that it is important to engage all available minds to address the environmental challenges the Nation faces. At the same time, EPA seeks to expand the environmental conversation by including members of communities which may have not previously participated in such dialogues to participate in EPA programs. For this reason, EPA strongly encourages all eligible applicants identified in Section III, including minority serving institutions (MSIs), to apply under this opportunity.

For purposes of this solicitation, the following are considered MSIs:

1. Historically Black Colleges and Universities, as defined by the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 1061(2)). A list of these schools can be found at [Historically Black Colleges and Universities](#);
2. Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), as defined by the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 1059c(b)(3) and (d)(1)). A list of these schools can be found at [American Indian Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities](#);
3. Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), as defined by the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 1101a(a)(5)). A list of these schools can be found at [Hispanic-Serving Institutions](#);
4. Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions; (AANAPISIs), as defined by the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 1059g(b)(2)). A list of these schools can be found at [Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions](#); and
5. Predominately Black Institutions (PBIs), as defined by the Higher Education Act of 2008, 20 U.S.C. 1059e(b)(6). A list of these schools can be found at [Predominately Black Institutions](#).

B. Background

There have been considerable research efforts and progress to understand the cumulative impacts of inequalities in environmental stressors on health and their implications for environmental and public health policies. Many past and current policies have not factored in the cumulative impacts of disparate exposure and health effects and might have exacerbated the inequalities. Past institutional practices and policies might have created conditions that fostered health disparities in underserved communities. For example, a growing body of literature has shown a link between historical redlining practices and present-day disproportionate exposures to environmental contaminants [31-39]. In recent years, several states, such as New Jersey and California, have begun to factor in cumulative impact assessments in their environmental decisions [40-41]. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Service's Healthy People 2030 focuses on the social determinants of health to reduce health inequalities [1]. However, fit-for-purpose, systematic and practical methods for application of cumulative impact assessment to inform local policies, programs, and decisions are needed.

EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) has published the final report, [Cumulative Impacts Research: Recommendations for EPA's Office of Research and Development](#), to inform the agency's strategic research actions [31]. It defines "cumulative impacts" and "cumulative impact assessment" as follows:

Cumulative Impacts are defined as the totality of exposures to combinations of chemical and non-chemical stressors and their effects on health, well-being, and quality of life outcomes. Cumulative impacts include contemporary exposures to multiple stressors as well as exposures throughout a person's lifetime. They are influenced by the distribution of stressors and encompass both direct and indirect effects to people through impacts on resources and the environment. Cumulative impacts can be considered in the context of individuals, geographically defined communities, or definable population groups. Cumulative impacts characterize the potential state of vulnerability or resilience of a community.

Cumulative Impact Assessment is defined as a process of evaluating both quantitative and qualitative data representing cumulative impacts to inform a decision. Cumulative impact assessment requires a systematic approach to characterize the combined effects from exposures to both chemical and non-chemical stressors over time across the affected population group or community. It evaluates how stressors from the built, natural, and social environments affect groups of people in both positive and negative ways. The posited elements of a cumulative impact assessment include: the role of the community throughout the assessment, such as identifying problems and potential intervention decision points to improve community health and well-being; combined impacts across multiple chemical and non-chemical stressors; multiple sources of stressors from the built, natural, and social environments; multiple exposure pathways across media; community vulnerability, sensitivity, adaptability, and resilience; exposures to stressors in the relevant past and future, especially during vulnerable lifestages; distribution of environmental burdens and benefits; individual variability and behaviors; health and well-being

benefits/mitigating factors; uncertainty and variability associated with the data and information; and approaches for how to integrate data and information to assess cumulative impacts.

This RFA aims to further advance the scientific knowledge essential for obtaining an accurate and realistic assessment of the cumulative impacts from multiple chemical and non-chemical stressors, exacerbated by environmental factors, including racial and social injustices in underserved communities. It seeks applications for community-based scientific research to assess cumulative impacts from multiple combined and interacting environmental (chemical [pollutants/contaminants] and non-chemical) stressors upon human health in underserved communities. This RFA is a follow-up to the EPA STAR RFA, [“Cumulative Health Impacts at the Intersection of Climate Change, Environmental Justice, and Vulnerable Populations/Lifestages: Community-Based Research for Solutions”](#) in terms of making progress toward developing and evaluating practical approaches or methods to conduct cumulative impact assessments that incorporate key environmental justice factors into solutions. While many environmental issues may be common across communities, each community is also unique in terms of its people and the issues they face. A program or policy that works for one community may not work for another. Therefore, for the solution to be effective, it must reflect and address the community’s needs to eliminate environmental health disparities. The goal is not only to understand cumulative impacts from a community perspective, but also to consider community dynamics and variability in the development of solutions. The RFA will seek research proposals to (1) improve health, well-being, and quality of life outcomes by assessing and addressing cumulative impacts resulting from combinations of chemical and non-chemical stressors in underserved communities and investigate how the scientific information can be used to develop effective cumulative impact assessment approaches and/or methods; and (2) investigate how cumulative impact assessment approaches and/or methods can be used to shape better informed practical programs, policies, and decisions to eliminate environmental health disparities. The applicants are asked to identify and work with specific communities, state, tribal, and/or local programs and policies that cumulative impact assessment can improve and inform explicitly where in the decision-making process the cumulative impact assessment can be applied.

C. Authority and Regulations

The authorities for this RFA and resulting awards are contained in the Safe Drinking Water Act, 42 U.S.C. 300j-1, Section 1442, the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1254, Section 104(b)(3), the Toxic Substances Control Act, 15 U.S.C. 2609, Section 10, as amended by P.L. 106-74, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, 7 U.S.C. 136r, Section 20, as amended by P.L. 106-74, the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7403, Section 103(b)(3), and the Solid Waste Disposal Act, 42 U.S.C. 6981, Section 8001.

For research with an international aspect, the above statutes are supplemented, as appropriate, by the National Environmental Policy Act, Section 102(2)(F).

Note that a project’s focus is to consist of activities within the statutory terms of EPA’s financial assistance authorities; specifically, the statute(s) listed above. Generally, a project must address the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of air pollution, water

pollution, solid/hazardous waste pollution, toxic substances control, or pesticide control depending on which statute(s) is listed above. Further note that applications dealing with any aspect of or related to hydraulic fracking will not be funded by EPA through this program.

Additional applicable regulations include: 2 CFR Part 200, 2 CFR Part 1500, and 40 CFR Part 40 (Research and Demonstration Grants).

D. Specific Research Areas of Interest/Expected Outputs and Outcomes

Note to applicant: The term “output” means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work products related to an environmental goal or objective, that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. The term “outcome” means the result, effect, or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective.

The activities to be funded under this solicitation support EPA’s FY 2022-2026 Strategic Plan (<https://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/strategicplan>). Awards made under this solicitation will support Goal 2: Take Decisive Action to Advance Environmental Justice and Civil Rights, Objective 2.1: Promote Environmental Justice and Civil Rights at the Federal, Tribal, State, and Local Levels, of the Plan. All applications must be for projects that support the goal and objective identified above.

Awards made under this announcement will further EPA’s priorities to protect the health of underserved communities and to advance environmental justice by reducing environmental health disparities. The proposed research awards support the STAR program’s goal of stimulating and supporting scientific and engineering research that advances EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment in relation to environmental justice. The research will provide the scientific foundation for the use of cumulative impact assessment to inform solutions to be used by state, tribal, local governments, and communities to protect the health of underserved communities from the risks posed by pollutants and other stressors.

EPA also requires that grant applicants adequately describe environmental outputs and outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements (see EPA Order 5700.7A1, Environmental Results under Assistance Agreements, <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-order-57007a1-epas-policy-environmental-results-under-epa-assistance-agreements>). Applicants must include specific statements describing the environmental results of the proposed project in terms of well-defined outputs and, to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes that will demonstrate how the project will contribute to the goal(s) and objective(s) described above.

As part of its STAR program, EPA is soliciting the scientific community to propose innovative community-based research to (1) better understand the cumulative impacts from key chemical and non-chemical stressors in underserved communities so that the scientific evidence and knowledge can lead to effective cumulative impact assessment and (2) develop and use a cumulative impact assessment approach and/or method to improve existing or to propose new specific and practical programs, policies, and decisions (at state, local, or community level) to

mitigate adverse health outcomes and to eliminate environmental health disparities in underserved communities.

Applications that integrate a diverse field of disciplines and methodologies (social sciences [such as economics, sociology, anthropology, etc.], environmental health, public health, community-based participatory research, epidemiology, engineering, environmental science, biology, statistics, toxicology, chemistry, etc.) to address the complexity of the research problem are strongly encouraged. Note that non-chemical stressors (e.g., social determinants of health such as nutrition, social conditions, stress, socioeconomic status and cultural factors) cannot be considered alone, but applicants are required to include them as secondary or modifying variables to the contaminant(s)/chemical stressor(s).

Applicants are strongly recommended to incorporate existing data (e.g., epidemiological, environmental, social, biological, healthcare, public health) and use mixed methods approaches. The proposed research should be comprehensive and include quantitative and qualitative data to characterize specific cumulative impacts from pollutants, non-chemical environmental stressors, and modifying factors that exist in specific underserved communities in the United States. The proposed research should also describe how results could inform effective decision making leading to potential preventive measures, programs, educational or practical community outreach, risk communication messages, platforms, tools, or engagement efforts. The goal is to provide solutions and tools to practitioners in the field of environmental justice, including state and local agencies, community organizations, environmental planners, and policymakers.

The research results must identify practical, real-world solution(s) which would lead to improved or new community-level initiatives, state and local policies, and commercial/private incentives for reducing exposures to chemical and non-chemical stressors, mitigating cumulative impacts, and building adaptive capacity with particular attention paid to underserved communities.

Applications must address the two research areas of interest outlined below. Applications that do not address and integrate both research areas of interest described below may not be rated as highly as those that do. Applicants are strongly recommended to consider the example research questions listed under each research area in shaping their research project. Applicants are not required to include all the research questions or limit their research scope to these examples.

Research Areas of Interest and Example Research Questions

1. Propose cutting-edge, multidisciplinary research to improve health, well-being, and quality of life outcomes by assessing and addressing cumulative impacts resulting from combinations of chemical and non-chemical stressors in underserved communities. Investigate how the scientific information can be used to develop effective cumulative impact assessment approaches and/or methods. Identification of specific health outcomes and key stressors (both chemical and non-chemical) are required.

- What are the key chemical and non-chemical stressors associated with the cumulative exposures and effects under investigation?
 - What quantitative and qualitative data pertaining to chemical, biological, and environmental (built, natural, and social) factors are necessary for effective cumulative impact assessment? How can key non-chemical stressors identified for underserved communities be successfully accounted for within a given decision context?
 - How can social, cultural, and historical context be included in cumulative impact assessment?
 - How can forms of knowledge including traditional ecological knowledge, indigenous knowledge, local knowledge, and community concerns be included in cumulative impact assessment?
 - What effective methods or approaches can be used to combine quantitative and qualitative data, such as quantitative and qualitative information on non-chemical stressors?
 - What holistic approach and/or method can be used for:
 - integrating quantitative and qualitative data?
 - identifying health pathways? (One key step in proposing and evaluating solutions is to identify health pathways and then evaluate, with the available data, how the proposed solutions might impact those pathways.)
 - characterizing environmental exposure disparities or inequalities?
 - characterizing environmental health disparities or inequalities?
2. Propose research to investigate how cumulative impact assessment approaches and/or methods can be used to shape better informed practical programs, policies, and decisions to eliminate environmental health disparities.
- How can existing programs or policies effectively be improved by accounting for key non-chemical stressors?
 - How can cumulative impact assessment help prioritize necessary programs, policies, and decisions to eliminate environmental health disparities in underserved communities?
 - What evidence-based process may be most effective for evaluating solutions that most benefit the community?
 - How can communities be effectively involved in cumulative impact assessment processes and decision making to reduce environmental health disparities? Which stakeholders from public, private, and commercial sectors should be included?

Expected Outputs and Outcomes

The expected outputs from this research will be novel and comprehensive scientific information, publications, data, and knowledge about how exposures to multiple pollutants and other

environmental stressors in underserved communities are quantitatively and/or qualitatively linked to specific health outcomes. Research results will also include important information on non-chemical environmental stressors and modifying factors that significantly affect vulnerability to both exposure and health effects among underserved communities within the United States. The desired outputs should result in more accurate cumulative health impact assessments leading to more effective, practical, and efficient reduction, mitigation, and prevention measures at tribal, state, local, and community levels.

The expected outcomes include reductions in environmental health disparities in underserved communities in the United States; reductions in adverse impacts to health and well-being from exposure to chemical and non-chemical environmental stressors; and improved prevention and/or mitigation policies and programs to improve the health and well-being of underserved communities. The proposed research should improve decision-making to achieve environmental justice and health equity in underserved communities across the United States.

Environmental Justice

To the maximum extent practicable, applicants should demonstrate in their application how they will advance environmental justice for underserved communities, as defined below. EJ is the just treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, income, Tribal affiliation or disability, with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of the adverse environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental, and commercial operations or policies. Meaningful involvement means people have an opportunity to participate in decisions about activities that may affect their environment and/or health; the public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision; community concerns will be considered in the decision-making process; and decision makers will seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected. For purposes of this competition and the evaluation of applications, “underserved communities” refers to populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life, and underserved communities may include people/communities of color, low income, tribal and indigenous populations, and other vulnerable populations such as the elderly, children, and those who have pre-existing medical conditions.

Underserved communities are often affected by disproportionate impacts. Disproportionate and adverse environmental, human health, climate-related and other cumulative impacts, as well the accompanying economic challenges of such impacts, may result when greater pollution burdens and/or consequences, and the impact of them, are more likely to affect or have affected the underserved communities described in this solicitation. The impacts may result from various factors including but not limited to being a function of historical trends and policy decisions.

Factors that may indicate disproportionate and adverse impacts as referenced above include: differential proximity and exposure to adverse environmental hazards; greater susceptibility to adverse effects from environmental hazards (due to causes such as age, chronic medical conditions, lack of health care access, or limited access to quality nutrition); unique

environmental exposures because of practices linked to cultural background or socioeconomic status (for example, subsistence fishing or farming); cumulative effects from multiple stressors; reduced ability to effectively participate in decision-making processes (due to causes such as lack of or ineffective language access programs, lack of programs to make processes accessible to persons with disabilities, inability to access traditional communication channels, or limited capacity to access technical and legal resources); and degraded physical infrastructure, such as poor housing, poorly maintained public buildings (e.g., schools), or lack of access to transportation.

In addressing the research areas described above in applications, applicants should demonstrate how their project will address the disproportionate and adverse human health, environmental, climate-related and other cumulative impacts, as well as the accompanying economic challenges of such impacts, resulting from industrial, governmental, commercial and/or other actions that have affected and/or currently affect the underserved communities. Applicants should also demonstrate how the project benefits the underserved communities including those that have experienced a lack of resources or other impediments to addressing the impacts identified above that affect their community.

Innovation and Sustainability

To the maximum extent practicable, research applications must embody innovation and sustainability. Innovation for the purposes of this RFA is defined as the process of making changes; a new method, custom, or device. Innovative research can take the form of wholly new applications or applications that build on existing knowledge and approaches for new uses. Research applications must include a discussion on how the proposed research is innovative (see Section IV.C.5.iii.a). The goal of sustainability, derived from the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), is to “create and maintain conditions, under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony, that permit fulfilling the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations.” Research applications must include a discussion on how the proposed research will seek sustainable solutions that protect the environment and strengthen our communities (see Section IV.C.5.iii.a). Reviewers will draw from all of the above-mentioned innovation and sustainability definitions in the review/evaluation process of research applications (see Section V.A).

Community Engagement Plan

A community engagement plan is required. See Section IV.C.5.iii.e. Researchers should involve underserved community(ies) or community-based organizations (see definition below) in the formulation of research objectives and in clarifying their real-world exposures and/or health effects. Researchers are strongly encouraged to partner with underserved community(ies). Applications should, at minimum, describe how: a) applicants will work in partnership with appropriate partners (e.g., MSIs, states, tribes, academia, industry groups, non-profit organizations, associations, and local communities/community-based organizations) to effectively design and implement the proposed project; b) to the extent possible, coordinate with and/or complement other projects or activities being performed by others that will result in a greater positive impact; and c) demonstrate how the proposed project will address the needs and concerns of underserved communities including how community-based organizations (as defined

below) and/or other appropriate parties will be engaged to enhance the project's effectiveness and/or efficiency.

For the purpose of this announcement, a "community-based organization" generally means a nongovernmental organization that has demonstrated effectiveness as a representative of a community or a significant segment of a community and that helps members of that community obtain environmental, educational, or other social services. A community-based organization must be a nonprofit or not for profit corporation in good standing under State or Tribal law with authority to enter into binding legal agreements. The community-based organization need not be tax exempt under the Internal Revenue Code but may use documentation of tax-exempt status to demonstrate that it is a nonprofit.

Applicants may utilize a Community Engagement Research (CEnR) framework, defined as a collaborative process of research involving researchers and community representatives, to meet this requirement. The CEnR process of scientific inquiry requires that community members or other key community stakeholders be included in the identification of research problems and objectives and in the formulation of community-driven solutions. Although a range of levels of community involvement can be considered CEnR, CEnR is characterized by substantial community input and involvement in the project. The applicant will need to justify the level of community involvement that is proposed in the application. While not required, each applicant is encouraged to form a CEnR framework to meet the requirement for community involvement in the project that may include relevant community leaders and a committee or an advisory group.

The Community Engagement Plan should:

- Describe the type of collaboration/engagement proposed and what role it will play in the overall project including the degree of partner/community input or engagement in the conceptualization, hypothesis/question development, design, methods, analyses and implementation of the research. This includes describing how the project addresses engagement with underserved communities, especially local residents in these communities who will be affected by the project, to ensure their meaningful participation with respect to the design, project planning, and performance of the project.
- Describe how the collaboration/engagement will enhance the overall impact of the project such that the project results are applicable and useable by impacted communities and address the needs and concerns of underserved communities. This includes the capacity of the project to more effectively communicate risk and translate scientific results into easily understandable outreach and education materials.
- Describe how activities of the project will be coordinated with related or complementary projects and studies.
- Describe how the collaboration/engagement will materialize during project performance. Describe the partner(s)' intent to participate in the proposed research including evidence of community support of an active partnership with a community engagement research committee, a community-based organization or advisory group members (e.g., letter(s) of intent or support from MSIs, community leaders, state or local government agencies, non-government organizations, public health professionals, community emergency planners or responders, social workers, child serving organizations, assisted living and nursing homes, utility managers, site

managers or operators, decision makers or policy planners). Any letters demonstrating evidence of collaboration and support should be included as part of section IV.C.5.viii.a. Letters of Intent/Letters of Support.

E. References

1. Healthy People 2030, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Retrieved May 5, 2021, from <https://health.gov/healthypeople/objectives-and-data/social-determinants-health>.
2. Evans G.W. and E. Kantrowitz, (2002), Socioeconomic status and health: the potential role of environmental risk exposure. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 23: 303–31.
3. Amadi C. (2017) Money as Health: A Study of Health Status Disparities among African Americans of Flint, Michigan. *J Psychol Clin Psychiatry* 8(3): 00484. DOI: [10.15406/jpcpy.2017.08.00484](https://doi.org/10.15406/jpcpy.2017.08.00484).
4. Downey L. and M. Van Willigen, Environmental stressors: the mental health impacts of living near industrial activity. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2005; 46(3): 289–305.
5. Martine Vrijheid, (2000), Health Effects of Residence Near Hazardous Waste Landfill Sites: A Review of Epidemiologic Literature, *Environ Health Perspect* 108 (suppl1):101-112.
6. Maheshwari R, S. Gupta, and K. Das, (2015), Impact of Landfill Waste on Health: An Overview, *Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*, Vol. 1 Issue. 4:17-23.
7. Landrigan P.J. (2010), Environmental Justice and the Health of Children, *Mt Sinai J Med*. 77(2): 178–187. doi: 10.1002/msj.20173.
8. Seeman T, S.S. Merkin, E. Crimmins, B. Koretz, S. Charette, and A. Karlamangla, (2008), Education, income and ethnic differences in cumulative biological risk profiles in a national sample of US adults: NHANES III (1988-1994). *Soc Sci Med*. 66(1):72 -87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.08.027>.
9. Crimmins E.M., J.K. Kim, and T.E. Seeman, (2009), Poverty and biological risk: the earlier “aging” of the poor. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 64(2):286–92. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/gln010>.
10. Beckie T.M. (2012), A systematic review of allostatic load, health, and health disparities. *Biol Res Nurs*.14(4):311–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1099800412455688>.

11. Schulz A.J., G. Mentz, L. Lachance, J. Johnson, C. Gaines, and B.A. Israel, (2012), Associations between socioeconomic status and allostatic load: effects of neighborhood poverty and tests of mediating pathways. *Am J Public Health*.102(9):1706–14.
<https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300412>.
12. Zota, A.R., A.M. Riederer, A.S. Ettinger, L.A. Schaider, J.P. Shine, C.J. Amarasiriwardena, R.O. Wright, and J.D. Spengler, (2016). Associations between metals in residential environmental media and exposure biomarkers over time in infants living near a mining impacted site. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 26(5): 510-519.
13. Senier L., P. Brown, S. Shostak, and B. Hanna, (2017), The Socio-Exposome: Advancing Exposure Science and Environmental Justice in a Post-Genomic Era, *Environ Sociol*. 3(2): 107–121. doi:10.1080/23251042.2016.1220848
14. Rodriguez E.J., E.N. Kim, A.E. Sumner, A.M. Nápoles, and E.J. Pérez-Stable, (2019), Allostatic Load: Importance, Markers, and Score Determination in Minority and Disparity Populations, *Journal of Urban Health* volume 96, pages3–11.
15. Juarez1, P.D., D.B. Hood, M. Song, and A. Ramesh, (2020), Use of an Exposome Approach to Understand the Effects of Exposures From the Natural, Built, and Social Environments on Cardio-Vascular Disease Onset, Progression, and Outcomes, *Frontiers in Public Health*. (<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00379>).
16. Janet Currie, (2011), Michael Greenstone, and Enrico Moretti, Superfund Cleanups and Infant Health, *Am Econ Rev*. 101(3): 435–441. doi:10.1257/aer.101.3.435.
17. Zota, A., L. Schaider, A. Ettinger, R.O. Wright, J.P. Shine, and J.D. Spengler, (2011), Metal sources and exposures in the homes of young children living near a mining-impacted Superfund site, *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*. 21(5): 495–505.
18. McEwen B.S. and P.J. Gianaros, (2010), Central role of the brain in stress and adaptation: links to socioeconomic status, health, and disease. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*.1186:190–222.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05331.x>.
19. Szanton S.L., J.M. Gill, and J.K. Allen, (2005), Allostatic load: a mechanism of socioeconomic health disparities? *Biol Res Nurs*.7(1):7–15. DOI: [10.1177/1099800405278216](https://doi.org/10.1177/1099800405278216)
20. Gustafsson P.E., U. Janlert, T. Theorell, H. Westerlund, and A. Hammarstrom, (2011), Socioeconomic status over the life course and allostatic load in adulthood: results from the Northern Swedish Cohort. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 65(11):986–92.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2010.108332>.

21. Colen, C. G., Addressing racial disparities in health using life course perspectives - Toward a constructive criticism, (2011), In: [Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, Volume 8, Issue 1: Special Issue: Racial Inequality and Health](#), pp. 79 – 94.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X11000075>.
22. Stillo F. and J.M. Gibson, (2017), Exposure to Contaminated Drinking Water and Health Disparities in North Carolina, *Am J Public Health*.107:180–185.
doi:10.2105/AJPH.2016.303482.
23. Marmot M., (2015), *The Health Gap: The Challenge of an Unequal World*, Bloomsbury Press, New York, NY.
24. Patel, A.I. and L.A. Schmidt, (2017), Water Access in the United States: Health Disparities Abound and Solutions Are Urgently Needed, *American Journal of Public Health (AJPH)*,
doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2017.303972.
25. Stillo, F., and J.M. Gibson, (2018), Racial disparities in access to municipal water supplies in the American South: Impacts on children’s health. *International Public Health Journal* 10(3):309-323.
26. Hanna-Attisha M, J. LaChance, R.C. Sadler, and S.A. Champney, (2016), Elevated blood lead levels in children associated with the flint drinking water crisis: a spatial analysis of risk and public health response. *Am J Public Health*. 106(2): 283–90.
27. Lockhart, S., E. Wood, and J.M. Gibson, (2020), Impacts of exclusion from municipal water service on water availability: a case study. *NEW SOLUTIONS: A Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy* 30(2):127-137. DOI: 10.1177/1048291120932913.
28. Gibson, J.M., M. Fisher, A. Clonch, J.M. MacDonald, and P. Cook. (2020), Children drinking private well water have higher blood lead than those with city water. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(29):16898-16907.
DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2002729117.
29. Clonch, A. C., M. Fisher, and J.M. Gibson, (2019), Water infrastructure and childhood blood lead levels: characterizing the effects of exclusion from municipal services in Wake County (NC, USA). *International Journal of Child Health and Human Development* 12(4).
30. U.S. EPA, Environmental Protection Agency (2022), [Supplement to the 2019 Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter \(Final Report\)](#). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, EPA/635/R-22/028.
31. U.S. EPA, Environmental Protection Agency (2021), [Cumulative Impacts Research: Recommendations for EPA’s Office of Research and Development \(pdf\)](#). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, EPA/600/R-22/014a.

32. Morello-Frosch R., M. Zuk, M. Jerrett, B. Shamasunder, A. D. Kyle (2011), Understanding the cumulative impacts of inequalities in environmental health: Implications for policy. *Health Affairs* 30(5): 879-887.
33. Lee, C. (2021), Confronting disproportionate impacts and systemic racism in environmental policy, *Environmental Law Reporter* 51(3): 10207-10225.
34. Yee, SH, Bradley, P., Fisher, W., Perreault, SD, Quackenboss, J., Johnson, ED, Bousquin, J., and Murphy, PA. (2012), Integrating Human Health and Environmental Health into the DPSIR Framework: A Tool to Identify Research Opportunities for Sustainable and Healthy Communities, *EcoHealth* 9, 411–426, DOI: 10.1007/s10393-012-0805-3.
35. Zhuang, S.; Bolte, G.; Lakes, T. (2022), Exploring Environmental Health Inequalities: A Scientometric Analysis of Global Research Trends (1970–2020). *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 19, 7394. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19127394>.
36. Gupta, J., Scholtens, J., Perch, L., Dankelman, I., Seager, J., Sander, F., Stanley-Jones, M., and Kempf, I. (2021), Re-imagining the driver–pressure–state–impact–response framework from an equity and inclusive development perspective, *Sustainability Science*, 15:503–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00708-6>.
37. Hodgson, EE, Halpern, BS, and Essington TE, (2019) Moving Beyond Silos in Cumulative Effects Assessment. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 7:211. doi: 10.3389/fevo.2019.00211.
38. Van Horne, YO, Alcala, CS, Peltier, RE, Quintana, PJE, Seto, E, Gonzales, M, Johnston, JE, Montoya, LD, Quirós-Alcalá, L, and Beamer, PI. (2023), An applied environmental justice framework for exposure science, *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology*, 33:1–11; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-022-00422-z>.
39. Lane, H.M., Morello-Frosch, R., Marchall, J.D., and Apte, J.S. (2022). Historical redlining is associated with present-day air pollution disparities in US cities, *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 9(4), 345-350.
40. Cumulative Impacts Subcommittee, Environmental Justice Advisory Council to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Report (2009), Strategies For Addressing Cumulative Impacts In Environmental Justice Communities. <http://hdl.rutgers.edu/1782.1/rucore00000002074.Document.000055986>.
41. Alexeeff, GV, Faust, JB, August, LM, Milanes, C., Randles, K., Zeise, L., and Denton, J. (2012), A Screening Method for Assessing Cumulative Impacts, *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 9, 648-659; doi:[10.3390/ijerph9020648](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph9020648).

F. Special Requirements

It is EPA Policy to ensure that the results of EPA-funded extramural scientific research are accessible to the public to the greatest extent feasible consistent with applicable law; policies and Orders; the Agency's mission; resource constraints; and U.S. national, homeland and economic security. This entails maximizing, at no charge, access by the public to peer-reviewed, scientific research journal publications or associated author manuscripts, and their underlying digital research data, created in whole or in part with EPA funds, while protecting personal privacy; recognizing proprietary interests, confidential business information, and intellectual property rights; and avoiding significant negative impact on intellectual property rights, innovation, and U.S. competitiveness.

Applications submitted under this announcement shall include a Scientific Data Management Plan (SDMP) that addresses public access to EPA-funded scientific research data. See the SDMP clause in Section IV for details on the content of an SDMP. Applicants will also be asked to provide past performance information on whether journal publications or associated author manuscripts, and the associated underlying scientific research data and metadata, under prior assistance agreements were made publicly accessible. These items will be evaluated prior to award.

Reasonable, necessary and allocable costs for data management and public access may be included in extramural research applications and detailed in the budget justification described in Section IV.

Agency policy and ethical considerations prevent EPA technical staff and managers from providing applicants with information that may create an unfair competitive advantage. Consequently, EPA employees will not review, comment, advise, and/or provide technical assistance to applicants preparing applications in response to EPA RFAs. EPA employees cannot endorse any particular application.

Multiple Investigator applications may be submitted as: (1) a single Lead Principal Investigator (PI) application with Co-PI(s) or (2) a Multiple PI application (with a single Contact PI). If you choose to submit a Multiple PI application, you must follow the specific instructions provided in Sections IV and V of this RFA. For further information, please see the EPA Implementation Plan for Policy on Multiple Principal Investigators (<https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-grants-guidance-and-policies>).

This solicitation provides the opportunity for the submission of applications for projects that may involve human subjects research. All applications must include a Human Subjects Research Statement (HSRS; described in Section IV.C.5.iii.c of this solicitation). If the project involves human subjects research, it will be subject to an additional level of review prior to funding decisions being made as described in Sections V.D and V.F of this solicitation.

These awards may involve the collection of “Geospatial Information,” which includes information that identifies the geographic location and characteristics of natural or constructed features or boundaries on the Earth or applications, tools, and hardware associated with the generation, maintenance, or distribution of such information. This information may be derived from, among other things, a Geographic Positioning System (GPS), remote sensing, mapping, charting, and surveying technologies, or statistical data.

G. Additional Provisions for Applicants Incorporated into the Solicitation

Additional provisions that apply to sections III, IV, V, and VI of this solicitation and/or awards made under this solicitation, can be found at [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#). These provisions are important for applying to this solicitation and applicants must review them when preparing applications for this solicitation. If you are unable to access these provisions electronically at the website above, please contact the EPA point of contact listed in this solicitation (usually in Section VII) to obtain the provisions.

II. AWARD INFORMATION

It is anticipated that a total of approximately \$10 million will be awarded under this announcement, depending on the availability of funds, quality of applications received, and other applicable considerations. The EPA anticipates funding approximately five awards under this RFA. Requests for amounts in excess of a total of \$2,000,000 per award, including direct and indirect costs, will not be considered. The total project period requested in an application submitted for this RFA may not exceed 3 years.

To increase the number of grants awarded to institutions who have not traditionally received awards, EPA intends to make at least one award to a “new awardee” as defined in Section V.F. Funding Decisions. This is an estimate and is subject to change based on funding levels, the quality of applications received, and other applicable considerations. See Section V.F. Funding Decisions for additional information.

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

In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund applications by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund an application, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the application, or portion thereof, was evaluated and selected for award, and therefore maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process. Awards may be fully or incrementally funded, as appropriate, based on funding availability, satisfactory performance, and other applicable considerations.

EPA may award both grants and cooperative agreements under this announcement.

Under a *grant*, EPA scientists and engineers are not permitted to be substantially involved in the execution of the research. However, EPA encourages interaction between its own laboratory scientists and grant Principal Investigators after the award of an EPA grant for the sole purpose of exchanging information in research areas of common interest that may add value to their respective research activities. This interaction must be incidental rather than substantial to achieving the goals of the research under a grant. Interaction that is “incidental” does not involve resource commitments by EPA.

Where appropriate, based on consideration of the nature of the proposed project relative to the EPA’s intramural research program and available resources, the EPA may award *cooperative agreements* under this announcement. A cooperative agreement is an assistance agreement that is used when there is substantial federal involvement with the recipient during the performance of an activity or project. EPA awards cooperative agreements for those projects in which it expects to have substantial interaction with the recipient throughout the recipient’s performance of the project. When addressing a research question/problem of common interest, collaborations between EPA scientists and the institution’s principal investigators are permitted under a cooperative agreement. These collaborations may include data and information exchange; providing technical input to experimental design and theoretical development; coordinating extramural research with in-house activities; the refinement of valuation endpoints; in accordance with 2 CFR 200.317 and 2 CFR 200.318, as appropriate, review of proposed procurements, reviewing qualifications of key personnel, and/or review and comment on the content of printed or electronic publications prepared; and joint authorship of journal articles on these activities. Note EPA does not have the authority to select employees or contractors employed by the recipient and the final decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient. EPA will negotiate the precise terms and conditions of “substantial involvement” as part of the award process. **Applications may not identify EPA cooperators, specific interactions between EPA’s investigators and those of the prospective recipient for cooperative agreements will be negotiated at the time of award.**

Potential applicants should contact Flora Barrow; phone: 202-564-0478; email: barrow.flora@epa.gov regarding questions pertaining to EPA’s substantial involvement.

III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#).

A. Eligible Applicants

Public and private nonprofit institutions/organizations, public and private institutions of higher education (IHEs), and hospitals located in the U.S. and its territories or possessions; state and local governments; Federally Recognized Indian Tribal Governments; and U.S. territories or possessions are eligible to apply. Profit-making firms and individuals are not eligible to apply.

Consistent with the definition of Nonprofit organization at 2 CFR § 200.1, 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 and is not organized primarily for profit; and uses net proceeds to maintain, improve, or expand the operation of the organization. The term includes tax-exempt nonprofit neighborhood and labor organizations. Note that 2 CFR § 200.1 specifically excludes Institutions of Higher Education from the definition of non-profit organization because they are separately defined in the regulation. While not considered to be a nonprofit organization(s) as defined by 2 CFR § 200.1, public or nonprofit Institutions of Higher Education are, nevertheless, eligible to submit applications under this RFA. Hospitals operated by state, tribal, or local governments or that meet the definition of nonprofit at 2 CFR § 200.1 are also eligible to apply as nonprofits or as instrumentalities of the unit of government depending on the applicable law. For-profit colleges, universities, trade schools, and hospitals are ineligible.

Nonprofit organizations that are not exempt from taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code must submit other forms of documentation of nonprofit status; such as certificates of incorporation as nonprofit under state or tribal law. Nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that lobby are not eligible for EPA funding as provided in the Lobbying Disclosure Act, 2 U.S.C. 1611.

Foreign governments, international organizations, and non-governmental international organizations/institutions are not eligible to apply.

National laboratories funded by Federal Agencies (Federally-Funded Research and Development Centers, “FFRDCs”) may not apply. FFRDC employees may cooperate or collaborate with eligible applicants within the limits imposed by applicable legislation and regulations. They may participate in planning, conducting, and analyzing the research directed by the applicant, but may not direct projects on behalf of the applicant organization. An award recipient may provide funds through its assistance agreement from the EPA to an FFRDC for research personnel, supplies, equipment, and other expenses directly related to the research.

Federal Agencies may not apply. Federal employees are not eligible to serve in a principal leadership role on an assistance agreement. Federal employees may not receive salaries or augment their Agency’s appropriations through awards made under this program unless authorized by law to receive such funding.

The applicant institution may enter into an agreement with a Federal Agency to purchase or utilize unique supplies or services unavailable in the private sector to the extent authorized by law. Examples are purchase of satellite data, chemical reference standards, analyses, or use of instrumentation or other facilities not available elsewhere. A written justification for federal involvement must be included in the application. In addition, an appropriate form of assurance that documents the commitment, such as a letter of intent from the Federal Agency involved, should be included.

Potential applicants who are uncertain of their eligibility should contact Ron Josephson in ORD, phone: 202-564-7823, email: josephson.ron@epa.gov.

B. Cost sharing

Cost sharing is not required.

C. Other

All applications will be reviewed for eligibility and must meet the eligibility requirements described in Sections III.A., B., and C. to be considered eligible. Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration as a result of the threshold eligibility review will be notified within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

a. Applications must substantially comply with the application submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this solicitation or else they will be rejected. However, where a page limit is expressed in Section IV with respect to the application, or parts thereof, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed. Applicants are advised that readability is of paramount importance and should take precedence in application format, including selecting a legible font type and size for use in the application.

b. In addition, initial applications must be submitted through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) as stated in Section IV of this solicitation (except in the limited circumstances where another mode of submission is specifically allowed for as explained in Section IV) on or before the application submission deadline published in Section IV of this solicitation. Applicants are responsible for following the submission instructions in Section IV of this solicitation to ensure that their application is timely submitted. Please note that applicants experiencing technical issues with submitting through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) should follow the instructions provided in Section IV, which include both the requirement to contact [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) and email a full application to EPA prior to the deadline.

c. Applications submitted outside of [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) will be deemed ineligible without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was due to EPA mishandling or technical problems associated with [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) or [SAM.gov](https://www.sam.gov). An applicant's failure to timely submit their application through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) because they did not timely or properly register in [SAM.gov](https://www.sam.gov) or [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) will not be considered an acceptable reason to consider a submission outside of [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov).

If an applicant submits more than one application under this announcement, each application must be submitted separately, and the scope of work proposed in each application must be significantly different from the other application(s) in order for them to all be deemed eligible. If applications are submitted with scopes of work that do not significantly differ, then EPA will only accept the most recently submitted application and all other applications will be deemed ineligible.

In order to be deemed eligible, the application must include a Community Engagement Plan (see

Section IV.C.5.iii.e) that demonstrates collaboration/engagement with partner(s)/community(ies) in the design and execution of the proposed research or how the applicant will be able to effectively perform and complete the project without such collaboration/engagement.

Also, applications exceeding the funding limits or project period described herein will be rejected without review. See Section II. Further, applications that fail to demonstrate a public purpose of support or stimulation (e.g., by proposing research which primarily benefits a Federal program or provides a service for a Federal agency) will not be funded.

IV. APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#).

Formal instructions for submission through Grants.gov are in Section F.

A. Grants.gov Submittal Requirements and Limited Exception Procedures

Applicants must apply electronically through [Grants.gov](#) under this funding opportunity based on the grants.gov instructions in this announcement. If your organization has no access to the internet or access is very limited, you may request an exception for the remainder of this calendar year by following the procedures outlined [here](#). Please note that your request must be received at least 15 calendar days before the application due date to allow enough time to negotiate alternative submission methods. Issues with submissions with respect to this opportunity only are addressed in section *F. Submission Instructions and Other Submission Requirements* below.

B. Application Package Information

Use the application package available at [Grants.gov](#) (see Section IV.F. “Submission Instructions and Other Submission Requirements”). Note: With the exception of the current and pending support form (available at <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-funding-opportunities-how-apply-and-required-forms>), all necessary forms are included in the electronic application package. Make sure to include the current and pending support form in your Grants.gov submission.

C. Content and Form of Application Submission

The application is made by submitting the materials described below. **Applications must contain all information requested.**

1. Standard Form 424

The applicant must complete Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance. Instructions for completion of the SF-424 are included with the form. However, note that EPA requires that the entire requested dollar amount appear on the SF-424, not simply the proposed

first year expenses. The form must contain the signature of an authorized representative of the applying organization.

2. Key Contacts, EPA Form 5700-54

The applicant must complete the “Key Contacts” form found in the [Grants.gov](https://www.epa.gov/grants) application package. An “Additional Key Contacts” form is also available at <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-funding-opportunities-how-apply-and-required-forms>. The Key Contacts form should also be completed for major subawards (i.e., principal investigators). Do not include information for consultants or other contractors. Please make certain that all contact information is accurate.

For Multiple PI applications: The Additional Key Contacts form *must* be completed (see Section I.F. for further information). *Note: The Contact PI must be affiliated with the institution submitting the application. EPA will direct all communications related to scientific, technical, and budgetary aspects of the project to the Contact PI; however, any information regarding an application will be shared with any PI upon request.* The Contact PI is to be listed on the Key Contact Form as the Project Manager/Principal Investigator (the term Project Manager is used on the Grants.gov form, the term Principal Investigator is used on the form located at <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-funding-opportunities-how-apply-and-required-forms>). For additional PIs, complete the Major Co-Investigator fields and identify PI status next to the name (e.g., “Name: John Smith, Principal Investigator”).

3. EPA Form 4700-4, Preaward Compliance Review Report for All Applicants and Recipients Requesting EPA Financial Assistance (For tips on completing the form see: <https://www.epa.gov/grants/tips-completing-epa-form-4700-4>.)

4. SF-424A Budget Information - Non-Construction Programs

Prepare a master budget table using Standard Form 424A, Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs, available in the [Grants.gov](https://www.epa.gov/grants) electronic application package. Only complete “Section B-Budget Categories”. Provide the object class budget category (a. - k.) amounts for each budget year under the “Grant Program, Function or Activity” heading. Each column reflects a separate budget year. For example, Column (1) reflects budget year 1. The total budget will be automatically tabulated in column (5).

Applicants may not use subawards to transfer or delegate their responsibility for successful completion of their EPA assistance agreement. Note: Prior to naming a contractor (including consultants) or subrecipient in your application as a “partner”, please carefully review Section IV.d, “Contracts and Subawards”, of EPA’s Announcement Clauses that are incorporated by reference in this announcement (See Section I.G). EPA expects recipients of funding to comply with competitive procurement contracting requirements as well as EPA’s rule on Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in EPA Programs in 40 CFR Part 33. The Agency does not accept justifications for sole source contracts for services or products available in the commercial marketplace based on a contractor’s role in preparing an application.

Please note that cost sharing is not required.

5. Project Narrative, submitted using Project Narrative Attachment Form and prepared as described below:

i) Table of Contents

Provide a list of the major subdivisions of the application indicating the page number on which each section begins.

ii) Abstract (1 page)

The abstract is a very important document in the review process. Therefore, it is critical that the abstract accurately describes the research being proposed and conveys all the essential elements of the research. Also, the abstracts of applications that receive funding will be posted on EPA's Research Grants website.

The abstract must include the information described below (a-h). Examples of abstracts for current grants may be found on [EPA's Research Grants website](#).

- a. Funding Opportunity Title and Number for this application.
- b. Project Title: Use the exact title of your project as it appears in the application. The title must be brief yet represent the major thrust of the project. Because the title will be used by those not familiar with the project, use more commonly understood terminology. Do not use general phrases such as "research on."
- c. Investigators: For applications with multiple investigators, state whether this is a single Lead PI (with co-PIs) or Multiple PI application (see Section I.F.). For Lead PI applications, list the Lead PI, then the name(s) of each co-PI who will significantly contribute to the project. For Multiple PI applications, list the Contact PI, then the name(s) of each additional PI. Provide a website URL or an email contact address for additional information.
- d. Institution(s): In the same order as the list of investigators, list the name, city and state of each participating university or other applicant institution. The institution applying for assistance must be clearly identified.
- e. Project Period and Location: Show the proposed project beginning and ending dates and the performance site(s)/geographical location(s) where the work will be conducted.
- f. Project Cost: Show the total funding requested from the EPA (include direct and indirect costs for all years).

- g. Project Summary: Provide three subsections addressing: (1) the objectives of the study (including any hypotheses that will be tested), (2) the experimental approach to be used (a description of the proposed project) and (3) the expected results (outputs/outcomes) of the project and how it addresses the research needs identified in the solicitation, including the estimated improvement in risk assessment or risk management that will result from successful completion of the proposed work.
- h. Supplemental Keywords: Without duplicating terms already used in the text of the abstract, list keywords to assist database searchers in finding your research. A list of suggested keywords may be found at: <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-funding-opportunities-how-apply-and-required-forms>.

iii) Research Plan, Quality Assurance Statement, Human Subjects Research Statement, Scientific Data Management Plan, Community Engagement Plan, and References

a. Research Plan (20 pages)

Applications should focus on a limited number of research objectives that adequately and clearly demonstrate that they meet the RFA requirements. Explicitly state the main hypotheses that you will investigate, the data you will create or use, the analytical tools you will use to investigate these hypotheses or analyze these data and the results you expect to achieve. Research methods must be clearly stated so that reviewers can evaluate the appropriateness of your approach and the tools you intend to use. A statement such as: “we will evaluate the data using the usual statistical methods” is not specific enough for peer reviewers.

This description must not exceed twenty (20) consecutively numbered (bottom center), 8.5x11 inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins. While these guidelines on page size, point type and margins establish the minimum type size requirements, applicants are advised that readability is of paramount importance and should take precedence in selection of an appropriate font for use in the application.

The description must provide the following information:

- (1) Objectives: List the objectives of the proposed research and the hypotheses being tested during the project, and briefly state why the intended research is important, how it supports the Agency’s research priorities and how it fulfills the requirements of the solicitation. This section should also include any background or introductory information that would help explain the objectives of the study. If this application is to expand upon research supported by an existing or former assistance agreement awarded under the STAR program, indicate the number of the agreement and provide a brief report of progress and results achieved under it.
- (2) Approach/Activities: Outline the research design, methods, and techniques that you intend to use in meeting the objectives stated above.

- (3) Innovation: Describe how your project shifts current research or engineering paradigms by using innovative theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions applicable to one or more fields of research.
- (4) Sustainability: Describe how your project embodies the principles of sustainability and seeks sustainable solutions that protect the environment and strengthen our communities. The sustainability primer (https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/sustainability_primer_v9.pdf) provides examples of research activities that promote and incorporate sustainability principles.
- (5) Environmental Justice: Demonstrate how the project will address the disproportionate and adverse human health, environmental, climate-related and other cumulative impacts described in Section I of this solicitation, as well as the accompanying economic challenges of such impacts, resulting from industrial, governmental, commercial and/or other actions that have affected and/or currently affect the underserved communities defined in Section I of this solicitation. Applicants should also demonstrate how the project benefits the underserved communities, including those that have experienced a lack of resources or other impediments to addressing the impacts identified above that affect their community.
- (6) Expected Results, Benefits, Outputs and Outcomes: Describe the expected outputs and outcomes resulting from the project. This section should also discuss how the research results will lead to solutions to environmental problems and improve the public's ability to protect the environment and human health. A clear, concise description will help ORD and peer reviewers understand the merits of the research.
- (7) Project Management: Discuss other information relevant to the potential success of the project. This should include facilities, personnel expertise/experience, project schedules with associated milestones and target dates, proposed management, interactions with other institutions, etc. If applicable, provide resources available to specific investigator(s), such as additional research space or personnel and in-kind contributions that support the research activity for use on the project/proposal being proposed. Describe the approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner and detail how project objectives will be successfully achieved within the grant period. Describe how progress toward achieving the expected results (outputs and outcomes) of the research will be tracked and measured. Applications for multi-investigator projects must identify project management and the functions of each investigator in each team and describe plans to communicate and share data.
- (8) Appendices may be included but must remain within the 20-page limit.

b. Quality Assurance Statement (3 pages)

For projects involving environmental data collection or processing, conducting surveys, modeling, method development, or the development of environmental technology (whether hardware-based or via new techniques), provide a Quality Assurance Statement (QAS) regarding the plans for processes that will be used to ensure that the products of the research satisfy the intended project objectives. Follow the guidelines provided below to ensure that the QAS describes a system that complies with EPA Quality Standards found at: <https://www.epa.gov/quality/agency-wide-quality-program-documents>. Do not exceed three consecutively numbered, 8.5x11-inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins.

NOTE: If selected for award, applicants will be expected to provide additional quality assurance documentation.

Address each applicable section below by including the required information, referencing the specific location of the information in the Research Plan or explaining why the section does not apply to the proposed research. (Not all will apply)

(1) Identify the individual who will be responsible for the quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC) aspects of the research along with a brief description of this person's functions, experience and authority within the research organization. Describe the schedule and type of assessments to be conducted along with the corrective action process for each assessment proposed. Describe the organization's general approach for conducting quality research. (*QA is a system of management activities to ensure that a process or item is of the type and quality needed for the project. QC is a system of activities that measures the attributes and performance of a process or item against the standards defined in the project documentation to verify that they meet those stated requirements*).

(2) Discuss project objectives, including quality objectives, any hypotheses to be tested, and the quantitative and/or qualitative procedures that will be used to evaluate the success of the project. Include any plans for peer or other reviews of the study design or analytical methods.

(3) Address each of the following project elements as applicable:

(a) Collection of new/primary data:

(Note: In this case the word "sample" is intended to mean any finite part of a statistical population whose properties are studied to gain information about the whole. If certain attributes listed below do not apply to the type of samples to be used in your research, simply explain why those attributes are not applicable).

(i) Discuss the plan for sample collection and analysis. As applicable, include sample type(s), frequency, locations, sample sizes, sampling procedures, and the criteria for determining acceptable data quality (e.g., precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, comparability, or data quality objectives).

- (ii) Describe the procedures for the handling and custody of samples including sample collection, identification, preservation, transportation, and storage, and how the accuracy of test measurements will be verified.
 - (iii) Describe or reference each analytical method to be used, any QA or QC checks or procedures with the associated acceptance criteria and any procedures that will be used in the calibration and performance evaluation of the analytical instrumentation.
 - (iv) Discuss the procedures for overall data reduction, analysis, and reporting. Include a description of all statistical methods to make inferences and conclusions, acceptable error rates and/or power, and any statistical software to be used.
- (b) Use of existing/secondary data (i.e., data previously collected for other purposes or from other sources):
- (i) Identify the types of secondary data needed to satisfy the project objectives. Specify requirements relating to the type of data, the age of data, geographical representation, temporal representation, and technological representation, as applicable.
 - (ii) Specify the source(s) of the secondary data and discuss the rationale for selection.
 - (iii) Establish a plan to identify the sources of the secondary data in all deliverables/products.
 - (iv) Specify quality requirements and discuss the appropriateness for their intended use. Accuracy, precision, representativeness, completeness, and comparability need to be addressed, if applicable.
 - (v) Describe the procedures for determining the quality of the secondary data.
 - (vi) Describe the plan for data management/integrity.
- (c) Method development:
- (Note: The data collected for use in method development or evaluation should be described in the QAS as per the guidance in section 3A and/or 3B above).*
- Describe the scope and application of the method, any tests (and measurements) to be conducted to support the method development, the type of instrumentation that will be used, and any required instrument conditions (e.g., calibration frequency), planned QC checks and associated criteria (e.g., spikes, replicates, blanks) and tests to verify the method's performance.
- (d) Development or refinement of models:

- (Note: The data collected for use in the development or refinement of models should be described in the QAS as per the guidance in section 3A and/or 3B above).*
- (i) Discuss the scope and purpose of the model, key assumptions to be made during development/refinement, requirements for code development, and how the model will be documented.
 - (ii) Discuss verification techniques to ensure the source code implements the model correctly.
 - (iii) Discuss validation techniques to determine that the model (assumptions and algorithms) captures the essential phenomena with adequate fidelity.
 - (iv) Discuss plans for long-term maintenance of the model and associated data.
- (e) Development or operation of environmental technology:
(Note: The data collected for use in the development or evaluation of the technology should be described in the QAS as per the guidance in section 3A and/or 3B above).
- (i) Describe the overall purpose and anticipated impact of the technology.
 - (ii) Describe the technical and quality specifications of each technology component or process that is to be designed, fabricated, constructed, and/or operated.
 - (iii) Discuss the procedure to be used for documenting and controlling design changes.
 - (iv) Discuss the procedure to be used for documenting the acceptability of processes and components and discuss how the technology will be benchmarked and its effectiveness determined.
 - (v) Discuss the documentation requirements for operating instructions/guides for maintenance and use of the system(s) and/or process(s).
- (f) Conducting surveys:
(Note: The data to be collected in the survey and any supporting data should be described in the QAS as per the guidance in section 3A and/or 3B above).
- (i) Discuss the justification for the size of the proposed sample for both the overall project and all subsamples for specific treatments or tests. Identify and explain the rationale for the proposed statistical techniques (e.g., evaluation of statistical power).
- (4) Discuss data management activities (e.g., record-keeping procedures, data-handling procedures, and the approach used for data storage and retrieval on electronic media). Include any required computer hardware and software and address any specific performance requirements for the hardware/software configuration used.

c. EPA Human Subjects Research Statement (HSRS) (4 pages)

Human subjects research supported by the EPA is governed by EPA Regulation 40 CFR Part 26 ([Protection of Human Subjects](https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0)). This includes the Common Rule at subpart A and prohibitions and additional protections for pregnant women and fetuses, nursing women and children at subparts B, C and D. While retaining the same notation, subparts B, C and D are substantively different in 40 CFR Part 26 than in the more commonly cited 45 CFR 46. Particularly noteworthy is that research meeting the regulatory definition of intentional exposure research found in subpart B is prohibited by that subpart in pregnant women, nursing women and children. Research meeting the regulatory definition of observational research (any research that is not intentional exposure research) found in subparts C and D is subject to the additional protections found in those subparts for pregnant women and fetuses (subpart C) and children (subpart D). These subparts also differ markedly from the language in 45 CFR 46. For more information, please see: <https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0>.

Procedures for the review and oversight of human research subject to 40 CFR Part 26 are also provided in EPA Order 1000.17A (<https://www.epa.gov/osa/epa-order-100017-policy-and-procedures-protection-human-research-subjects-epa-conducted-or>). These include review of projects for EPA-supported human research by the EPA Human Subjects Research Review Official (HSRRO). Additional requirements must be met and final approval must be received from the HSRRO before the human subjects' portion of the research can begin. When reviewing human observational exposure studies, EPA Order 1000.17A requires the HSRRO to apply the principles described in the SEAOKS document (<https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P10012LY.PDF?Dockkey=P10012LY.PDF>) and grant approval only to studies that adhere to those principles.

All applications submitted under this solicitation must include a HSRS as described below. For more information about what constitutes human subjects research, please see: <https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0>. For information on the prohibition on the inclusion of vulnerable subjects in intentional exposure research, please see: <https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0>.

Human Subjects Research Statement (HSRS) Requirements

If the proposed research **does not** involve human subjects as defined above, provide the following statement in your application package as your HSRS: “The proposed research does not involve human subjects.” Applicants should provide a clear justification about how the proposed research does not meet the definition (for example, all samples come from deceased individuals OR samples are purchased from a commercial source and provided without identifiers, etc.).

If the proposed research **does** involve human subjects, then include in your application package a HSRS that addresses each applicable section listed below, referencing the specific location of the information in the Research Plan, providing the information in the HSRS or explaining why the section does not apply to the proposed research. (Not all will apply). Please note that even

research that has been determined to be exempt from the human subjects regulations by an IRB must be reviewed by the EPA HSRRO. Therefore, consider exempt research to include human subjects work for this EPA solicitation. Do not exceed **four** consecutively numbered, 8.5x11-inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins. The factors below are not intended to be exhaustive of all those needed for the HSRRO to provide the final approval necessary for research to be conducted but provide a basis upon which the human subjects oversight review may begin.

NOTE: Researchers must provide evidence of an assurance on file with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) or other Federal Agency that it will comply with regulatory provisions in the Common Rule. In special circumstances where there is no such assurance, EPA will work with investigators to obtain an assurance from HHS or another source.

Complete all items below for studies involving human subjects.

Protection of Human Subjects (Adapted from National Institutes of Health Supplemental Instructions for PHS 398 and SF424 (R&R) II-10)

1. Risks to Human Subjects

a. Human Subjects Involvement, Characteristics and Design

- Describe and justify the proposed involvement of human subjects in the work outlined in the Research Strategy section.
- Describe the characteristics of the subject population, including their anticipated number, age range, and health status, if relevant.
- Describe and justify the sampling plan, including retention strategies and the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of any subpopulation.
- Explain the rationale for the involvement of special vulnerable populations, such as pregnant women, children, or others who may be considered vulnerable populations.
- If relevant to the proposed research, describe procedures for assignment to a study group. As related to human subject's protection, describe and justify the selection of an intervention's dose, frequency, and administration.
- List any collaborating sites where human subjects research will be performed and describe the role of those sites and collaborating investigators in performing the proposed research. Explain how data from the site(s) will be obtained, managed, and protected.

b. Sources of Materials

- Describe the research material obtained from living individuals in the form of specimens, records, or data.
- Describe any data that will be collected from human subjects for the project(s) described in the application.
- Indicate who will have access to individually identifiable private information about human subjects.
- Provide information about how the specimens, records, and/or data are collected, managed and protected as well as whether material or data that include individually identifiable private information will be collected specifically for the proposed research project.

c. Potential Risks

- Describe all the potential risks to subjects posed by participation in the research (physical, psychological, financial, legal, or other), and assess their likelihood and seriousness to the human subjects.
- Where appropriate, describe alternative treatments and procedures, including the risks and potential benefits of the alternative treatments and procedures, to participants in the proposed research.

2. Adequacy of Protection Against Risks

a. Recruitment and Informed Consent

- Describe plans for the recruitment of subjects (where appropriate) and the process for obtaining informed consent. If the proposed studies will include children, describe the process for meeting requirements for parental permission and child assent.
- Include a description of the circumstances under which consent will be sought and obtained, who will seek it, the nature of the information to be provided to prospective subjects and the method of documenting consent. If a waiver of some or all of the elements of informed consent will be sought, provide justification for the waiver.

b. Protections Against Risk

- Describe planned procedures for protecting against or minimizing potential risks, including risks to privacy of individuals or confidentiality of data and assess their likely effectiveness.
- Research involving vulnerable populations, as described in the EPA regulations, Subparts B-D, must include additional protections. Refer to EPA guidance:

Prohibition of Research Conducted or Supported by EPA Involving Intentional Exposure of Human Subjects who are Children or Pregnant or Nursing Women
<https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0>

Additional Protections for Pregnant Women and Fetuses Involved as Subjects in Observational Research Conducted or Supported by EPA
<https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0>

Additional Protections for Children Involved as Subjects in Observational Research Conducted or Supported by EPA
<https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0>

- Where appropriate, discuss plans for ensuring necessary medical or professional intervention in the event of adverse effects to the subjects. Studies that involve clinical trials must include a general description of the plan for data and safety monitoring of the clinical trials and adverse event reporting to the IRB, the Data and Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) (if one has been established for the trial), the EPA and others, as appropriate, to ensure the safety of subjects.

3. Potential Benefits of the Proposed Research to Human Subjects and Others

- Discuss the potential benefits of the research to research participants and others.

- Discuss why the risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits to research participants and others.
- Please note that financial compensation of subjects is not considered to be a benefit of participation in research.

4. Importance of the Knowledge to be Gained

- Discuss the importance of the knowledge to be gained as a result of the proposed research.
- Discuss why the risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the importance of the knowledge that reasonably may be expected to result.

Note that an Interventional Study (or Clinical Trial) is a clinical study in which participants are assigned to receive one or more interventions (or no intervention) so that researchers can evaluate the effects of the interventions on biomedical or health-related outcomes; the assignments are determined by the study protocol.

d. Scientific Data Management Plan (2 pages)

Applications submitted in response to this solicitation must include a Scientific Data Management Plan (SDMP) that addresses public access to EPA-funded scientific research data by including the information below:

(1) If the proposed research described in the application is expected to result in the generation of scientific research data, the application must include a Scientific Data Management Plan (SDMP) of up to two single-spaced pages (this is in addition to any application page limits described in Section IV of this solicitation that apply to other parts of the application package) describing plans for providing long-term preservation of, and public access to, the scientific research data and accompanying metadata created and/or collected under the award (including data generated under subawards and contracts) funded in whole or in part by EPA. The SDMP should indicate that recipients will make accessible, at a minimum, scientific research data and associated metadata underlying their scientific research journal publications funded in whole or in part by EPA. SDMPs should reflect relevant standards and community best practices for data and metadata and make use of community-accepted repositories whenever practicable. The contents of the SDMP (or absence thereof) will be considered as part of the application review process for selected applicants as described in Section V and must be deemed acceptable for the applicant to receive an award. The SDMP should include the following elements (Note: If any of the items listed below do not apply, please explain why):

- i. Types of scientific research data and metadata expected to be generated and/or collected under the award.
- ii. The location where the data will be publicly accessible.
- iii. The standards to be used for data/metadata format and content.
- iv. Policies for accessing and sharing data including provisions for appropriate protection of privacy, security, intellectual property, and other rights or requirements consistent with applicable laws, regulations, rules, and policies.

- v. Plans for digital data storage, archiving, and long-term preservation that address the relative value of long-term preservation and access along with the associated costs and administrative burden.
- vi. Description of how data accessibility and preservation will enable validation of published results or how such results could be validated if data are not shared or preserved.
- vii. Roles and responsibilities for ensuring SDMP implementation and management (including contingency plans in case key personnel leave the project).
- viii. Resources and capabilities (equipment, connections, systems, software, expertise, etc.) requested in the research application that are needed to meet the stated goals for accessibility and preservation (reference can be made to the relevant section of the research application's budget justification).
- ix. If appropriate, an explanation as to why data accessibility and/or preservation are not possible.

(2) If the proposed research is not expected to result in the generation of scientific research data, provide the following statement (not subject to any application page limits described in Section IV of this solicitation) in your application as the SDMP: "The proposed research is not expected to result in the generation of scientific research data." If scientific research data are generated after award, the recipient agrees to update the statement by providing EPA with a revised SDMP (see content of SDMP described above) describing how scientific research data and accompanying metadata created and/or collected under the award (including data generated under subawards and contracts) will be preserved and, as appropriate, made publicly accessible.

e. Community Engagement Plan (5 pages)

Provide a plan to detail strategies for promoting and/or obtaining collaboration/engagement and support from appropriate partners such as MSIs, states, tribes, academia, industry groups, non-profit organizations, associations, and underserved communities/community-based organizations. Researchers are strongly encouraged to partner with underserved community(ies) as defined in Section I. Applicants should document the following:

- Describe the type of collaboration/engagement proposed and what role it will play in the overall project including the degree of partner/community input or engagement in the conceptualization, hypothesis/question development, design, methods, analyses and implementation of the research. This includes describing how the project addresses engagement with underserved communities, especially local residents in these communities who will be affected by the project, to ensure their meaningful participation with respect to the design, project planning, and performance of the project.
- Describe how the collaboration/engagement will enhance the overall impact of the project such that the project results are applicable and useable by impacted communities and address the needs and concerns of underserved communities. This includes the capacity of the project to more effectively communicate risk and translate scientific results into easily understandable outreach and education materials.

- Describe how activities of the project will be coordinated with related or complementary projects and studies.
- Describe how the collaboration/engagement will materialize during project performance. Describe the partner(s)' intent to participate in the proposed research including evidence of community support of an active partnership with a community engagement research committee, a community-based organization or advisory group members (e.g., letter(s) of intent or support from community leaders, MSIs, state or local government agencies, non-government organizations, public health professionals, community emergency planners or responders, social workers, child serving organizations, assisted living and nursing homes, utility managers, site managers or operators, decision makers or policy planners). Any letters demonstrating evidence of collaboration and support should be included as part of section IV.C.5.viii.a. Letters of Intent/Letters of Support.
- Applicants that do not plan on collaborating/engaging with other groups in project performance should describe how they will be able to effectively perform and complete the project without such collaboration/engagement.
- Allocate appropriate resources as needed to the research partners to ensure success of the collaboration, e.g., delineating funds under the project's budget for community participation. Examples include:
 - i. travel/stipends for partners and community members to participate in advisory group meetings, workshops, and focus groups,
 - ii. subawards to eligible organizations for their involvement in the proposed research.

EPA requires that estimated amounts for subawards and individual participant support costs be classified as "Other" for the purposes of the budget table (aka SF-424A). Please see ([EPA Solicitation Clauses](#)) for EPA guidance on competition for contractors (including consulting contracts) and acceptable noncompetitive subawards. Applicants may provide subawards to partners to enhance project effectiveness and/or efficiency. Note that applicants, not EPA, will select their subawardees and the applicants must demonstrate in their application that the organization(s) or other groups are willing to accept the subaward and have the capacity to effectively administer and perform the agreement. The selected applicant who proposes to make subawards, including those to partners must follow proper procedures in making subawards and will be expected to make the subawards consistent with their application.

Applicants may utilize a Community Engagement Research (CEnR) framework, defined as a collaborative process of research involving researchers and community representatives, to meet this requirement. The CEnR process of scientific inquiry requires that community members or other key community stakeholders be included in the identification of research problems and objectives, and in the formulation of community-driven solutions. Although a range of levels of community involvement can be considered CEnR, CEnR is characterized by substantial community input and involvement in the project. The applicant will need to justify the level of community involvement that is proposed in the application. While not required, each applicant is

encouraged to form a CEnR framework to meet the requirement for community involvement in the project that may include relevant community leaders and a committee or an advisory group.

In the plan, the applicant should also identify the methods of community engagement and communication. There are many possible methods that could be employed, including, but not limited to, the following illustrative examples:

- Including substantial contributions from, or leadership by, community groups in application development and project execution.
- Budgeting for subawards to eligible organizations for their involvement in the proposed research.
- Assessing community needs and interest through workshops.
- Forming an advisory board to gain diverse perspectives on various aspects of the project's communications.
- Analyzing, sharing and communicating data in ways that maximize meaning and usefulness for communities and that lead to accurate lessons for communities and individuals.
- Sharing data through a website or through other means.
- Holding events to share research plans or research results.

f. References: References cited are in addition to other page limits (e.g., research plan, quality assurance statement).

iv) Budget Justification [*3 pages in addition to the Section IV.C.5.iii page limitations*]

Identify the amount requested for each budget category and describe the basis for calculating the personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual support, and other costs identified in the SF-424A. The budget justification should not exceed three consecutively numbered (bottom center), 8.5x11-inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins. EPA provides detailed guidance on preparing budgets and budget justifications in the Agency's [Interim General Budget Development Guidance for Applicants and Recipients of EPA Financial Assistance](#).

Budget information must be supported at the level of detail described below:

- a. Personnel: List all staff positions by title. Give annual salary, percentage of time assigned to the project, total cost for the budget period, project role, and specify any annual cost of living adjustments. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with payments for similar work within the applicant organization. Note that for salaries to be allowable as a direct charge to the award, a justification of how that person will be directly involved in the project must be provided. General administrative duties such as answering telephones, filing, typing, or accounting duties are not considered acceptable.

Below is a sample computation for Personnel:

Position/Title	Annual Salary	% of Time Assigned to Project	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Total
Project Manager	\$70,000	50%	\$35,000	\$36,050	\$37,132	\$108,182
Env. Specialist	\$60,000	100%	\$60,000	\$61,800	\$63,654	\$185,454
Env. Health Tech	\$45,000	100%	\$45,000	\$46,350	\$47,741	\$139,091
Total Personnel			\$140,000	\$144,200	\$148,527	\$432,727

*There is a 3% increase after Year 1 for all personnel for cost of living adjustments.

Note this budget category is limited to persons employed by the applicant organization ONLY. Those employed elsewhere are classified as subawardees, program participants, contractors, or consultants. Contractors and consultants should be listed under the “Contractual” budget heading. Subawards made to eligible subrecipients are listed under the “Other” budget heading. Participant support costs such as stipends or travel assistance for trainees (e.g., interns or fellows) are listed under the “Other” budget heading.

- b. Fringe Benefits: Identify the percentage used and the basis for its computation. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (a) above and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project. Fringe benefits include but are not limited to the cost of leave, employee insurance, pensions and unemployment benefit plans. The applicant should not combine the fringe benefit costs with direct salaries and wages in the personnel category.

Below is a sample computation for Fringe Benefits:

Position/Title	Base Fringe % Rate	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Total
Project Manager	47.22%	\$16,527	\$17,022	\$17,533	\$51,082
Env. Specialist	50.83%	\$30,498	\$31,413	\$32,355	\$94,266
Total Fringe Benefits		\$47,025	\$48,435	\$49,888	\$145,348

*An annual inflation rate of 3% has been factored into years 2 and 3 of the fringe benefits.

- c. Travel: In a table format, specify the estimated number of trips, purpose of each trip, number of travelers per trip, destinations, and other costs for each type of travel for applicant employees. Travel costs for program participants should be specified in the “Other” budget category. Explain the need for any travel, paying particular attention to travel outside the United States. Foreign travel includes trips to Mexico and Canada but does not include trips to Puerto Rico, the U.S. territories or possessions. **If EPA funds will not be used for foreign travel, the budget justification must expressly state that the applicant will not use EPA funds for foreign travel without approval by EPA.** Include travel funds for annual STAR program progress reviews (estimate for two days in Washington, D.C.) and a final workshop to report on results.

Below is a sample computation for Travel:

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
EPA STAR Progress Review	Washington DC	Lodging	4 people x \$100 per night x 2 nights	\$800
		Airfare	4 people x \$500 round trip	\$2,000
		Per Diem	4 people x 50 per day x 2 days	\$400
Total Travel				\$3,200

- d. Equipment: Identify all tangible, non-expendable personal property to be purchased that has an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit and a useful life of more than one year. Equipment also includes accessories and services included with the purchase price necessary for the equipment to be operational. It does not include: (1) equipment planned to be leased/rented; or (2) separate equipment service or maintenance contracts. Details such as the type of equipment, cost, and a brief narrative on the intended use of the equipment for project objectives are required. Each item of equipment must be identified with the corresponding cost. Particular brands of equipment should not be identified. General-purpose equipment (office equipment, etc.) must be justified as to how it will be used on the project. (Property items with a unit cost of less than \$5,000 are considered supplies).
- e. Supplies: “Supplies” are tangible property other than “equipment” with a per item acquisition cost of less than \$5,000. Include a brief description of the supplies required to perform the work. Costs should be categorized by major supply categories (e.g., office supplies, computing devices, monitoring equipment) and include the estimated costs by category.
- f. Contractual: List the proposed contractual activities along with a brief description of the scope of work or services to be provided, the proposed duration of the contract/procurement, the estimated cost, and the proposed procurement method (competitive or non-competitive). **Any procurement of services from individual consultants or commercial firms (including space for workshops) must comply with the competitive procurement requirements of 2 CFR Part 200.317-200.327. Please see [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#) for more details.** EPA provides detailed guidance on procurement requirements in the Agency’s [Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements](#).

Examples of Contractual costs include:

- i. Consultants – Consultants are individuals with specialized skills who are paid at a daily or hourly rate. EPA’s participation in the salary rate (excluding overhead) paid to individual consultants retained by recipients or by a recipient's

contractors or subcontractors is limited to the maximum daily rate for a Level IV of the Executive Schedule (formerly GS-18), to be adjusted annually.

ii. Speaker/Trainer Fees – Information on speakers should include the fee and a description of the services they are providing.

- g. Other: List each item in sufficient detail for the EPA to determine the reasonableness of its cost relative to the research to be undertaken. “Other” items may include equipment rental, telephone service and utilities and photocopying costs. Note that subawards, such as those with other universities or nonprofit research institutions for members of the research team, are included in this category. **Provide the total costs proposed for subawards as a separate line item in the budget justification and brief description of the activities to be supported for each subaward or types of subawards if the subrecipients have not been identified.** Subawards may not be used to acquire services from consultants or commercial firms. Please see [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#) for more details. The “Other” budget category also includes participant support costs such as stipends or travel assistance for trainees (e.g. interns or fellows). **Provide the total costs proposed for participant support costs as a separate line item in the budget justification and brief description of the costs. If EPA funds will not be used for foreign travel by program participants, the budget justification must expressly state that the applicant will not use EPA funds for foreign travel without approval by EPA.**
- h. Indirect Costs: For additional information pertaining to indirect costs, please see the IDC Competition Clause at [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#).

v) Resumes

Provide resumes for each investigator identified by the applicant who will contribute in a substantive, meaningful way to the scientific development or execution of the research and development project. Investigators typically do not include undergraduate and graduate students. The resume is not limited to traditional materials but should provide materials to clearly and appropriately demonstrate that the investigator has the knowledge needed to perform their component of the proposed research. The resume for each individual must not exceed two consecutively numbered (bottom center), 8.5x11-inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins.

In addition to professional preparation (e.g., educational degrees), the resume should also include organizational affiliations and academic, professional or institutional appointments, whether or not remuneration is received, and whether they are full-time, part-time, or voluntary.

Alternative to a standard resume, you may use a profile such as an NIH BioSketch that can be generated in SciENcv (see <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/biosketch.htm> for information on the BioSketch; also see https://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/techbull/so13/so13_sciencv.html for information on SciENcv). These materials should generally conform to the requirements for a resume (e.g., content and page number).

vi) Current and Pending Support

Current and pending support information is used to assess the capacity of the individual to carry out the research as proposed and helps assess any potential scientific and budgetary overlap/duplication, as well as overcommitment with the project being proposed. Complete a current and pending support form (provided at <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-funding-opportunities-how-apply-and-required-forms>) for each investigator identified by the applicant who will contribute in a substantive, meaningful way to the scientific development or execution of the research and development project. Investigators typically do not include undergraduate and graduate students. Include all current and pending support regardless of source. Investigators will certify that the information contained in their current and pending support form is current, accurate, and complete. For applications selected for funding, EPA will require investigators to update, as needed, their current and pending support disclosure prior to award and at any subsequent time the agency determines appropriate during the term of the award.

Current and pending research support means all resources made available, or expected to be made available, to an individual in support of the individual's research and development efforts, regardless of: (i) whether the source of the resource is foreign or domestic; (ii) whether the resource is made available through the entity applying for a research and development award or directly to the individual; or (iii) whether the resource has monetary value. Current and pending research support also includes in-kind contributions requiring a commitment of time and directly supporting the individual's research and development efforts, such as the provision of office or laboratory space, equipment, supplies, employees, or students.

Consistent with the [Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 \(NSPM-33\) on National Security Strategy for United States Government-Supported Research and Development](#), investigators are required to disclose contracts associated with participation in programs sponsored by foreign governments, instrumentalities, or entities, including foreign government-sponsored talent recruitment programs. Note that non-disclosure clauses associated with these contracts are not acceptable exemptions from this disclosure requirement.

Investigators should disclose current or pending participation in, or applications to, programs sponsored by foreign governments, instrumentalities, or entities, including foreign government-sponsored talent recruitment programs. This disclosure is limited to those that are associated directly or indirectly with a foreign government (i.e., foreign governments or foreign government instrumentalities or entities).

Investigators should also disclose paid consulting that falls outside of their appointment or separate from the institution's agreement; in-kind contributions not intended for use on the project/proposal being proposed; visiting scholars funded by an entity other than your own institution; students and postdoctoral researchers funded by an entity other than your own institution; and travel supported/paid by an entity other than your own institution to perform research activities with an associated time commitment.

In accordance with Section 223(a)(1) of the *William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021* (42 USC 6605(a)(1)), investigators are required to certify that the information provided in their current and pending support form is current, accurate, and complete. Each investigator who provides a pending and support form must also provide a certification attesting that the information contained in the form is current, accurate, and complete.

False representations may be subject to prosecution and liability pursuant to, but not limited to, 18 U.S.C. §§ 287, 1001, 1031 and 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733 and 3802.

Note to all prospective applicants requiring multiple Current and Pending Support Form pages: Due to a limitation in Adobe Acrobat's forms functionality, additional pages cannot be directly inserted into the original PDF form and preserve the form data on the subsequent pages. Multiple page form submissions can be created in Acrobat 8 and later using the "PDF Package" option in the "Create PDF from Multiple Files" function. If you have an earlier version of Adobe Standard or Professional, applicants will need to convert each PDF page of the form to an EPS (Encapsulated Post Script) file before creating the PDF for submission. The following steps will allow applicants with earlier versions of Adobe Standard or Professional to create a PDF package:

1. Populate the first page of the PDF and save it as an EPS (Encapsulated Post Script) file.
2. Reopen the form and populate it with the data for page 2. Save this page as a different EPS file. Repeat for as many pages as necessary.
3. Use Acrobat Distiller to convert the EPS files back to PDF.
4. Open Acrobat Professional and combine the individual pages into a combined PDF file.

vii) Applicant Current and Pending Support Certification

The applicant's Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) is required to provide a certification that each individual employed by the organization and identified on the proposal as an investigator has been made aware of the certification requirements identified in the *William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021*, Section 223(a)(1) (42 USC 6605(a)(1)).

False representations may be subject to prosecution and liability pursuant to, but not limited to, 18 U.S.C. §§ 287, 1001, 1031 and 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733 and 3802.

viii) Guidelines, Limitations, and Additional Requirements

a. Letters of Intent/Letters of Support

Letters of intent to provide resources for the proposed research or to document intended interactions are limited to one brief paragraph committing the availability of a resource (e.g., use of a person's time or equipment) or intended interaction (e.g., sharing of data, as-needed consultation) that is described in the Research Plan or the Community Engagement Plan. EPA employees are not permitted to provide letters of intent for any application.

Letters of support do not commit a resource vital to the success of the application. A letter of support is written by businesses, organizations, or community members stating their support of the applicant's proposed project. EPA employees are not permitted to provide letters of support for any application.

Note: Letters of intent or support must be part of the application; letters submitted separately will not be accepted. Any letter of intent or support that exceeds one brief paragraph (excluding letterhead and salutations), associated with the Research Plan is considered part of the Research Plan and is included in the 20-page Research Plan limit. Any letter of intent or support that exceeds one brief paragraph (excluding letterhead and salutations), associated with the Community Engagement Plan is considered part of the Community Engagement Plan and is included in the 5-page Community Engagement Plan limit. Any transactions between the successful applicant and parties providing letters of intent or support financed with EPA grant funds are subject to the contract and subaward requirements described here <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-solicitation-clauses>.

b. Funding Opportunity Number(s) (FON)

At various places in the application, applicants are asked to identify the FON.

The Funding Opportunity Number for this RFA is:

EPA-G2023-STAR-G1, Community-Based Research for Effective Programs, Policies, and Decisions to Mitigate Cumulative Health Impacts and Environmental Health Disparities in Underserved Communities

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

D. Submission Dates and Times

Applications **must be transferred to Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 pm Eastern Time** on the solicitation closing date. Applications transferred after the solicitation closing date and time will be deemed ineligible without further consideration. EPA will not accept any changes to applications after the solicitation closing date.

It should be noted that this schedule may be changed without prior notification because of factors not anticipated at the time of announcement. In the case of a change in the solicitation closing date, a new date will be posted on EPA's Research Grants website (<https://www.epa.gov/research-grants>) and a modification posted on [Grants.gov](https://www.epa.gov/grants).

Solicitation Closing Date: **August 31, 2023**, 11:59:59 pm Eastern Time (applications *must* be submitted to Grants.gov by this time, see Section IV.F “Submission Instructions and Other Submission Requirements” for further information).

NOTE: Customarily, applicants are notified about evaluation decisions within six months of the solicitation closing date. Awards are generally made 9-12 months after the solicitation closing date.

E. Funding Restrictions

The funding mechanism for all awards issued under STAR solicitations will consist of assistance agreements from the EPA. All award decisions are subject to the availability of funds. In accordance with the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act, 31 U.S.C. 6301 et seq., the primary purpose of an assistance agreement is to accomplish a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by federal statute, rather than acquisition for the direct benefit or use of the Agency. In issuing a grant, the EPA anticipates that there will be no substantial EPA involvement in the design, implementation, or conduct of the research. However, the EPA will monitor research progress through annual reports provided by grantees and other contacts, including site visits (as needed), with the Principal Investigator(s).

EPA award recipients may incur allowable project costs 90 calendar days before the Federal awarding agency makes the Federal award. Expenses more than 90 calendar days pre-award require prior approval of EPA. All costs incurred before EPA makes the award are at the recipient's risk. EPA is under no obligation to reimburse such costs if for any reason the recipient does not receive a Federal award or if the Federal award is less than anticipated and inadequate to cover such costs.

If you wish to submit applications for more than one STAR funding opportunity you must ensure that the research proposed in each application is significantly different from any other that has been submitted to the EPA or from any other financial assistance you are currently receiving from the EPA or other federal government agency.

Collaborative applications involving more than one institution must be submitted as a single administrative package from one of the institutions involved.

Each proposed project must be able to be completed within the project period and with the initial award of funds. Applicants should request the entire amount of money needed to complete the project. Recipients should not anticipate additional funding beyond the initial award of funds for a specific project.

Coalitions

Groups of two or more eligible applicants may choose to form a coalition and submit a single application under this RFA; however, one entity must be responsible for the grant. Coalitions must identify which eligible organization will be the recipient of the grant and which eligible organization(s) will be subrecipients of the recipient (the “pass-through entity”). *Subawards* must

be consistent with the definition of that term in 2 CFR 200.1 and comply with EPA's [Subaward Policy](#). The pass-through entity that administers the grant and subawards will be accountable to EPA for proper expenditure of the funds and reporting and will be the point of contact for the coalition. As provided in 2 CFR 200.332, subrecipients are accountable to the pass-through entity for proper use of EPA funding.

For-profit organizations are not eligible for subawards under this grant program but may receive procurement contracts. Any contracts for services or products funded with EPA financial assistance must be awarded under the competitive procurement procedures of 2 CFR Part 200 and/or 2 CFR Part 1500, as applicable. The regulations at 2 CFR 1500.10 contain limitations on the extent to which EPA funds may be used to compensate individual consultants. Refer to the [Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements](#) for guidance on competitive procurement requirements and consultant compensation. Do not name a procurement contractor (including a consultant) as a "partner" or otherwise in your application unless the contractor has been selected in compliance with competitive procurement requirements.

F. Submission Instructions and Other Submission Requirements

Please read this entire section before attempting an electronic submission through Grants.gov.

If you do not have the appropriate internet access to utilize the Grants.gov application submission process for this solicitation, see Section IV.A above for additional guidance and instructions.

Note: Grants.gov submission instructions are updated on an as-needed basis. Please provide your Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) with a copy of the following instructions to avoid submission delays that may occur from the use of outdated instructions.

1. SAM.gov (System for Award Management) Registration Instructions: Organizations applying to this funding opportunity must have an active SAM.gov registration. If you have never done business with the Federal Government, you will need to register your organization in SAM.gov. If you do not have a SAM.gov account, then you will create an account using [login.gov](#)³ to complete your SAM.gov registration. SAM.gov registration is FREE. The process for entity registrations includes obtaining Unique Entity ID (UEI), a 12-character alphanumeric ID assigned an entity by SAM.gov, and requires assertions, representations and certifications, and other information about your organization. Please review the [Entity Registration Checklist](#) for details on this process.

If you have done business with the Federal Government previously, you can check your entity status using your government issued UEI to determine if your registration is active. SAM.gov

³ Login.gov a secure sign in service used by the public to sign into Federal Agency systems including SAM.gov and Grants.gov. For help with login.gov accounts you should visit <http://login.gov/help>.

requires you renew your registration every 365 days to keep it active.

Please note that SAM.gov registration is different than obtaining a UEI only. Obtaining an UEI only validates your organization's legal business name and address. Please review the [Frequently Asked Question](#) on the difference for additional details.

Organizations should ensure that their SAM.gov registration includes a current e-Business (EBiz) point of contact name and email address. The EBiz point of contact is critical for Grants.gov Registration and system functionality.

Contact the [Federal Service Desk](#) for help with your SAM.gov account, to resolve technical issues or chat with a help desk agent: (866) 606-8220. The Federal Service desk hours of operation are Monday – Friday 8am – 8pm ET.

2. Grants.gov Registration Instructions: Once your SAM.gov account is active, you must register in Grants.gov. Grants.gov will electronically receive your organization information, such as e-Business (EBiz) point of contact email address and UEI. Organizations applying to this funding opportunity must have an active Grants.gov registration. Grants.gov registration is FREE. If you have never applied for a federal grant before, please review the [Grants.gov Applicant Registration](#) instructions. As part of the Grants.gov registration process, the EBiz point of contact is the only person that can affiliate and assign applicant roles to members of an organization. In addition, at least one person must be assigned as an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR). Only person(s) with the AOR role can submit applications in Grants.gov. Please review the [Intro to Grants.gov-Understanding User Roles](#) and [Learning Workspace – User Roles and Workspace Actions](#) for details on this important process.

Please note that this process can take a month or more for new registrants. Applicants must ensure that all registration requirements are met in order to apply for this opportunity through Grants.gov and should ensure that all such requirements have been met well in advance of the application submission deadline.

Contact [Grants.gov](#) for assistance at 1-800-518-4726 or support@grants.gov to resolve technical issues with Grants.gov. Applicants who are outside the U.S. at the time of submittal and are not able to access the toll-free number may reach a Grants.gov representative by calling 606-545-5035. The Grants.gov Support Center is available 24 hours a day 7 days a week, excluding federal holidays.

3. Application Submission Process: To begin the application process under this grant announcement, go to [Grants.gov](#) and click the red “Apply” button at the top of the view grant opportunity page associated with this opportunity.

The electronic submission of your application to this funding opportunity must be made by an official representative of your organization who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal financial assistance. If the submit button is grayed out, it may be because you do not have the appropriate role to submit in your organization. Contact your

organization's EBiz point of contact or contact [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) for assistance at 1-800-518-4726 or support@grants.gov.

Applicants need to ensure that the Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) who submits the application through Grants.gov and whose UEI is listed on the application is an AOR for the applicant listed on the application. Additionally, the UEI listed on the application must be registered to the applicant organization's SAM.gov account. If not, the application may be deemed ineligible.

Please submit all of the application materials described below using the Grants.gov application package accessed using the instructions above.

The application package consists of the following mandatory documents.

(a) Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424): Complete the form except for the "competition ID" field.

(b) EPA Key Contacts Form 5700-54: Complete the form. If additional pages are needed, see (e) below.

(c) EPA Form 4700-4, Preaward Compliance Review Report for All Applicants and Recipients Requesting EPA Financial Assistance: Complete the form.

(d) SF-424A, Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs: Only complete "Section B-Budget Categories". Provide the object class budget category (a. - k.) amounts for each budget year under the "Grant Program, Function or Activity" heading. Each column reflects a separate budget year.

(e) Project Narrative Attachment Form: Attach a single electronic PDF file labeled "Application" that contains the items described in Section IV.C.5.i through IV.C.5.viii.a (Table of Contents, Abstract, Research Plan, Quality Assurance Statement, Human Subjects Research Statement, Scientific Data Management Plan, Community Engagement Plan, References, Budget Justification, Resumes, Current and Pending Support, Applicant Current and Pending Support Certification, and Letters of Intent/Support) of this solicitation. *In order to maintain format integrity, this file must be submitted in Adobe Acrobat PDF.* Please review the PDF file for conversion errors prior to including it in the electronic application package; requests to rectify conversion errors will not be accepted if made after the solicitation closing date and time. If Key Contacts Continuation pages (see <https://www.epa.gov/research-grants/research-funding-opportunities-how-apply-and-required-forms>) are needed, attach them using the Project Narrative Form.

4. Application Submission Deadline: Your organization's AOR must submit your complete application package electronically to EPA through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) no later than **August 31, 2023, 11:59:59 pm Eastern Time**. Please allow for enough time to successfully submit your application

and allow for unexpected errors that may require you to resubmit.

Applications submitted through Grants.gov will be time and date stamped electronically. Please note that successful submission of your application through Grants.gov does not necessarily mean your application is eligible for award. Any application submitted after the application deadline time and date deadline will be deemed ineligible and not be considered.

5. Technical Issues with Submission: If applicants experience technical issues during the submission of an application that they are unable to resolve, follow these procedures **before** the application deadline date:

- a. Contact Grants.gov Support Center **before** the application deadline date.
- b. Document the Grants.gov ticket/case number.
- c. Send an email with the FON (EPA-G2023-STAR-G1) in the subject line to electronic-grant-submissions@epa.gov **before** the application deadline time and date and **must** include the following:
 - i. Grants.gov ticket/case number(s)
 - ii. Description of the issue
 - iii. The entire application package in PDF format.

Without this information, EPA may not be able to consider applications submitted outside of Grants.gov. Any application submitted after the application deadline time and date deadline will be deemed ineligible and **not** be considered.

Please note that successful submission through Grants.gov or email does not necessarily mean your application is eligible for award.

EPA will make decisions concerning acceptance of each application submitted outside of Grants.gov on a case-by-case basis. EPA will only consider accepting applications that were unable to submit through Grants.gov due to [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) or relevant [SAM.gov](https://www.sam.gov) system issues or for unforeseen exigent circumstances, such as extreme weather interfering with internet access. Failure of an applicant to submit prior to the application submission deadline date because they did not properly or timely register in SAM.gov or Grants.gov is **not** an acceptable reason to justify acceptance of an application outside of Grants.gov.

V. APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#).

A. Peer Review

All eligible grant applications are reviewed by appropriate external technical peer reviewers based on the criteria and process described below. This review is designed to evaluate each application according to its scientific merit. The individual external peer reviewers include non-

EPA scientists, engineers, social scientists, and/or economists who are accomplished in their respective disciplines and proficient in the technical subjects they are reviewing.

Prior to the external technical peer review panel meeting, all reviewers will receive access to electronic copies of all applications. Each application will be assigned to a minimum of three primary peer reviewers, one of whom will be assigned the role of Rapporteur. Each reviewer will be assigned up to approximately 10 applications on which to serve as a primary reviewer. During the review period leading up to the panel meeting, primary reviewers read the entire application package for each application they are assigned. The primary reviewers will also prepare a written individual evaluation for each assigned application that addresses the peer review criteria described below and rate the application with a score of Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor. To promote a better panel discussion, all reviewers must, at a minimum, read the abstracts of all applications.

At the beginning of the panel meeting, each primary reviewer will report their ratings for the applications they reviewed. Those applications receiving at least two ratings of *Very Good* or one rating of *Excellent* from among the primary reviewers will then be further discussed by the entire panel in terms of the peer review criteria below. In addition, if there is one *Very Good* rating among the primary reviewers of an application, the primary reviewer, whose initial rating is the *Very Good*, may request discussion of the application by the peer review panel. All other applications will be declined for further consideration.

After the discussion of an application by the panel, the primary reviewers may revise their initial ratings and if they do so, this will also be documented. The final ratings of the primary reviewers will then be translated by EPA into the final peer review score (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair or Poor) for the application. This is reflected in a peer review results document developed by the Rapporteur which combines the individual initial and final evaluations of the primary reviewers and captures any substantive comments from the panel discussion. This score will be used to determine which applications undergo the internal relevancy and past performance review discussed below. A peer review results document is also developed for applications that are not discussed. However, this document is a consolidation of the individual primary reviewer initial evaluations, with an average of the scores assigned by the primary reviewers.

Peer reviewers consider an application's merit based on the extent to which the application demonstrates the criteria below. Criteria are listed in descending order of importance (i.e., Criteria 1 has the heaviest weight).

1. **Research Merits** (subcriteria are in descending order of importance):
 - a. The degree to which the application demonstrates that the research is original and contributes to the scientific knowledge in the topic area. And the degree to which the application demonstrates that the project (and its approach) is defensible and technically feasible, and uses appropriate and adequate research methods.

- b. The degree to which the application demonstrates that the project results will produce benefits to the public (such as improvements to the environment or human health) and will be disseminated to enhance scientific and technological understanding.
2. **Responsiveness:** The degree to which the application demonstrates that the research is responsive to the objectives and research areas of interest specified by the RFA, including whether it addresses both research areas of interest described in Section I.D.
3. **Project Management** (subcriteria are equally weighted):
 - a. **Investigators:** The degree to which the application demonstrates that the Principal Investigator(s) and other key personnel have the appropriate qualifications to effectively perform the project (including research training, demonstrated knowledge of pertinent literature, experience and publication records).
 - b. **Management:** The degree to which the application demonstrates that the project will be adequately managed to ensure the timely and successful achievement of objectives using appropriate project schedules and milestones. And the degree to which the application demonstrates the applicant will adequately track and measure progress toward achieving expected results (outputs and outcomes).
 - c. **Quality Assurance (QA):** The degree to which the application includes an appropriate and adequate QA Statement.
 - d. **Resources and Cost Controls:** The degree to which the application demonstrates that the facilities, equipment and budget are appropriate, adequate, and available. And the degree to which the application demonstrates that well-defined and acceptable approaches, procedures and controls are used to ensure timely and efficient expenditure of awarded grant funds.
4. **Environmental Justice:** The degree to which the application demonstrates how the project will address the disproportionate and adverse human health, environmental, climate-related and other cumulative impacts described in Section I of the solicitation, as well as the accompanying economic challenges of such impacts, resulting from industrial, governmental, commercial and/or other actions that have affected and/or currently affect the underserved communities described in Section I of the solicitation. As part of this evaluation, applications will be evaluated based on how the project benefits the underserved communities including those that have experienced a lack of resources or other impediments to addressing the impacts identified above that affect their community.
5. **Community Engagement Plan** (subcriteria are equally weighted):
 - a. The degree to which the Plan clearly describes the type of collaboration/engagement proposed and what role it will play in the overall project including the degree of

partner/community input or engagement in the conceptualization, hypothesis/question development, design, methods, analyses and implementation of the research. This includes the degree to which the Plan addresses engagement with underserved communities, especially local residents in these communities who will be affected by the project, to ensure their meaningful participation with respect to the design, project planning, and performance of the project. If an applicant does not plan on collaborating/engaging with other groups in project performance, the degree to which the Plan clearly describes how the applicant will be able to effectively perform and complete the project without such collaboration/engagement will be evaluated.

- b. The degree to which the Plan clearly describes how the collaboration/engagement will: 1) enhance the overall impact of the project such that the project results are applicable and useable by impacted communities and address the needs and concerns of underserved communities, and 2) effectively communicate risk and translate scientific results into easily understandable outreach and education materials. If an applicant does not plan on collaborating/engaging with other groups in project performance, the degree to which the Plan clearly describes how the aforementioned activities will be effectively performed and completed without such collaboration/engagement will be evaluated.
- c. The degree to which the Plan clearly describes how project activities will be coordinated with related or complementary projects and studies.
- d. The degree to which the Plan clearly describes how the proposed collaboration/engagement will materialize during the project along with evidence of the partner(s)' intent to participate. If an applicant does not intend to collaborate/engage with respect to the project, then the applicant will be evaluated based on how well it demonstrates that it can effectively perform and complete the project without such collaboration/engagement.

6. **Other Factors** (subcriteria are equally weighted):

- a. **Innovation:** The degree to which the application demonstrates that the research will challenge and seek to shift current research or engineering paradigms by using innovative theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions applicable to one or more fields of research.
- b. **Sustainability:** The degree to which the application demonstrates that the research will embody the principles of sustainability and seek sustainable solutions that protect the environment and strengthen our communities. The sustainability primer (see link) provides examples of research activities that promote and incorporate sustainability principles (https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/sustainability_primer_v9.pdf).

B. Relevancy Review

Applications receiving final peer review scores of Excellent or Very Good will then undergo an internal relevancy review, as described below, conducted by experts from the EPA, including

individuals from the Office of Research and Development (ORD) and program and regional offices involved with the science or engineering proposed. All other applications are automatically declined. The purpose of the relevancy review is to ensure an integrated research portfolio for the Agency and help determine which applications to recommend for award.

Prior to the relevancy review panel meeting, all relevancy reviewers will receive electronic copies of all applications that passed peer review as well as a full set of abstracts for the applications. Each application will be assigned to a minimum of three primary relevancy reviewers, one of whom will be assigned the role of Rapporteur. Each reviewer will be assigned up to approximately 10 applications on which to serve as a primary relevancy reviewer. During the review period leading up to the relevancy review panel meeting, all reviewers will be instructed to read the full set of abstracts and the entire application package for each application they are assigned. They will also prepare a written individual evaluation for each assigned application that addresses the relevancy review criteria described below and rate the application with a score of A, high relevance to EPA mission; B, relevant to EPA mission; C, moderately relevant to EPA mission; D, possibly relevant to EPA mission; or E, not relevant to EPA mission.

All applications that pass peer review will be discussed by the relevancy review panel with the Rapporteur initiating the discussion. If the primary relevancy reviewers revise their initial scores after the discussion by the panel they will document the reasons for the revisions. After the discussion, the primary relevancy reviewers will provide their final score for the applications they are assigned. The final ratings of the primary reviewers will then be translated by EPA into the final relevancy review score (A, B, C, D, or E) for the application.

The final relevancy review score (A, B, C, D, or E) and final peer review score (Excellent or Very Good) will be used to place each application in one of 6 ranking tiers: Tier 1 = A/Excellent; Tier 2 = A/Very Good or B/Excellent; Tier 3 = B/Very Good or C/Excellent; Tier 4 = C/Very Good or D/Excellent; Tier 5 = D/Very Good; Tier 6 = E/Excellent or E/Very Good.

The internal relevancy review panel will assess the relevancy of the proposed research to the EPA's mission and priorities based on the following criteria that are listed in descending order of importance (i.e., Criteria 1 has the heaviest weight):

1. The degree to which the proposed science/research is relevant to EPA's priorities as described in this solicitation and Goal 2: Take Decisive Action to Advance Environmental Justice and Civil Rights, Objective 2.1: Promote Environmental Justice and Civil Rights at the Federal, Tribal, State, and Local Levels, of EPA's [FY2022-2026 Strategic Plan](#).
2. The degree to which results (i.e., outputs/outcomes) of the research have broad application or affect large segments of society.
3. The degree to which the research is designed to produce data and methods that can immediately and/or with little to no translation be utilized by the public, states, and tribes to better assess or manage environmental problems.

C. Past Performance History Review

Those applicants who received final scores of Excellent or Very Good as a result of the peer review process will also be asked to provide additional information for the past performance history review pertaining to the proposed Lead PI's (in the case of Multiple-PI applications, the Contact PI's) "Past Performance and Reporting History." The applicant must provide the EPA with information on the proposed Lead/Contact PI's past performance and reporting history under prior Federal agency assistance agreements (assistance agreements include grants and cooperative agreements but not contracts) in terms of: (i) the level of success in managing and completing each agreement, (ii) history of meeting the reporting requirements and documenting progress towards achieving the expected results (outputs/outcomes) under each agreement, and (iii) whether journal publications or author manuscripts associated with the journal publications, and the associated underlying scientific research data and metadata, resulting from those agreements were made publicly accessible.

This information is required only for the proposed Lead/Contact PI's performance under Federal assistance agreements performed within the last five years.

Past performance history review scores are satisfactory (S), nothing to report (NTR) or unsatisfactory (U). For purposes of consideration of an award, scores of S will be considered favorable, NTR will be considered neither favorable nor unfavorable and scores of U will be considered unfavorable and unlikely to result in an award recommendation. Scores of S and U must be justified by the reviewer, with scores of U clearly documented to explain why past performance history cannot be considered satisfactory.

The specific information required for each agreement is shown below and must be provided within one week of EPA's request. A maximum of three pages will be permitted for the response; excess pages will not be reviewed. **Note: If no prior past performance information and/or reporting history exists, you will be asked to so state.**

1. Name of Awarding Agency
2. Grant/Cooperative agreement number
3. Grant/Cooperative agreement title
4. Grantee Institution
5. Brief description of the grant/cooperative agreement
6. A discussion on whether the agreement was successfully managed and completed; if not successfully managed and completed, provide an explanation
7. Information relating to the proposed Lead/Contact PI's past performance in reporting on progress towards achieving the expected results (outputs/outcomes) under the agreement and meeting reporting requirements under the agreement. Include the history of submitting acceptable and timely progress/final technical reports, describe how progress towards achieving the expected results was reported/documented and if such progress was not being made, provide an explanation of whether and how this was reported

8. Information relating to whether journal publications or author manuscripts associated with the journal publications, and the associated underlying scientific research data and metadata, resulting from those agreements were made publicly accessible (and if not, explain why not; or explain why this requirement does not apply) to the extent permissible under applicable laws and regulations
9. Total (all years) grant/cooperative agreement dollar value
10. Project period
11. Technical contact (project officer), telephone number and Email address (if available)

In evaluating applicants under the past performance history factor, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current/prior grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). **If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in your response and you will receive a nothing to report (NTR) score for these factors assuming EPA does not have any information in its files or from other sources that can be considered. If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive an unsatisfactory (U) score for these factors.**

The past performance history review will be conducted by the EPA and will assess the following criteria which are of equal weight:

1. History of successfully managing and completing these prior Federal assistance agreements, including whether there is a satisfactory explanation for any lack of success.
2. History in meeting reporting requirements under the prior agreements and reporting progress toward achieving results (outputs/outcomes) under these agreements, including the proposed Lead/Contact PI's history of submitting acceptable and timely progress/final technical reports that adequately describe the progress toward achieving the expected results under the agreements. Any explanation of why progress toward achieving the results was not made will also be considered.
3. History of whether journal publications or author manuscripts associated with the journal publications, and the associated underlying scientific research data and metadata, resulting from these prior assistance agreements were made publicly accessible, and if not whether the Lead/Contact PI adequately explained why not, or the Lead/Contact PI explained why the requirement does not apply.

D. Human Subjects Research Statement (HSRS) Review

Applications being considered for funding after the Relevancy and Past Performance Review that involve human subjects research studies will have their HSRS reviewed prior to award. The local EPA Human Subjects Officer (HSO) will review the information provided in the HSRS and the Research Plan to determine if the ethical treatment of human subjects is described in a manner appropriate for the project to move forward. The HSO may consult with the EPA Human

Subjects Research Review Official (HSRRO) as appropriate. The HSRRO may determine that an application cannot be funded if it is inconsistent with EPA's regulations at 40 CFR Part 26.

E. Evaluation of the Scientific Data Management Plan

EPA will evaluate the merits of the SDMPs for those applications recommended for award. The SDMPs for those applications not recommended for award will not be reviewed. The SDMPs of all applications recommended for award will be evaluated to ensure they are appropriate and adequate (e.g., describe the types of scientific research data and metadata to be collected and/or generated under the proposed research award and include plans for providing long-term preservation of, and public access to, the scientific research data and metadata). SDMPs that indicate the proposed research will not result in the generation and/or collection of scientific research data will also be evaluated to ensure the proposed research will not result in the generation and/or collection of scientific research data and therefore not require a more comprehensive SDMP. Applicants may be contacted regarding their SDMP if additional information is needed or if revisions are required prior to award. If upon review of the SDMP, EPA identifies any issues with the plan, EPA will raise these issues to the applicant, so they may be addressed. Applicants with an unsatisfactory SDMP will not receive an award.

F. Funding Decisions

EPA intends to select approximately five of the highest ranked applications for award including at least one award to the highest ranked new awardee as defined below. This is an estimate and is subject to change based on funding levels, the quality of applications received, and other applicable considerations. EPA reserves the right to change the ratio of awards for existing and recent recipients and new awardees based on the results of the competition and Agency priorities.

For selection purposes, EPA's Office of Research and Development will prepare two ranked lists of applications.

One list will be comprised of "existing and recent recipients" defined as:

- applicants who have an active EPA STAR (Science to Achieve Results) grant, or
- applicants who were awarded an EPA STAR grant with a project period start date in calendar year 2018 or later.

A second list will be comprised of "new awardees" defined as:

- applicants who have never received an EPA STAR grant, or
- applicants who were awarded an EPA STAR grant with a project period start date in calendar year 2017 or earlier.

Final funding decisions are made by the ORD selection official based on the ranking tier, the past-performance history review, the evaluation of the SDMP, and, where applicable, the assessment of the applicant's human subjects research (see Section IV.C.5.iii.c). In addition, in making the final funding decisions, the ORD selection official may also consider program

balance, the ratio of awards for existing and recent recipients and new awardees, potential duplication of effort, disclosure of support, and available funds. Applicants selected for funding will be required to provide additional information listed below under “Award Notices.” The application will then be forwarded to EPA’s Grants and Interagency Agreement Management Division for award in accordance with the EPA’s procedures.

VI. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#).

A. Award Notices

Customarily, applicants are notified about evaluation decisions within six months of the solicitation closing date. Applicants to be recommended for funding will be required to submit additional certifications and an electronic version of the revised project abstract. They may also be asked to provide responses to comments or suggestions offered by the peer reviewers and/or submit a revised budget. EPA Project Officers will contact the Lead PI/Contact PI to obtain these materials. Before or after an award, applicants may be required to provide additional quality assurance documentation.

The official notification of an award will be made by the Agency’s Grants and Interagency Agreement Management Division. Applicants are cautioned that only a grants officer is authorized to bind the Government to the expenditure of funds; preliminary selection by the ORD selection official does not guarantee an award will be made. For example, statutory authorization, funding or other issues discovered during the award process may affect the ability of EPA to make an award to an applicant. The award notice, signed by an EPA grants officer, is the authorizing document and will be provided through electronic or postal mail.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Expectations and responsibilities of ORD grantees and cooperative agreement recipients are summarized in this section, although the terms grants and cooperative agreements are used interchangeably.

1. Meetings

Principal Investigators will be expected to budget for, and participate in, All-Investigators Meetings (also known as progress reviews) approximately once per year with EPA scientists and other grantees to report on research activities and discuss issues of mutual interest.

2. Approval of Changes after Award

Prior written approval of changes may be required from EPA. Examples of these changes are contained in 2 CFR 200.308. Note: prior written approval is also required from the EPA Award Official for incurring costs more than 90 calendar days prior to award.

3. Human Subjects

A grant applicant must agree to comply with all applicable provisions of EPA Regulation 40 CFR Part 26 (Protection of Human Subjects). In addition, grant applicants must agree to comply

with EPA's procedures for oversight of the recipient's compliance with 40 CFR Part 26, as given in EPA Order 1000.17A (Policy and Procedures on Protection of Human Research Subjects in EPA Conducted or Supported Research). As per this Order, no human subject may be involved in any research conducted under this assistance agreement, including recruitment, until the research has been approved or determined to be exempt by the EPA Human Subjects Research Review Official (HSRRO) after review of the approval or exemption determination of the Institutional Review Board(s) (IRB(s)) with jurisdiction over the research under 40 CFR Part 26. Following the initial approvals indicated above, the recipient must, as part of the annual report(s), provide evidence of continuing review and approval of the research by the IRB(s) with jurisdiction, as required by 40 CFR 26.109(e).

Guidance for investigators conducting EPA-funded research involving human subjects may be obtained here:

<https://www.epa.gov/osa/basic-information-about-human-subjects-research-0>

https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40cfr26_main_02.tpl

4. Data Access and Information Release

EPA's requirements associated with data access and information release as well as copyrights, may be accessed here: <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-solicitation-clauses>.

Congress, through OMB, has instructed each federal agency to implement Information Quality Guidelines designed to "provide policy and procedural guidance...for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information, including statistical information, disseminated by Federal agencies." The EPA's implementation may be found at <https://www.epa.gov/quality/guidelines-ensuring-and-maximizing-quality-objectivity-utility-and-integrity-information>. These procedures may apply to data generated by grant recipients if those data are disseminated as described in the Guidelines.

5. Reporting

A grant recipient must agree to provide annual performance progress reports, with associated summaries, and a final report with an executive summary. The summaries will be posted on EPA's Research Grants website. The reports and summaries should be submitted electronically to the Technical Contact named in Section VII of this announcement.

A grant recipient must agree to provide copies of, or acceptable alternate access to (e.g., web link), any peer reviewed journal article(s) resulting from the research during the project period. In addition, the recipient should notify the ORD Project Officer of any papers published after completion of the grant that were based on research supported by the grant. ORD posts references to all publications resulting from a grant on EPA's Research Grants website.

6. Acknowledgement of EPA Support

EPA's full or partial support must be acknowledged in journal articles, oral or poster presentations, news releases, interviews with reporters and other communications. The acknowledgement to be included in any documents developed under this agreement that are

intended for distribution to the public or inclusion in a scientific, technical or other journal will be provided in the award's terms and conditions.

VII. AGENCY CONTACTS

Further information, if needed, may be obtained from the EPA contacts indicated below. Information regarding this RFA obtained from sources other than these Agency Contacts may not be accurate. Email inquiries are preferred.

Technical Contact: Flora Barrow; phone: 202-564-0478; email: barrow.flora@epa.gov

Eligibility Contact: Ron Josephson; phone: 202-564-7823; email: josephson.ron@epa.gov

Electronic Submissions Contact: electronic-grant-submissions@epa.gov