TAB Technical Assistance to Brownfields | Kansas State University



REVOLVING LOAN FUND GRANT

Guidelines

Updated November 2026

Notice of Funding Opportunity

Applications Due: **Thursday, January 21, 2027**

Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization

FY27 GUIDELINES FOR BROWNFIELD REVOLVING LOAN FUND GRANTS

Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-OLEM-OBLR-26-05

Contents

1. Basic Information 1

A. Executive Summary 1
B. Key Information 1
C. Key Dates 2
D. Funding Details 2
E. Agency Contact Information 3

2. Eligibility 3

A. Eligible Applicants 3
B. Threshold Eligibility Criteria 5

1. Applicant Eligibility 7
2. Demonstration of Previous RLF Grant Status 8
3. Description of RLF Boundary(ies) 9
4. Oversight Structure and Legal Authority to Manage a Revolving Loan Fund 9
5. Contractors and Named Subrecipients (other than borrowers and site cleanup subgrantees) . 9

C. Cost Sharing 11

3. Program Description 12

A. Purpose, Priorities, and Activities 12

1. Purpose 12
2. Eligible Uses of Grant Funds 14
3. Ineligible Uses of Grant Funds 15
4. Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outputs/Outcomes 16
5. Leveraging 17

B. Program Goals and Objectives 18
C. Statutory Authority 18
D. Funding Type 18

4. Application Contents and Format 19

A. Application Forms (Submission Checklist) 19
B. Application Information Sheet 21
C. Narrative Criteria Outline 23
D. Applicants Using Contractors and/or Subrecipients 27

5. Submission Requirements and Deadlines 29

A. Submission Dates and Times 29
B. Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) and System for Award Management (SAM.gov) 29
C. Submission Instructions 29
D. Technical Issues with Submission 30
E. Intergovernmental Review 30

6. Application Review Information 31

A. Responsiveness Review 31
B. Narrative Criteria Responses and Review Criteria 31

1. PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION AND PLANS FOR REVITALIZATION 32
2. COMMUNITY NEED AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT 34
3. TASK DESCRIPTIONS, COST ESTIMATES, AND MEASURING PROGRESS 37
4. PROGRAMMATIC CAPABILITY AND PAST PERFORMANCE 41

C. Review and Selection Process 47

1. Other Evaluation Factors 47

D. Risk Review 48

7. Award Notices 48

8. Post-Award Requirements and Administration 48

A. Administrative and National Policy Requirements 48
B. Reporting 49
C. Subaward and Executive Compensation Reporting 49
D. Brownfield Programmatic Requirements 49
E. Build America, Buy America 49

9. Other Information 50

A. Additional Provisions for Applicants 50

1. Basic Information

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization (OBLR)

FY27 GUIDELINES FOR BROWNFIELD REVOLVING LOAN FUND GRANTS

Multipurpose, Assessment, RLF, and Cleanup (MARC) Grant Application Resources

A. Executive Summary

This notice announces the availability of funds and solicits applications from eligible entities to capitalize a revolving loan fund (RLF) to provide loans and subgrants to carry out cleanup activities at brownfield sites. Eligible entities include government organizations, Federally recognized Tribes, and 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations.

Please see Section 2.A. for the complete list of eligible entities. Applications must meet all threshold eligibility criteria in Section 2.B. and the 20% cost share requirement in Section 2.C. to be considered eligible to receive an RLF Grant.

RLF programs provide loans and subgrants to eligible entities to carry out cleanup activities at brownfield sites contaminated with hazardous substances[1] and/or petroleum.[2] EPA will determine site eligibility after the award of the grant throughout the project period, prior to expending grant funds at any site. Sites where hazardous substances and petroleum contamination are distinguishable must meet eligibility requirements for both contaminants. See Section 3.A.1. for RLF Grant features and Section 3.A.2. on the requirement to use 50% or more of the total award amount (EPA funds plus the applicant's cost share) to provide loans and associated eligible programmatic costs.

B. Key Information

Opportunity Number:

EPA-OLEM-OBLR-26-05

Assistance Listing:

66.818

Announcement Type:

Initial

Funding Available:

$10,000,000

Number of Awards:

Approximately 10

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) requires applicants to provide a 20% cost share of the federal funds for RLF Grants. For example, a $1,000,000 RLF Grant awarded by EPA will require the recipient to provide a $200,000 cost share. The cost share, which may be in the form of a contribution of money, labor, material, or services, must be for eligible and allowable costs under the grant, as described in the grant regulations at 2 CFR § 200.306. See Section 2.C. for details.

Only eligible entities that **do not have, or are not a part of** (i.e., a non-lead coalition member), **an open cooperative agreement** for a Brownfields RLF at the time of application may apply for funding under this

[1] Hazardous substance sites eligible for funding are those sites with the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, sites that are contaminated with controlled substances, or that are mine-scarred lands. For more information, please refer to the FY27 Brownfields Frequently Asked Questions.
[2] Petroleum sites eligible for funding are those sites that meet the definition set forth in CERCLA § 101(39)(D)(ii)(II), as further described in Section 1.3.2. in the *Information on Sites Eligible for Brownfields Funding under CERCLA § 104(k)*.

solicitation. An "open" cooperative agreement is one in which the *Period of performance*, as defined in 2 CFR § 200.1, has not yet ended. The period of performance is specified in EPA's initial or amended "Notice of Award."

Grant recipients **with an open Brownfields RLF cooperative agreement** may request additional funding to capitalize their RLF program through EPA's annual, non-competitive, supplemental funding process. Additional information on the timing, requirements, and procedures for supplemental funding requests will be available on EPA's Brownfields RLF Website.

Please carefully review Section 4.D. of these guidelines, Section IV.E. "Coalitions, Contracts, and Subawards" of EPA Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Clauses, and Section D. in the FY27 Brownfields Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) to ensure that contractors (including individual consultants) are procured in compliance with the fair and open competition requirements. Also, carefully review the EPA Subaward Policy and Subaward Frequent Questions for establishing and managing subawards.

A checklist of mandatory documents is in Section 4.A.

For the purposes of this NOFO, the term "grant" refers to the cooperative agreement that EPA will award to a successful applicant.

C. Key Dates

November 12, 2026 2:00 pm ET	National Outreach Webinar
January 21, 2027 11:59 pm ET	Application Submission Deadline
June 2027	Anticipated Notification of Selection
September 2027	Anticipated Award Notification

D. Funding Details

It is anticipated that up to **10 awards** will be made under this announcement. The amount of funding is expected to be **$10,000,000**, depending on Agency funding levels, the quality of applications received, agency priorities, and other applicable considerations. Awards funded under this opportunity are expected to have a **5-year** project period. Applicants may apply for up to $1,000,000 of EPA funds. (Note, applicants may also request an amount that is less than $1,000,000.) Funding estimates are approximations that are subject to change.

EPA reserves the right to:

- make additional awards under this funding announcement consistent with Agency policy and guidance if additional funding becomes available after the original selections are made. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than 6 months after the original selection decisions.
- to make no awards under the funding opportunity.
- partially fund applications by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If a project is partially funded, it will be done in a manner that maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.
- incrementally fund applications based on funding availability and/or satisfactory performance.

- adjust funding levels for priorities, set-asides, or other types of funding categories.
- increase or decrease (including decreasing to zero) the total number and amount of awards under each funding category or change the ratio of assistance agreements it awards among the funding categories.

The actual award amounts and number of projects awarded may differ from the estimated amounts.

E. Agency Contact Information

Further information, if needed, may be obtained from the EPA contact(s) indicated below.

Technical Contact:	**Elyse Salinas,** brownfields@epa.gov
Eligibility Contact:	**See Regional Contacts below**
Electronic Submissions Contact:	**Grants.gov, 1-800-518-4726, support@grants.gov**
Regional Contact(s):	**EPA Region 1 (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)** Dorrie Paar, Paar.Dorrie@epa.gov, (617) 918-1432 **EPA Region 2 (NJ, NY, PR, VI)** Patrick Peck, Peck.Patrick@epa.gov, (212) 637-4421 **EPA Region 3 (DE, DC, MD, PA, VA, WV)** Anthony Geiger, Geiger.Anthony@epa.gov, (215) 814-3367 **EPA Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN)** Sid Patel, patel.siddhartha@epa.gov, (404) 562-9640 **EPA Region 5 (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI)** Ashley Green, Green.Ashley@epa.gov, (312) 886-6054 **EPA Region 6 (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX)** Marsha Lay, Lay.Marsha@epa.gov, (214) 665-7562 **EPA Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE)** Jennifer Morris, R7_Brownfields@epa.gov, (913) 551-7341 **EPA Region 8 (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY)** Curt Jeffries, Jeffries.Curtis@epa.gov, (303) 312-7007 **EPA Region 9 (AZ, CA, HI, NV, Pacific Island Territories)** Daniel Moher, moher.daniel@epa.gov, (415) 972-3210 **EPA Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA)** Terri Griffith, Griffith.Terri@epa.gov, (206) 553-8511

2. Eligibility

Applications must meet all requirements in this section, including the submission of responses to the Section 2.B. threshold eligibility criteria, to be considered eligible. Applicants should direct eligibility questions to the Regional Contact in Section 1.E. well in advance of the application deadline.

A. Eligible Applicants

Only these types of organizations may apply for an RLF Grant. Organization types are consistent with definitions at CERCLA § 104(k)(1) and 2 CFR § 200.1. Note, entities that **currently have, or are a part of (i.e., a non-lead coalition member), an open cooperative agreement** for a Brownfields RLF at the time of application are not eligible to apply for an RLF Grant in FY27.

- General Purpose Unit of Local Government. Local government means a county, borough, municipality, city, town, township, parish, local public authority (including any public housing agency under the United States Housing Act of 1937), school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (whether or not incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), and any other agency or instrumentality of a multi-, regional, or intra-State or local government.
- Land Clearance Authority or another quasi-governmental entity that operates under the supervision and control of, or as an agent of, a General Purpose Unit of Local Government.
- Government Entity Created by State Legislature.
- Regional Council established under governmental authority or group of General Purpose Units of Local Government established under Federal, State, or local law (e.g., councils of governments) to function as a single legal entity with authority to enter into binding agreements with the Federal Government.
- Redevelopment Agency that is chartered or otherwise sanctioned by a State.
- State.[3]
- Federally recognized Indian Tribe[4] other than in Alaska. (The exclusion of Tribes from Alaska, with the exception of the Metlakatla Indian Community as noted below, from Brownfields Grant eligibility is statutory at CERCLA § 104(k)(1). Intertribal Consortia, comprised of eligible Indian Tribes, are eligible for funding in accordance with EPA's policy for funding intertribal consortia published in the *Federal Register* on November 4, 2002, at 67 Fed. Reg. 67181. This policy also may be obtained from your Regional Brownfields Contact listed in Section 1.E.)
- Alaska Native Regional Corporation and Alaska Native Village Corporation as those terms are defined in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 and following) and the Metlakatla Indian Community. For more information, please refer to the FY27 FAQs.
- Nonprofit organization described in section 501(c)(3) of title 26 (the Internal Revenue Code (IRC)) and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that title.
- Limited liability corporation in which all managing members are 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under 501(a) of the IRC or limited liability corporations whose sole members are 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under 501(a) of the IRC.
- Limited partnership in which all general partners are 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under 501(a) of the IRC or limited liability corporations whose sole members are 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under 501(a) of the IRC.
- Qualified community development entity as defined in section 45D(c)(1) of the IRC.

Note, individuals, for-profit organizations, and nonprofit organizations that are **not** tax-exempt under section 501(c)(3) are ineligible to receive Brownfields RLF Grants. Organizations exempt from taxation

[3] As defined in CERCLA § 101(27), the definition of State for purposes of the Brownfields Program "include[s] the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and any other territory or possession over which the United States has jurisdiction."

[4] There are currently 575 federally recognized Tribes, and there are many names that these sovereign nations use to describe their culture, history, and geography, including Tribe, Village, Nation, Band, and Pueblo. For the purpose of these guidelines, the EPA Brownfields Program uses "Tribe" and "Tribal Nation" as all-encompassing terms.

under section 501(c)(4) of the IRC may be eligible for a Brownfields RLF Grant if they also qualify as an eligible entity type listed above and demonstrate that they do not lobby the Federal government.[5]

B. Threshold Eligibility Criteria

Applications must meet the following threshold eligibility criteria to be considered eligible to receive an RLF Grant under this NOFO. The information you submit will be used by EPA solely to make eligibility determinations for Brownfield Grants and is not legally binding for other purposes, including federal, State, or Tribal enforcement actions. Only those applications that pass all the threshold eligibility criteria will be evaluated against the review criteria in Section 6.B. of this announcement.

EPA staff will respond to questions regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the application, and requests for clarification about this announcement. For purposes of the threshold eligibility review, an EPA Brownfields and Land Revitalization Program representative, if necessary, may seek clarification of applicant information that is included in the application and/or consider information from other sources, including EPA files. Such communications shall not be used to correct application deficiencies or material omissions, materially alter the application or project proposed, or discuss changes to the applicant's responses to any review or selection criteria.

To maintain the integrity of the competition process, EPA staff cannot meet with individual applicants to discuss draft applications, provide informal comments on draft applications, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to the Narrative Criteria Responses. EPA's limitations on staff involvement with grant applicants are described in EPA's Policy for Competition of Assistance Agreements.

i. Number of Applications EPA will Accept:

   a. Entities that are applying for an FY27 RLF Grant under this NOFO may not also apply for an FY27 Brownfields Cleanup Grant.

   b. RLF Coalition members may not be non-lead members of other RLF Coalition applications, nor submit an RLF Grant application as an individual applicant under this NOFO. A coalition member wishing to apply as part of a different RLF Coalition or as an individual applicant must withdraw from the coalition.

   c. Applicants may not submit multiple applications (i.e., submit applications for different projects) under this NOFO. EPA considers departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the same State or city governments to be the same applicant if they are directly supervised or controlled by the same elected/appointed executive (even if they have different Unique Entity Identifier numbers). For example, a corporation formed under State or local law to perform redevelopment activities on behalf of or in support of a local government that is primarily staffed by employees of that local government will be considered an agency or instrumentality of that local government. These eligibility determinations are made on a case-by-case basis since State and local laws vary. For Tribes, EPA defers to the Tribe's interpretation of a department, agency, or instrumentality being the same or a separate entity.

[5] The Lobbying Disclosure Act (2 U.S.C. 1601 et. seq.) provides requirements for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government.

If the same applicant exceeds the number or type of applications allowable, EPA will contact the applicant to determine which application(s) to withdraw from the competition. In the absence of application withdrawal, EPA will accept the first application received in Grants.gov and deem all other applications submitted by that applicant ineligible.

If an applicant submits the same application multiple times, unless told otherwise by the applicant, EPA will review the most recently received application in Grants.gov.

ii. Ineligible Activities: If an application is submitted that includes any ineligible tasks or activities, that portion of the application will be ineligible for funding and may, depending on the extent to which it affects the application, render the entire application ineligible for funding.

iii. Substantial Compliance: Applications must substantially comply with the submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section 4 of this announcement or they will be rejected. See Section 4.A. for the application submission checklist.

iv. Risk Review: Applications from entities that are excluded from participation in Federal Assistance programs at the time of selection will be deemed ineligible for funding. To determine this, EPA will check SAM.gov for suspended or debarred entities that apply for this funding opportunity as per 2 CFR § 200.206(d).

For applications from entities that are not suspended or debarred at the time of selection, EPA will conduct a risk review as per Section 6.D. of the NOFO after the selection process and before awards are made.

v. RLF Coalition Grants:

An RLF Coalition is comprised of one "lead" eligible entity that partners with one or more non-lead eligible entities. The lead eligible entity is the applicant that submits an application on behalf of the non-lead coalition members. The RLF Coalition may request funding up to $1,000,000 to address brownfield sites with hazardous substances and/or petroleum contamination.

If selected, the lead entity will be the point of contact for the other non-lead coalition members. The lead entity will be the grant recipient and must administer the grant, and be accountable to EPA for effectively carrying out the scope of work and the proper financial management of the grant.

Please note that once the lead entity submits the application, it becomes the applicant, and the non-lead coalition members may not substitute another eligible entity as the lead entity after the deadline for submitting applications has passed. Additionally, the non-lead coalition members may not be substituted after the deadline for submitting applications has passed. If the application is selected for funding, the lead member must partner with the other non-lead coalition members that were named in the application.

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) documenting the coalition's site selection process must be in place prior to the expenditure and draw down of any funds that are awarded. The coalition

members should identify and establish relationships necessary to achieve the project's goal. A process for successful execution of the project's goal, including a description and role of each coalition member, should be established along with the MOA. The purpose of the MOA is for coalition members to agree internally on the distribution of funds and the mechanisms for implementing the cleanup work.

vi. **Required Eligibility Documentation: Responses to each item below and Section 2.C. Cost Sharing are required and must be included in the application submitted to EPA. Threshold eligibility criteria responses and documentation do not have a page limit.**

1. **Applicant Eligibility**

a. From the list of eligible entities in Section 2.A., *Eligible Applicants*, **indicate** your applicant type (and the applicant type for each coalition member, if applicable) and **provide** information that demonstrates how you (and each non-lead coalition member, if applicable) are an eligible entity for an RLF Grant.

- For entities that are villages, towns, cities, counties, Tribes, or States, affirm that the organization is eligible for funding.

- For government entities other than villages, towns, cities, counties, Tribes, or States, attach documentation of your eligibility (e.g., resolutions, statutes, etc.).

- For Intertribal consortia, attach documentation that meets the requirements in 40 CFR § 35.504(a) and (c). All members of the Intertribal consortium must authorize the submission of an application.

- For nonprofit organizations, or organizations comprised of nonprofit organizations, provide documentation as an attachment to the Narrative Criteria Responses demonstrating tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the IRC.

- For qualified community development entities, provide documentation as an attachment to the Narrative Criteria Responses certifying the organization's status.

b. All applicants: **Indicate** if your organization (and the non-lead coalition members' organizations, if applicable) is exempt from Federal taxation under section 501(c)(4) of the IRC. *Note, villages, towns, cities, counties, Tribes, or States should respond N/A. All other entities must indicate yes or no.*

- If yes, **indicate** if your organization (and the non-lead coalition members' organizations, if applicable) lobbies the Federal government. *Note, if a 501(c)(4) organization lobbies the Federal government, the organization is ineligible for an EPA Brownfields Grant.*

- If yes, but your organization (and the non-lead coalition members' organizations, if applicable) does not lobby the Federal government, **attach** a legal opinion that states

that the organization does not engage in lobbying activities.[6] *Note, organizations with 501(c)(4) tax-exempt status that do not lobby the Federal government must also qualify as an entity type listed in Section 2.A. to be eligible for an RLF Grant.*

The non-lead coalition members may not be an agency or instrumentality of or affiliated with **the lead member** (for example, a county and the redevelopment authority of the same county), except for coalitions in which the State is the lead and one of the non-lead members is a regional council or regional commission that is created by a State legislature through a charter or another official action.

A non-lead member may not be an agency or instrumentality of or affiliated with **another non-lead member** in the same coalition. The non-lead members must be separate legal entities. For example, the following may not be members of the same coalition:

1. Different departments within the same unit of government;
2. A unit of government and an affiliated nonprofit organization exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the IRC that the city controls; or
3. Affiliated 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations (e.g., nonprofit organizations that have the same board of directors or staff). This does not preclude separately incorporated chapters of a national nonprofit organization from being non-lead members of coalitions in different geographic areas. For example, an organization that is a national nonprofit could have local chapters that are separately incorporated and have their own board of directors and staff. Local chapter "A" conducts programming in the State of "Y." Local chapter "B" conducts programming in the State of "Z." Both chapters may be non-lead members of different FY27 RLF Coalition Grant applications.

RLF Coalitions:

- Each non-lead coalition member must submit a signed letter to the grant applicant (the lead coalition member) in which they agree to be part of the coalition. An active Memorandum of Agreement that includes a description and role of each coalition member may serve in place of the individual non-lead coalition members' letters. **Include** the document(s), as an attachment, in your application. **Documentation that is not included with the application will render that non-lead member ineligible from participating in the coalition, and potentially render the entire application ineligible if there is less than one non-lead member.**

2. Demonstration of Previous RLF Grant Status

Affirm that the applicant has not had, or been a part of, a cooperative agreement for a Brownfields RLF in the past.

Entities with an open cooperative agreement for a Brownfields RLF are not eligible to apply for funding under this solicitation. If the applicant has previously been either a recipient of a Brownfields RLF cooperative agreement or a non-lead member of a coalition that obtained RLF funding, **provide** the grant number and closeout date for the RLF cooperative agreement(s).

[6] The Lobbying Disclosure Act (2 U.S.C. 1601 et. seq.) provides requirements for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government.

3. **Description of RLF Boundary(ies)**
   EPA awards RLF Grants to clean up sites that are located within the geographic boundary(ies) of the RLF's operation as defined in the application. This does not preclude applicants from targeting developers in communities or areas outside the RLF boundary(ies) in their marketing outreach, as long as the loans and subgrants are for cleaning up sites within the boundary(ies) as defined in the application. Applicants must provide a description of the boundary(ies) of their RLF operation (e.g., the city limits of The City of ABC). EPA recommends that applicants choose as large a boundary(ies) as is legally allowable since recipients cannot easily expand their RLF boundary(ies) after selection and award. For example, some regional organizations may operate their RLF within their entire State boundary, and 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations may operate their RLF without regard to jurisdictional boundaries that are applicable to governmental recipients.

   Provide a description of the RLF's geographic boundary(ies). **Note:** For RLF Coalitions, the lead applicant must have the governmental authority over non-lead coalition members (i.e., encompassing jurisdictions), and/or program capacity to ensure adequate program performance of non-lead coalition members, borrowers, and/or subgrantees, if warranted.

4. **Oversight Structure and Legal Authority to Manage a Revolving Loan Fund**
   RLF Grant recipients will be required to comply with all applicable federal and state laws and ensure that the cleanup project protects human health and the environment.

   a. **Describe** how you will ensure adequate oversight of the cleanup at sites. **Indicate** whether you plan to require loan or subgrant recipients to enroll in a State or Tribal response program. If you do not plan to require loan or subgrant recipients to enroll in a State or Tribal response program, or an appropriate state or Tribal response program is not available, you will be required to consult with EPA to ensure cleanups are protective of human health and the environment. Therefore, if you do not plan to require loan or subgrant recipients to enroll in a State or Tribal response program, **provide** a description of the technical expertise you have to conduct, manage, and oversee the cleanups and/or whether you plan to acquire additional technical expertise. See Section 2.B.6. and Section 4.D. for requirements related to obtaining additional technical expertise via a contract or subaward.

   b. **Provide** a legal opinion from your counsel that cites the relevant State law(s) or local ordinance(s) to demonstrate:
      i. you have legal authority to access and secure sites in the event of an emergency or default of a loan agreement or non-performance under a subgrant; and
      ii. you have legal authority to perform the actions necessary to manage a revolving loan fund. At a minimum, legal authority must include the ability to hold funds, make loans, enter into loan agreements, and collect repayments.

      Attach your counsel's legal opinion.

5. **Contractors and Named Subrecipients (other than borrowers and site cleanup subgrantees)**
   Provide information about contractors and named subrecipient eligibility as described below.

Applicants that plan to use contractors and/or subrecipients in their application or the subsequent award should review Section 4.D. to ensure they comply with all applicable competitive procurement and/or subaward requirements.

- **Contractors.**
  State, territory,[7] Tribal, and eligible Tribal entity applicants must **disclose** whether they have already selected/hired a contractor that will be compensated with EPA funds made available under this NOFO and whether they followed the same policies and procedures they use for procurements with non-federal funds.[8] If such policies and procedures do not exist, the applicant must also respond to the requirements below.

  Applicants (other than State, territory, Tribal, and eligible Tribal entity applicants that followed the same policies and procedures they use for procurements with non-federal funds) must **disclose** whether they have already selected a contractor that will be compensated with EPA funds made available under this NOFO and the procurement procedures that were followed to hire the contractor(s). If a contractor(s) has been selected prior to submitting the application to EPA (including when a contractor(s) has been selected under a "dual procurement process" for both grant proposal writing and grant implementation services), applicants must **describe**:

  - information on **where and when** the solicitation document (e.g., Request for Proposals/Request for Qualifications) was posted;
  - the length of time the RFP/RFQ was advertised;
  - the number of firms solicited and the number of offers received and considered; and
  - the name(s) of the firm(s) the applicant entered into contract(s) with.

  Provide a copy of (or link to) the solicitation document(s) and the signed executed contract(s).

  Alternatively, **state** 'n/a' or 'not applicable' if a contractor has not been procured at the time of application submission.

- **Named Subrecipients.**
  The following threshold eligibility requirement does not apply to subrecipients (borrowers and subgrantees) that will receive cleanup funding for specific brownfield sites. EPA will determine the eligibility for named borrowers and subgrantees if the RLF Grant application is selected for funding.

[7] As defined in 2 CFR § 200.1, the definition of State for purposes of federal procurement standards applicable to the Brownfields Program "means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any agency or instrumentality thereof exclusive of local governments."
[8] Consistent with 2 CFR § 200.317, State and Tribal applicants (including eligible Tribal entities) must follow the same policies and procedures they use for procurements with non-federal funds, as well as the requirements in 2 CFR §§200.321, 200.322, 200.323, and 200.327 and 40 CFR Part 33. If such policies and procedures do not exist, then the federal procurement standards at 2 CFR §§ 200.318 through 200.327 apply and must be followed.

All applicants, **describe** how the named subrecipient is eligible for a subaward (e.g., is a nonprofit organization or unit of government). Alternatively, **state** 'n/a' or 'not applicable' if a subrecipient is not named at the time of application submission.

Failure to provide the requested information will result in rejection of the application. EPA staff may contact the applicant to clarify issues or obtain additional information before making a final eligibility determination.

Please see Section 6 for additional information on threshold eligibility review.

C. Cost Sharing

RLF Grant applicants must demonstrate in their application how they will meet the 20% cost share requirement to be considered eligible. Selected recipients must comply with 2 CFR § 200.306 when meeting a cost share requirement.

The cost share is calculated as 20% of the total federal RLF Grant funds awarded. For example, if EPA awards you $1,000,000 of federal RLF Grant funds, you must provide a cost share of an additional $200,000. The cost share may be in the form of a contribution of money, labor, material, or services from a non-federal source. If the cost share is in the form of a contribution of labor, material, or other services, it must be incurred for an eligible and allowable expense under the grant and not for ineligible expenses. Eligible and allowable expenses may include administrative costs borne by the recipient or a third-party to meet its cost share obligation; including indirect costs, subject to the 5% limit on administrative costs. Costs incurred before EPA notifies the applicant of selection are generally not allowable to meet the cost share. See the FY27 FAQs for more information on the cost share requirement.

As provided in 2 CFR § 200.1, voluntary committed cost sharing is when an applicant voluntarily proposes to legally commit to provide costs or contributions to support the project when a cost share is not required. **Voluntary cost share above the required 20% cost share will not be accepted under this competition**.

RLF Grant applicants may petition EPA to waive the cost share requirement if meeting a cost share will place an undue hardship. EPA will consider hardship waiver requests submitted with the application on a case-by-case basis and intends to approve such requests on an **extremely limited basis**. EPA will only consider hardship waiver requests at the time of application. Applicants **must** include the cost share in the budget even if applying for a cost share waiver. If the applicant is successful and the cost share waiver is approved, it will be removed in pre-award negotiation.

Insular Territory applicants: The cost share requirement is waived for any RLF Grant projects located in U.S. Territories. This is consistent with the Omnibus Territories Act of 1977, which authorizes Departments and Agencies to award grants to Insular Territories, such as the U.S. Virgin Islands, without a cost share requirement. Requests for waivers from the cost share requirement are not required for projects located within U.S. Territories.

a. **Describe** how you will meet the required cost share, including the sources of the funding or services, as required for this RLF Grant.

b. Applicants requesting a hardship waiver of the entire cost share, or a portion of the cost share, must **attach** a justification for the waiver request, up to two pages, titled "Hardship Waiver Request." The justification should include whether the proposed project(s) could still proceed if the cost share waiver was not approved and relevant data such as:

- unemployment rate;
- per capita income;
- data demonstrating substantial out-migration or population loss;
- data demonstrating underemployment, that is, employment of workers at less than full-time or at less skilled tasks than their training or abilities permit;
- local natural or other major disasters or emergencies;
- information regarding extraordinary depletion of natural resources;
- closure or restructuring of industrial firms and negative effects of changing trade patterns;
- whether you are located in a President-declared disaster area (declared within 18 months of the submission date for your application); and/or
- whether you have exhausted effective taxing (for governmental entities only) and borrowing capacity.

Where available, applicants must supply data derived from the most recent American Community Survey ("ACS") published by the U.S. Census Bureau. In cases where such data are not available, applicants may provide data from other sources (including data available from the Census Bureau and the Bureaus of Economic Analysis, Labor Statistics, Indian Affairs, or other federal sources). In cases where no federal data is available, applicants may submit the most recent data available through their State, Tribal, or local government. Cite all sources for data provided.

Successful applicants will be notified at the time of the grant announcement if their cost share waiver request was approved. Approval of a cost share waiver does not increase the amount of funding that will be provided by EPA in the grant award. Rather, approval of the cost share waiver will relieve the selected applicant of the responsibility for providing the cost share amount for the grant award.

3. Program Description

A. Purpose, Priorities, and Activities

1. Purpose

EPA's Brownfields and Land Revitalization Program provides funds to empower States, Tribal Nations, communities, and nonprofit organizations to prevent, inventory, assess, clean up, and reuse brownfield sites.

A **brownfield site is defined** in CERCLA § 101(39) as real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, controlled substance, petroleum, or petroleum product, or is mine-scarred land.[9]

[9] The *Understanding Brownfields Fact Sheet Series* is available at www.epa.gov/brownfields/understanding-brownfields.

A critical part of EPA's Brownfields and Land Revitalization Program is to ensure that residents living in communities historically affected by economic disinvestment, health disparities, and environmental contamination have an opportunity to benefit from brownfields redevelopment. EPA's Brownfields and Land Revitalization Program is committed to helping communities revitalize brownfield properties, mitigate potential health risks, and restore economic vitality.

As described in Section 6 of this announcement, applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant demonstrates: a vision for the cleanup, reuse, and redevelopment of brownfield sites and a strategy for leveraging resources to help accomplish the vision; the environmental, social, health, and economic needs and benefits of the target area(s); strong community engagement; reasonable costs, eligible tasks, and appropriate use of grant funding; the capacity for managing and successfully implementing the cooperative agreement; and other factors.

For examples of grant project accomplishments across the country, please see the EPA Brownfield Grant Recipients Success Stories.

Some features of the RLF Grants are:

- RLF programs are designed to operate for many years (possibly decades) and as such, they require long-term resource commitments by the RLF Grant recipients and ongoing reporting to EPA, even after the RLF Grants are closed.

- Recipients need to have a strong understanding of real estate financing principles and approaches, including loan underwriting, loan servicing, and credit analysis.

- Recipients need to have the ability to market the RLF program on an ongoing basis during the performance period of the grant and after the closeout of the RLF Grant.

- Recipients must commit to properly manage funds and program income generated by their RLF program in perpetuity, unless they terminate their Closeout Agreement (COA) and return any remaining program income to EPA. Program income for the RLF shall be defined as the gross income received by the recipient, directly generated by the cooperative agreement award, or earned while the cooperative agreement and/or COA are in effect. Program income includes principal repayments, interest earned on outstanding loan principal, interest earned on accounts holding RLF program income not needed for immediate lending, all loan fees and loan-related charges received from borrowers, and other income generated from RLF operations, including proceeds from the sale, collection, or liquidations of assets acquired through defaults of loans.
    - The majority of program income is generated from the repayments of loans issued by the RLF program.
    - Advances of cooperative agreement funds and program income must be held in an interest-bearing account. Interest earned on program income is considered additional program income.
    - Loan repayment terms can be short- or long-term, i.e., a few years to decades; hence, the program income can be generated over several years.
    - Program income must be used in accordance with the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement, including the COA. EPA prefers that the program income be used for future loans.

  - Program income may be retained and used after the end of the cooperative agreement in accordance with the recipients' COA. Termination of the cooperative agreement occurs when all payments from EPA have been received and all cleanup activities funded by the cooperative agreement are complete.
  - Program income is governed by 2 CFR §§ 200.307 and 1500.8.

- The award of an RLF Grant is contingent upon the recipient signing and returning the COA to the EPA Project Officer no later than 30 days after award. This COA is based on the FY22 RLF COA template. EPA reserves the right to renegotiate the terms of this RLF COA every five years, in conjunction with the template change (e.g., the earliest next change will be in FY27). If the recipient agrees to continue to operate the RLF under a COA past FY27, the recipient shall work with EPA's Project Officer to update to the latest COA template. Otherwise, the Project Officer and recipient will negotiate a mutually acceptable disposition of unused program income, and an Authorized EPA Official (e.g., Award Official or Grants Management Officer) will modify the COA accordingly. The FY22 RLF COA Template and a fact sheet describing it are available under "RLF Closeout Resources" on the Brownfields Program website.

2. Eligible Uses of Grant Funds

Revolving loan funds are used to provide no-interest or low-interest loans for eligible brownfield cleanups, subgrants for cleanups, and other eligible programmatic costs necessary to manage the RLF. An RLF Grant recipient must use 50% or more of the total award amount (EPA funds plus the applicant's cost share) to provide loans for the cleanup of eligible brownfield sites and associated eligible programmatic costs. The remaining EPA funding may be used for eligible programmatic costs, including issuing and managing subgrants to clean up eligible brownfield sites.

An RLF Grant recipient may discount loans, also referred to as the practice of forgiving a portion of loan principal. For an individual loan, the amount of principal discounted may be any percentage of the total loan amount up to 50%, provided that the total amount of the principal forgiven for that loan shall not exceed $500,000 per site. Eligible entities and nonprofit organizations described in Section 2.A. are eligible for discounted loans. Private, for-profit entities are not eligible for discounted loans. In addition, a discounted loan shall not be used in combination with a subgrant at the same site. The discounted portion of a loan applies toward the subgrant limit described in the previous paragraph.

RLF Grant recipients may not subgrant or provide a discounted loan to themselves (i.e., to clean up a site the RLF recipient itself owns even if the site is owned by another agency within the same unit of government). Unlike intra-governmental loans, intra-governmental subgrants and intra-governmental discounted loans are not allowed under the RLF program. For example, if the RLF recipient is a city, then it cannot subgrant to its city development agency that is subject to the same elected or appointed (i.e., a city manager) chief executive's direct supervision and control. However, if the city redevelopment agency is a separate legal entity that is not subject to the chief executive's direct supervision and control, it may be eligible. These eligibility determinations are made on a case-by-case basis since state and local laws vary widely. However, the RLF Grant recipient may subgrant to other non-lead coalition members if EPA awards an RLF Coalition Grant.

Subgrants are limited to $500,000 per site. Entities receiving RLF subgrants must own the subject site throughout the period of performance of the subgrant, but borrowers are not subject to the same requirement. An RLF Grant recipient cannot make a loan or a subgrant to a party that may be found to be potentially liable for the contamination at the brownfield site, per CERCLA § 107, and the borrower or

subgrantee may not be affiliated with a potentially liable person as described in CERCLA §§ 101(40) and 107(q)(1)(A)(ii). In addition, the RLF Grant recipient may not make a loan or subgrant to clean up a site for which the recipient (or a non-lead coalition member in the case of RLF Coalition Grants) is potentially liable under CERCLA § 107.

Participant Support Costs
Participant support costs, as defined in 2 CFR § 200.1, are allowable under RLF Grants. Examples of potentially allowable participant support costs include stipends for attendees at community meetings, attendee travel to community meetings, or childcare expenses to encourage attendance at community meetings. Please refer to the FY27 FAQs for additional details on the use of participant support costs.

In their project descriptions, applicants should describe the process they will follow for determining the amounts of allowable stipends, procedures for accounting for participant support cost payments (including receipts), and procedures for documenting that the costs are allowable and do not duplicate other support for the individual(s). Additional information on participant support costs is available in EPA's Guidance on Participant Support Costs.

In addition to direct costs associated with the cleanup of a brownfield site, RLF Grant funds may be used for:

i. Direct costs associated with programmatic management of the grant, such as required performance reporting, cleanup oversight, environmental monitoring of cleanup work, and funds management.

   All costs charged to RLF Grants must be consistent with the requirements at 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E.

ii. A local government (as defined in 2 CFR § 200.1, *Local Government*, and summarized in Section 2.A. of these guidelines and the Health Monitoring Fact Sheet) may use up to 10% of its grant funds for the following activities:
   a. health monitoring of populations exposed to hazardous substances from a brownfield site; and
   b. monitoring and enforcement of any institutional control used to prevent human exposure to any hazardous substance from a brownfield site.

iii. A portion of the Brownfields Grant may be used to purchase environmental insurance. (See the FY27 FAQs for additional information on purchasing environmental insurance.)

3. Ineligible Uses of Grant Funds
Grant funds cannot be used for the payment of:

i. Direct costs for proposal preparation;

ii. a penalty or fine;

iii. a federal cost share requirement consistent with 2 CFR § 200.306(b)(5) (i.e., a cost share required by other federal funds unless there is authority in another Federal statute to use Federal funds for cost share);

iv. administrative costs, including all indirect costs and direct costs for grant administration, in excess of five (5) percent of the total award amount (EPA funds plus the recipient's cost share), with the exception of financial and performance reporting costs (which are considered allowable programmatic costs and not subject to the 5% limitation);

v. a response cost at a brownfield site for which the recipient of the grant, subaward, or loan is potentially liable under CERCLA § 107;

vi. a cost of compliance with any federal law, excluding the cost of compliance with laws applicable to the cleanup; or

vii. unallowable costs (e.g., lobbying) under 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E.

See the FY27 FAQs for additional information on ineligible grant activities and unallowable costs.

4. Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outputs/Outcomes

EPA requires that applicants adequately describe environmental outputs (performance measures) and outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements.[10] 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 EPA's goals and objectives described below in Section 3.B.

Applicants are required to describe how funding will help EPA achieve environmental outputs and outcomes in their Narrative Criteria Responses in Section 6.B. Outputs and outcomes specific to each project will be identified as deliverables in the negotiated workplan if the application is selected for award. Recipients will be expected to report progress toward the attainment of expected project outputs and outcomes during the project performance period. Outputs and outcomes are defined as follows:

i. Outputs

The term "outputs" refers to an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work product(s) related to an environmental goal or objective that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during the project period. The expected outputs for the grants awarded under these guidelines may include, but are not limited to, the number of loans and subgrants executed, the number of community meetings held, the number of Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives (ABCA) completed, the number of community involvement and cleanup plans completed, the number of underground storage tanks pulled, and/or the number of cleanups completed.

ii. Outcomes

The term "outcomes" refers to the result, effect, or consequence that will occur from carrying out the activities under the grant. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic; must be qualitative or quantitative, and may not necessarily be achievable during

[10] *EPA Order 5700.7, EPA's Policy for Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements* is available at www.epa.gov/grants/epa-order-57007a1-epas-policy-environmental-results-under-epa-assistance-agreements.

the project period. Expected outcomes of Brownfield Grants include the number of jobs created and funding leveraged through the economic reuse of sites; the number of acres made ready for reuse; acres of greenspace created for communities; and the minimized exposure to hazardous substances and petroleum contamination.

EPA will evaluate whether recipients have made sufficient progress in implementing the environmental outputs outlined in the cooperative agreement two years from the date of award. Additional details on sufficient progress and Brownfield Programmatic Requirements are in Section 8.D.

5. Leveraging

Leveraging is generally when an applicant commits to contributing additional funds or resources, either from its own assets or from third-party sources, such as private organizations or other federal grants, to support or complement the project they are seeking to fund. This contribution goes above and beyond the financial support provided by the EPA grant funds awarded and is intended to amplify the project's impact. Leveraging demonstrates the applicant's ability to secure and utilize supplementary resources to achieve greater outcomes.

Leveraged resources are not the same as voluntary committed cost sharing under 2 CFR § 200.1. Leveraged resources are funds, services, or in-kind support that complement the project but are not a binding cost share commitment and are not part of the EPA assistance agreement budget. They may occur during the period of performance or after the grant ends. Applicants that wish to include leveraged resources should describe them and their sources in the Narrative Criteria Responses. Applicants must not include leveraged resources in the project budget - they are not part of the budget, and the costs do not have to be eligible or allowable. By contrast, voluntary committed cost sharing, which is prohibited under this funding opportunity, is a binding commitment that becomes part of the award budget and must meet all eligibility and allowability requirements. Under this solicitation, applicants must not propose a voluntary cost share above the required 20% cost share.

- **Leveraging that will materialize during the grant:** Leveraging that typically materializes during a Brownfields Grant period of performance includes an applicant's leveraged resources that are needed to support or complement the grant.[11] Examples include additional public or private funds or in-kind resources for assessment, remediation, and/or subsequent reuse of the site. If applicants propose to provide leveraged funds/resources, EPA expects them to make the effort to secure the leveraged resources described in their Narrative Criteria Responses. If the proposed leveraging does not materialize during grant performance, then EPA may reconsider the legitimacy of the award and/or take other appropriate action as authorized by CERCLA § 104(k)(8)(C) and 2 CFR § 200.339 and 2 CFR Part 1500. The grant workplan must include a statement indicating that the applicant is expected to produce the proposed leveraging consistent with the terms of the announcement and the applicant's Narrative Criteria Responses.

- **Leveraging that will materialize after the Brownfields Grant has ended:** Examples of leveraging that typically materialize after the Brownfields Grant has ended include resources for remediation, infrastructure updates, and reuse.[12]

[11] If an applicant proposes to contribute leveraged resources to support or complement the grant, EPA will evaluate responses to the *3.b. Project Implementation* criterion.

[12] EPA will evaluate an applicant's responses to criteria *1.f. Resources Needed for Site Reuse* and *1.g. Use of Existing Infrastructure*.

B. Program Goals and Objectives

The activities to be funded under this funding announcement support Goal 1 of EPA's Strategic Plan and are aligned with all current executive orders, including Executive Order 14154 Unleashing American Energy and Executive Order 14332 Improving Oversight of Federal Grantmaking. The objectives of this funding opportunity are to advance EPA's mission to protect human health and the environment by supporting efforts to ensure access to clean air, land, and water; reduce toxic emissions; clean up hazardous sites; promote conservation; and improve emergency response capabilities to help communities recover quickly and safely. EPA expects funded activities to ensure the efficient and effective use of Federal resources in support of these mission-driven objectives.

The goal of the Brownfields and Land Revitalization Program is to provide grants to communities, States, Tribes, and others to assess and clean up contaminated properties with the aim of facilitating their sustainable reuse.

C. Statutory Authority

CERCLA was amended by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act in 2002 to include Section 104(k), which provides federal financial assistance authorities for brownfields revitalization, including grants for assessment, cleanup, and revolving loan funds. The Brownfields Utilization, Investment, and Local Development (BUILD) Act (Public Law 115-141) enacted in 2018 reauthorized EPA's Brownfields and Land Revitalization Program and made additional amendments to CERCLA that affect EPA's brownfield grant authorities, and ownership and liability provisions. (Note: References to CERCLA in this funding opportunity refer to CERCLA as amended by the 2002 Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act and the 2018 BUILD Act.)

The statutory authority for assistance agreements expected to be awarded by EPA under this announcement is CERCLA § 104(k)(3).

D. Funding Type

It is anticipated that cooperative agreements will be funded under this funding opportunity.

Cooperative agreements provide for substantial involvement between the EPA Project Officer and the selected applicant(s) in the performance of the work supported. Although EPA will negotiate precise terms and conditions relating to substantial involvement as part of the award process, the anticipated substantial federal involvement for these projects may include, but is not limited to:

- Close monitoring of the successful applicant's performance to verify the results proposed by the applicant.
- Collaboration during performance of the scope of work, including participation in project activities, to the extent permissible under EPA policies. Examples of collaboration include:
    - Consultation between EPA staff and the recipients on effective methods of carrying out the scope of work provided the recipient makes the final decision on how to perform authorized activities.
    - Advice from EPA staff on how to access publicly available information on EPA or other federal agency websites.
    - With the consent of the recipient, EPA staff may provide technical advice to recipient contractors or subrecipients provided the recipient approves any expenditures of funds

necessary to follow advice from EPA staff. (The recipient remains accountable for performing contract and subaward management as specified in 2 CFR §§ 200.317, 200.318, and 200.332, as well as the terms of the EPA cooperative agreement.)
    - EPA staff participation in meetings, webinars, and similar events upon the request of the recipient or in connection with a co-sponsorship agreement.
- Reviewing and approving Quality Assurance Project Plans and related documents or verifying that appropriate Quality Assurance requirements have been met where quality assurance activities are being conducted pursuant to an EPA-approved Quality Assurance Management Plan.
- In accordance with 2 CFR § 200.325, review of proposed procurements, as well as the substantive terms of proposed contracts or subawards as appropriate. This may include reviewing requests for proposals, invitations for bids, scopes of work, and/or plans and specifications for contracts over the simplified acquisition threshold prior to advertising for bids.
- Approving qualifications of key personnel (EPA does not have the authority to and will not select employees or contractors employed by the award recipient).
- Review and comment on reports prepared under the cooperative agreement (the final decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient).
- Reviewing and approving that the Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives (ABCA), or equivalent State Brownfields program document, meets the Brownfields and Land Revitalization Program's requirements for an ABCA.
- Verifying sites meet applicable site eligibility criteria and ensuring that sites are consistent with the selection criteria outlined in the workplan.
- Monitoring the use of program income after the cooperative agreement project period ends.
- Participation in periodic telephone conference calls to share ideas, project successes and challenges, etc., with EPA.

4. Application Contents and Format

All application materials must be in English. The Application Information Sheet and the Narrative Criteria Responses must be typed, single-spaced, on letter-sized (8.5 x 11-inch) paper, and should **use standard Times New Roman, Arial, or Calibri fonts with a 12-point font size**. The Application Submission Checklist below outlines the documents that must be submitted to complete the application package. Extraneous materials, including photos, graphics, and attachments not listed, will not be considered.

A. Application Forms (Submission Checklist)

The following forms and documents are required under this announcement:

Mandatory Documents:[13]

1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)
2. Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)
3. EPA Key Contacts Form 5700-54
4. EPA Form 4700-4 Preaward Compliance Review Report [Guidance on how to complete this form is available at www.epa.gov/grants/tips-completing-epa-form-4700-4.]
5. Project Narrative Attachment Form: use this to submit the following as one file, if possible

[13] FY27 sample federal forms are available on the MARC Grant Application Resources webpage under open solicitations.

- **Application Information Sheet** (3-page limit, single-spaced)
- **Application Information Sheet Attachment**: Letter from the State or Tribal environmental authority (see Section 4.B.10.)
- **Narrative Criteria Responses** as described in Section 6.B. (12-page limit, single-spaced)
- **Threshold Eligibility Criteria Responses and Documentation** as described in Section 2.B.:
  - A statement of applicant eligibility if a village, town, city, county, State, or Tribe (and non-lead coalition member eligibility, if applicable) (see Section 2.B.1.)
  - Documentation of applicant eligibility if other than a village, town, city, county, State, or Tribe; e.g., resolutions, statutes, Intertribal Consortium documentation, or documentation of 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status or qualified community development entity (and documentation for each non-lead coalition member, if applicable) (see Section 2.B.1.)
  - A statement of the applicant's 501(c)(4) tax-exempt status and, if applicable, legal opinion regarding lobbying activities (and for each non-lead coalition member, if applicable) (see Section 2.B.1.)
  - **For RLF Coalitions:** A signed letter of commitment from each non-lead coalition member or an active Memorandum of Agreement (see Section 2.B.1.)
  - Demonstration of Previous RLF Grant Status (see Section 2.B.2.)
  - Description of RLF Boundary(ies) (see Section 2.B.3.)
  - Description of cleanup oversight (see Section 2.B.4.a.)
  - Legal opinion establishing that the applicant has authority to
    (1) access and secure sites in the event of an emergency or default of a loan agreement or non-performance under a subgrant; and
    (2) make loans and accept payments of fees, interest, and principal (see Section 2.B.4.b.)
  - Discussion on contractors and named subrecipients; or an affirmative statement that a contractor has not been procured and/or a subrecipient has not been named (see Section 2.B.5.)
  - A copy of (or link to) the solicitation documents and the signed executed contract, as applicable (see Section 2.B.5.)
- **Required Cost Share**
  - Discussion on how the cost share will be met; and a cost share waiver request, if applicable (see Section 2.C.)

Optional Documents:

6. Grants.gov Lobbying Form – To be submitted by applicants requesting **more than** $100,000 of EPA grant funding.
7. Other Attachments Form – Negotiated/Proposed Indirect Cost Rate Agreement – To be submitted using the Other Attachments Form by applicants proposing to charge indirect costs to the EPA grant. Please note that applicants may budget for indirect costs pending approval of their Indirect Cost Rate Agreement by the cognizant Federal agency or an exception granted by EPA under section 6.3 or 6.4 of EPA's Indirect Cost Policy for Recipients of EPA Assistance Agreements. However, recipients may not draw down indirect costs until their rate is approved or EPA approves an exception.

Recommended Resources:

Applicants are encouraged to refer to EPA's:

1. Pre-recorded video on the grant submission process, Application Information Sheet, and threshold eligibility requirements for FY27 RLF Grants.
2. National Outreach Webinar on the FY27 Narrative Criteria Responses for RLF Grants.
3. Applicant Resources listed under General Program Resources and Open Solicitations
4. Technical Assistance to Brownfields Communities (TAB) Provider assistance with preparing a grant application.

B. Application Information Sheet

The Application Information Sheet should address the information below and shall not exceed three single-spaced pages. Do not include a summary or overview of your Narrative Criteria Responses/project. Any pages submitted over the page limit or information beyond what is requested below will not be considered and may be redacted. EPA does not consider information in the Application Information Sheet to be Narrative Criteria Responses. Provide the Application Information Sheet on the applicant's official letterhead. You will not be penalized if you provide this information to EPA in a different format.

1. Applicant Identification: Provide the name and full address of the entity applying for funds. This is the agency or organization that will receive the grant and be accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds.

2. Website URL: Provide the website URL of your organization (and for each non-lead coalition member, if applicable). If selected for funding, EPA will include the link to your website on the Brownfields Grant Factsheet Tool.

3. Funding Requested:
   a. Grant Type: Indicate "Individual RLF" or "RLF Coalition."

   b. Federal Funds Requested:
      i. $_____ (Include the amount being requested from EPA; must not exceed $1,000,000. Do not include the amount the applicant will contribute toward the cost share.)
      ii. Indicate if you are requesting a waiver of the 20% cost share requirement.

4. RLF Boundary(ies):
   Provide the geographic boundary(ies) of the a) city(ies), b) county(ies), and c) state or reservation, Tribally owned lands, Tribal fee lands, etc., of the community(ies) that you propose to serve. For RLF Coalition Grants, list all the non-lead members and describe the geographic boundaries to be covered by the coalition members under the application.

5. Target Area and Priority Site Information:
   - List the target area(s) discussed in the Narrative Criteria Responses.
   - Provide the address(es) of the priority site(s) proposed in the Narrative Criteria Responses.
   - (Optional) As a separate one-page attachment, you may include a map to visually depict the target area(s) and/or priority site(s). Do not include any additional information or data on the map. Maps will not be evaluated and will not count against the 3-page limit. Applicants that do not include a map will not be penalized.

6. Contacts:
   a. Project Director: Provide the name, phone number, email address, and mailing address of the Project Director assigned to this proposed project. This person should be the main point of contact for the project and should be the person responsible for the project's day-to-day operations. The Project Director may be contacted if other information is needed.

   b. Chief Executive/Highest-Ranking Elected Official: Provide the name, phone number, email address, and mailing address of the applicant's Chief Executive or highest-ranking elected official. For example, if your organization is a municipal form of government, provide this information for the Mayor or County Commissioner. Otherwise, provide this information for your organization's Executive Director or President. These individuals may be contacted if other information is needed.

7. Population:
   - If you are a city/town/village, provide the population of your jurisdiction.
   - If you are a county/parish/borough, State, or regional organization that covers a geographic area with more than one city/town, provide the population of the city(ies)/town(s) in which each priority site/target area is located.
   - If you are a nonprofit organization exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) or a qualified community development entity, provide the population of the city(ies)/town(s) in which each priority site is located.
   - If you are a Tribe, provide the number of Tribal/non-tribal members affected.

   Population data can be found at www.census.gov.

8. Other Factors: Applicants claiming one or more of the other factors below must provide a summary in the Narrative Criteria Responses on the applicable other factor(s). Please identify which of the below items apply to your community/proposed project by noting the corresponding Narrative Criteria Responses page number. **If none of the Other Factors apply to your community/proposed project, please provide a statement to that effect**. EPA may verify this information prior to selection.

Sample Format for Providing Information on the Other Factors	**Page #**
Community population is 15,000 or less.	
The applicant is, or will assist, a federally recognized Indian Tribe or United States Territory.	
The priority site(s) is impacted by mine-scarred land.	
The priority site(s) is adjacent to a body of water (i.e., the border of the priority site(s) is contiguous or partially contiguous to the body of water, or would be contiguous or partially contiguous with a body of water but for a street, road, or other public thoroughfare separating them).	
The priority site(s) is in a federally designated flood plain.	
The reuse of the priority site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy.	
The reuse of the priority site(s) will incorporate energy efficiency measures.	
The proposed project will improve local resilience to the impacts of extreme weather events and natural disasters.	
The target area(s) is impacted by a coal-fired power plant that has recently closed (2016 or later) or is closing.	

9. Releasing Copies of Applications:
   To support transparency, EPA may make copies of applications submitted under this NOFO publicly available on the Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization website or another public website for approximately 3 months after selected applications are announced. EPA recommends that you do not include confidential business information (CBI) or trade secrets in your application. Additionally, do not include information that would invade someone's personal privacy (e.g., an individual's salary, personal email address, etc.).

   If the application does not include CBI, state 'n/a' or 'not applicable.'

   Applicants that include CBI in their application must make CBI claims at the time of application submission as follows:
   - **Clearly mark the specific sections/pages you claim as CBI (e.g., with a cover sheet, a stamped or typed legend, or another appropriate notice) to help EPA identify and handle them.**
   - **Use terms such as "trade secret," "proprietary," or "confidential" as per 40 CFR § 2.203(b).**
   - **If confidentiality is needed only until a specific date or event, state that date or event.**

   Information covered by a CBI claim will be treated in accordance with, and disclosed only to the extent, and by means of the procedures, set forth in 40 CFR Part 2, Subpart B. If information is not marked as CBI when EPA receives it, EPA may make it public without further notice. See 40 CFR § 2.203(a)(2), 41 Fed. Reg. 36,907.

10. Letter from the State or Tribal Environmental Authority (not included in the three-page limit):
    For an applicant other than a State or Tribal environmental authority, attach a current letter from the appropriate State or Tribal environmental authority (or equivalent State or Tribal regulatory oversight authority) acknowledging that the applicant plans to conduct RLF activities and is planning to apply for FY27 EPA Brownfields Grant funds. Letters regarding applications from prior years will not be accepted.

    If you are applying for more than one type of grant, one acknowledgment letter from your State or Tribal environmental authority is sufficient, but you must attach a copy of that letter to each application. Please note that general correspondence and documents evidencing State involvement with the project (i.e., State enforcement orders or State notice letters) will not be accepted. Coordinate early with your State or Tribal environmental authority in order to allow adequate time for you to obtain the acknowledgment letter and include it in your application.

C. Narrative Criteria Outline

Section 6.B. provides detailed instructions for what to include in the Narrative Criteria Responses. These responses should address the Review Criteria that are also listed in Section 6.B. You may use the outline below to organize your responses. The Narrative Criteria Responses, including citations, must not exceed 12 single-spaced pages.

This section also includes sample format tables that applicants may use to present all or a portion of their response. Applicants that do not use the sample format tables will not be penalized.

1. PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION AND PLANS FOR REVITALIZATION

Target Area and Brownfields

a. Overview of Brownfield Challenges and Description of Target Area
b. Description of the Priority Brownfield Site(s)
c. Identification and Prioritization of Additional Site(s)

Revitalization of the Target Area

d. Reuse Strategy and Alignment with Revitalization Plans
e. Outcomes and Benefits of Reuse Strategy

Strategy for Leveraging Resources

f. Resources Needed for Site Reuse
g. Use of Existing Infrastructure

2. COMMUNITY NEED AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community Need

a. The Community's Need for Funding
b. Health or Welfare of Sensitive Populations
c. Greater Than Normal Incidence of Disease and Adverse Health Conditions
d. Disaster Preparedness

Community Engagement

To conserve space, you may present information for 2.e. – 2.f. in the same response and/or use the suggested table format below.

e. Program Involvement
f. Program Roles

Sample Format for List of Organizations/Entities/Groups & Roles

Name of organization/entity/group	Entity's mission	Point of contact (name & email)	Specific decision-making role or contribution to the program
Add rows as needed			

g. Incorporating Community Input

3. TASK DESCRIPTIONS, COST ESTIMATES, AND MEASURING PROGRESS

Program Description and Marketing Strategy

a. Program Management
b. Revolution of the RLF Program
c. Marketing Strategy

Description of Tasks/Activities and Outputs

To conserve space, you may present information for 3.d. – 3.g. in the same response and/or use the suggested table format below.

d. Program Implementation
e. Anticipated Project Schedule
f. Task/Activity Lead
g. Outputs

Sample Format for Tasks/Activities and Outputs

Task/Activity:
d. Program Implementation ▪ EPA-funded tasks/activities: ▪ Non-EPA grant resources needed to carry out tasks/activities, if applicable:
e. Anticipated Project Schedule:
f. Task/Activity Lead:
g. Outputs:

Cost Estimates and Plan to Measure and Evaluate

h. Cost Estimates

You may use the sample table format below to present how you plan to allocate grant funds for tasks/activities described in Section 6.B.3. by budget category. Replace the task number heading in the sample table with the actual title of the task.

Only include costs to be covered by EPA grant funds and the required cost share in this table. Leveraged resources should not be included in the budget table.

Sample Format for Budget (do not change Budget Categories)

Budget Categories		Project Tasks ($)				
		(Task 1)	(Task 2)	(Task 3)	Administrative Costs	**Total**
Direct Costs	Personnel					
	Fringe Benefits					
	Travel[1]					
	Equipment[2]					
	Supplies					
	Contractual					
	Construction[3]	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
	Other - Loans (must be at least 50% of the total award amount)[4]					
	Other - Subgrants					
	Other Direct Costs (specify type) ____					
Total Direct Costs[5]						
Indirect Costs[5]						
Total Federal Funding (not to exceed $1,000,000)						
Cost share (20% of requested federal funds)[6]						
Total Budget (Total Direct Costs + Indirect Costs + Cost Share)						

[1] Travel to brownfields-related training conferences is an acceptable use of these grant funds.
[2] EPA defines equipment as items that cost $10,000 or more with a useful life of more than one year unless the applicant has a lower threshold for equipment costs. Items costing less than $10,000 (e.g., laptop computers) are considered supplies. Generally, equipment is not required for Brownfield Grants.
[3] The Construction budget line must be $0 for RLF Grant applicants. Direct cleanup and other construction activities are not eligible under the RLF Program. See the FY27 FAQs for more information.
[4] At least 50% of the total award amount (i.e., EPA funds for the RLF Grant plus the applicant's cost share) must be used to provide loans for the cleanup of eligible brownfield sites and for associated eligible programmatic costs (see FY27 FAQs for an example).
[5] Administrative costs (direct and/or indirect) for the RLF Grant applicant itself cannot exceed 5% of the total award amount (EPA funds plus the applicant's cost share). All indirect costs are considered administrative and are therefore subject to the 5% administrative limit.
[6] Applicants must include the cost share in the budget even if applying for a cost share waiver (see Section 2.C. for details). If the applicant is successful and the cost share waiver is approved, it will be removed in pre-award negotiation.

i. Plan to Measure and Evaluate Environmental Progress and Results

4. PROGRAMMATIC CAPABILITY AND PAST PERFORMANCE

Programmatic Capability

To conserve space, you may present information for 4.a. – 4.c. in the same response.

a. Organizational Capacity
b. Organizational Structure
c. Description of Key Staff
d. Acquiring Additional Resources

Past Performance and Accomplishments

e. Currently Has or Previously Received an EPA Brownfields Grant That Closed in 2016 or Later
   (1) Accomplishments
   (2) Compliance with Grant Requirements

– OR –

f. Has Not Received an EPA Brownfields Grant but has Received Other Federal or Non-Federal Financial Assistance Agreements That Closed in 2016 or Later
   (1) Purpose and Accomplishments
   (2) Compliance with Grant Requirements

– OR –

g. No or Limited Financial Assistance Agreements

D. Applicants Using Contractors and/or Subrecipients

Contractors

EPA does not require or encourage applicants to procure contractors (including consultants) before the EPA cooperative agreement is awarded, but applicants may choose to do so.

Applicants, other than State (which includes territories)[14] or Tribal applicants,[15] that have procured a contractor(s) where the amount of the contract will be more than the micro-purchase threshold in 2 CFR § 200.320(a)(1) must demonstrate how the contractor (including consultants) was selected in compliance with the fair and open competition requirements in 2 CFR Part 200 and 2 CFR Part 1500. EPA provides guidance on complying with the competition requirements in the Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements and the Brownfields Grants: Guidance on Competitively Procuring a Contractor. For example:

- EPA will not accept sole source justifications for procurement contracts for services such as environmental consulting, engineering, and remediation that are available in the commercial marketplace.

[14] As defined in 2 CFR § 200.1, the definition of State for purposes of federal procurement standards applicable to the Brownfields Program "means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any agency or instrumentality thereof exclusive of local governments."

[15] Consistent with 2 CFR § 200.317, State and Tribal applicants (including eligible Tribal entities) must follow the same policies and procedures they use for procurements with non-federal funds, as well as the requirements in 2 CFR §§200.321, 200.322, 200.323, and 200.327 and 40 CFR Part 33. If such policies and procedures do not exist, then the federal procurement standards at 2 CFR §§ 200.318 through 200.327 apply and must be followed.

- Firms or individual consultants that develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids or requests for proposals must be excluded from competing for such procurements as provided in 2 CFR § 200.319(b).

- Consistent with 2 CFR § 200.320(b)(2)(iii), when the value of a procurement transaction exceeds the simplified acquisition threshold, price generally must be an evaluation factor in the review of proposals or quotes.

Note, unless the exception discussed above applies, regardless of whether the solicitation is issued as a Request for Proposals or a Request for Qualifications, price reasonableness for the grant implementation work must be a selection factor in the evaluation of proposals or quotes. See the Brownfields Grants: Guidance on Competitively Procuring a Contractor for additional guidance.

Successful applicants that procure a contractor(s) after being advised by EPA of selection, but prior to award, must describe how they complied with the procurement procedures described above when submitting the final workplan for the award.

Recipients of EPA funding that select a contractor(s) after award must fully comply with the procurement standards at 2 CFR Part 200, 2 CFR Part 1500, and 40 CFR Part 33.

If EPA determines that the process an applicant completed to select a contractor was not compliant with the federal regulations in 2 CFR Part 200, 2 CFR Part 1500, and 40 CFR Part 33, and the application is selected for funding, the applicant may need to prepare and issue a new RFP/RFQ that is compliant with federal procurement regulations. Additionally, EPA may review the new RFP/RFQ and selection process to ensure compliance with fair and open competition requirements. Please see the FY27 FAQs for additional guidance.

Subrecipients
EPA does not require or encourage applicants to name a specific subrecipient(s) in the application for Brownfields Grant funding. However, if an applicant chooses to identify a specific subrecipient(s) to conduct work proposed in this application, the applicant must comply with the following requirements even if the entity is referred to as a "partner" in the application.

Successful applicants that do not name a specific subrecipient(s) in their application but identify a subrecipient(s) after being advised of selection, must also comply with the requirements described below.

All applicants, including States, territories, and Tribes, that name a specific subrecipient in this application must demonstrate that the subrecipient is eligible for a subaward in compliance with Appendix A of EPA's Subaward Policy for EPA Assistance Agreement Recipients. This policy provides, among other things, that transactions between recipients and for-profit firms and individual consultants are procurement contracts rather than subawards when the transaction involves the acquisition of services from the firm or individual. For additional guidance, applicants should review EPA's Subaward Policy Frequent Questions.

Refer to EPA's NOFO Clause Section IV.E. "Coalitions, Contracts, and Subawards" for additional guidance on these requirements which must be met for all contractors (except for micro-purchases as described above) and/or subrecipients specifically named in the application.

5. Submission Requirements and Deadlines

A. Submission Dates and Times

January 21, 2027 11:59 pm ET Application Submission Deadline

Grants.gov creates a date and time record when it receives the application. If you submit the same application more than once, we will accept the last on-time submission.

B. Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) and System for Award Management (SAM.gov)

SAM.gov

You must have an active account with SAM.gov. SAM.gov will provide a UEI for your organization, which is required to apply for grants using Grants.gov. To register, go to SAM.gov Entity Registration and click Get Started. From the same page, you can also click on the Entity Registration Checklist for the information you will need to register. Make sure you are current with SAM.gov and UEI requirements before applying for the award.

SAM.gov registration can take several weeks. Begin that process today.

Grants.gov

You must also have an active account with Grants.gov. You can see step-by-step instructions at the Grants.gov Quick Start Guide for Applicants.

Please visit How to Register to Apply for Grants for additional information.

C. Submission Instructions

You must submit your application through Grants.gov. See Section 5.B. above for information on getting registered. The registration process for all the above items **may take a month or more to complete.**

Important tips:

- 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.
- See the Quick Start Guide for Applicants for instructions on how to submit.
- Make sure your application passes the Grants.gov validation checks.
- Do not encrypt, zip, or password protect any files.
- Your application must be submitted by an official representative of your organization who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal financial assistance.
- If you receive an error or the 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 for assistance at 1-800-518-4726 or support@grants.gov.
- See Grants.gov Errors for information on other Grants.gov errors.
- 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.

D. Technical Issues with Submission

Applicants that experience technical issues during the submission of an application and are unable to submit through Grants.gov must follow the below procedures **before** the application deadline for EPA to consider accepting the application outside of Grants.gov

1. Contact the appropriate help desk before the deadline:
    - Grants.gov Support Center for Grants.gov issues
    - Federal Service Desk for SAM.gov registration issues

2. Before the deadline, send an email to brownfields@epa.gov with EPA-OLEM-OBLR-26-05 in the subject line. Include the following information:
    - Grants.gov ticket/case number(s)
    - Full copy of Federal Service Desk ticket(s), if applicable
    - Description of the issue
    - The entire application package as described in Section 4.A. in PDF format.

The EPA will decide whether to accept applications submitted via email on a **case by case basis** and will only consider exceptions for:

- **Grants.gov or SAM.gov system issues**
- **Unforeseen emergencies**, such as extreme weather affecting internet access

Not registering on time is **not** a valid reason to justify acceptance of an application outside of Grants.gov.

Important:

- If any of the above information is missing, the EPA may not review the request.
- Applications submitted after the deadline will be ineligible.
- Submitting through Grants.gov or email does not guarantee eligibility.

Limited Internet Access: Applicants with limited or no access to the internet may request an exception by following the procedures outlined here. The request must be received at least 15 calendar days before the application due date to allow enough time to negotiate alternative submission methods.

E. Intergovernmental Review

Intergovernmental review is applicable to this assistance listing when proposed Federal financial assistance involves land use planning or construction associated with demonstration projects.

If the application includes land use planning or construction, applicants may need to submit application information for Intergovernmental Review. Some States have adopted Single Points of Contact (SPOC) for coordinating the review.

See the FY27 FAQs for more information.

This requirement does not apply to American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes or Tribal organizations.

6. Application Review Information

A. Responsiveness Review

Applications must meet the eligibility requirements described in Section 2 to be evaluated. Applicants not meeting these requirements will be deemed ineligible and will be notified within 15 calendar days of the determination.

- Applications must adhere to the page limit requirements. Any pages over the limit(s) in Section 4 will not be reviewed.
- Initial applications must be submitted *on or before* the application deadline through Grants.gov or through limited circumstances as expressed in Section 5. EPA will not evaluate applications that are not submitted on time.
- *Technical difficulties applying:* Applicants having technical difficulties applying must contact the Grants.gov hotline at 1-800-518-4726 *and* then must email a PDF of the full application to the EPA contact listed in Section 1. The submission must be received prior to the application deadline for consideration.

B. Narrative Criteria Responses and Review Criteria

The Narrative Criteria Responses must provide clear, concise, and factually correct responses to all criteria and sub-criteria below, with sufficient detail to allow for an evaluation of the application's merits. **A response to a criterion/sub-criterion that is included in a different section of the Narrative** Criteria Responses **may not be scored as favorably**. If a criterion does not apply, clearly state this. **Any criterion left unanswered may result in zero points given for that criterion.** Responses should include the criteria number and title but need not restate the entire text of the criteria.

If selected for funding, the information in your Narrative Criteria Responses will be incorporated into the workplan, subject to any adjustments to clarify issues with carrying out the project's scope of work made during the post-selection negotiation process. The workplan is a legally binding document. Therefore, applicants should carefully consider and accurately respond to the criteria, including the identification of the geographic boundary(ies) (which will become the boundary(ies) in which work can be performed), target area(s), criteria used to select additional sites, use of grant funds, and leveraged resources committed to the project that will materialize during the period of performance. EPA may not permit material changes to the workplan.

Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate that they have the capability to successfully perform the project as described in Section 3 of this funding opportunity.

Only eligible entities whose applications meet the threshold eligibility criteria in Section 2 of this announcement will be evaluated. **Applicants should explicitly address these criteria as part of their application package submittal in the Narrative Criteria Responses.** Each application will be rated using a point system. Applications will be evaluated based on a total of 185 possible points.

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***

1. PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION AND PLANS FOR REVITALIZATION

45 Points

Target Area and Brownfields	
1.a. Overview of Brownfield Challenges and Description of Target Area (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Identify the geographic boundary(ies)[16] for the proposed grant activities and discuss the brownfield challenges and their impacts. Briefly explain how this grant may help address these challenges and impacts. • Within the geographic boundary(ies), identify and describe the target area(s) for the focused grant activities, such as a neighborhood, district, corridor, or census tract. *(Depending on the scope and design of your program, one or more target areas may be presented.)*	The degree to which the identified brownfield challenges impact the target area(s) within the geographic boundary(ies). The extent to which the proposed grant activities may help address these challenges and impacts.
1.b. Description of the Priority Brownfield Site(s) (10 points)	
Applicants should: • Provide an overview of the brownfield sites in the target area(s) with information such as the estimated number of sites, size, and environmental concerns. • Highlight one or more priority sites and discuss why the site(s) is prioritized for cleanup and reuse. Include information such as past and current land uses, current site conditions (including structures), and potentially related environmental issues.	The degree to which it is clear why the priority site(s) were selected for cleanup and reuse among the known brownfield sites in the target area(s).
1.c. Identification and Prioritization of Additional Site(s) (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe the process you will use to identify additional sites for eligible RLF activities within the geographic boundary(ies) identified in *1.a. Overview of Brownfield Challenges and Description of Target Area* if grant funds remain after addressing the target area(s)/priority site(s). • Identify the criteria for prioritizing additional sites.	The extent to which the process to identify additional sites for eligible RLF activities within the geographic boundary(ies), including the criteria for prioritizing additional sites, is well-defined and reasonable.

[16] The geographic boundary may be the jurisdiction of a unit of government.

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
Revitalization of the Target Area	
1.d. Reuse Strategy and Alignment with Revitalization Plans (10 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe the reuse strategy, or projected reuse, for the priority site(s) and discuss how it aligns with and advances the local government's land use and revitalization plans, or related community priorities.	The extent to which a reuse strategy, or projected reuse, for the priority site(s) clearly aligns with and advances the local government's land use and revitalization plans, or related community priorities.
1.e. Outcomes and Benefits of Reuse Strategy (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe how the proposed project or revitalization plans may stimulate economic development in the target area(s) post-cleanup of the priority site(s), and/or may facilitate the creation of, preservation of, or addition to a park, a greenway, undeveloped property, recreational property, or other property used for nonprofit purposes in the target area(s). • If applicable, describe how the reuse of the priority site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy; or will incorporate energy-efficient approaches. *(For more information on energy efficiency, please refer to the FY27 FAQs and Renewable Energy or Energy-Efficient Approaches in Brownfields Redevelopment Fact Sheet.)*	Given the type of community being served (e.g., urban, rural, Tribal, etc.), the degree to which the proposed project or revitalization plans may stimulate economic development in the target area(s) post-cleanup of the priority site(s) and/or may facilitate the creation of, preservation of, or addition to a park, a greenway, undeveloped property, recreational property, or other property used for nonprofit purposes in the target area(s). The degree to which these outcomes clearly correlate with the applicant's reuse strategy/projected site reuse(s). When applicable, the extent to which the reuse of the priority site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy, or will incorporate energy-efficient approaches.
Strategy for Leveraging Resources	
1.f. Resources Needed for Site Reuse (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe your eligibility for and likelihood to obtain funding from other resources (e.g., any other EPA Brownfields resources or public or private resources) and how the grant will stimulate the availability of additional funds to support the completion of the environmental site assessment or remediation, and subsequent reuse strategy at the priority site(s). *(Do not duplicate sources discussed in 3.d.-3.g. under Description of Tasks/Activities and Outputs or sources used to meet the cost share.)*	The extent to which the applicant is eligible for and likely to obtain funding from other resources (e.g., any other EPA Brownfields resources or public or private resources), and the extent to which the grant will stimulate the availability of additional funds to support the completion of the environmental site assessment or remediation, and subsequent reuse strategy at the priority site(s). *(Note, a response may not earn full points if the applicant duplicates sources that are listed in 3.d.-3.g. under Description of Tasks/Activities and Outputs or sources used to meet the cost share.)*

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
Likelihood to obtain funding from other resources may be demonstrated by providing information such as the source of the funding, confirmation that the applicant's organization is eligible for the funding, whether the applicant's organization has accessed these funds previously, and/or how often the funding is offered, etc.	
1.g. Use of Existing Infrastructure (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe the state of the existing infrastructure (e.g., utilities, roads, buildings, etc.) at the priority site(s) and/or within the target area(s). • Describe how this grant will facilitate the use of this existing infrastructure. • If applicable, identify infrastructure needs or upgrades that are key to the reuse of the priority site(s), describe these needs/upgrades and funding resources that will be sought to implement that work.	The extent to which this grant will facilitate the use of existing infrastructure at the priority site(s) and/or within the target area(s). When additional infrastructure needs or upgrades are key to the reuse of the priority site(s), the extent to which the identified funding resources that will be sought to implement that work are relevant.

2. COMMUNITY NEED AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

35 Points

Community Need Applicants may use geospatial mapping tools to better understand the communities that may be adversely and disproportionately affected by environmental or human health harms and risks. Applicants should include data in their Narrative Criteria Responses to help characterize and describe the target area(s) and its community(ies). Data from other sources (e.g., studies, census, and third-party reports) can also be included to give a more complete picture of the impacted communities and populations. Applicants are not expected to generate new data. Applicants are encouraged to explain if supporting data is limited or unavailable and why the level of data provided is appropriate.	
2.a. The Community's Need for Funding (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe how this grant will meet the needs of the communities within the geographic boundary(ies) that have an inability to draw on other sources of funding to carry out environmental remediation and subsequent	The extent to which this grant will meet the needs of the communities within the geographic boundary(ies) that have an inability to draw on other sources of funding to carry out environmental remediation and subsequent reuse in the target area(s) **because the community has a small population and/or is low income**. *(Note, if the response does not demonstrate why the community's small population or low income has resulted in an inability to draw on other sources of funding, then the response may only earn up to 2 points.)*

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
reuse in the target area(s) **because of the small population[17] and/or low income of the community**.	
2.b. Health or Welfare of Sensitive Populations (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Identify sensitive populations[18] in the target area(s) and describe their health or welfare issues.[19] • Discuss how this grant and reuse strategy/projected site reuse(s) will address these issues and/or help identify and reduce related threats.	The extent to which this grant and reuse strategy/projected site reuse(s) will address, or help identify and reduce related threats to, the health or welfare issues among the sensitive populations in the target area(s).
2.c. Greater Than Normal Incidence of Disease and Adverse Health Conditions (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Provide quantitative data to demonstrate that populations in the target area(s) suffer from a greater-than-normal[20] incidence of diseases or conditions (including cancer, asthma, or birth defects) that may be associated with exposure to hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or petroleum. If applicable, explain why the level of data provided is appropriate. • Describe how this grant and reuse strategy/projected site reuse(s) will address, or help identify and reduce, threats to these populations.	The extent to which this grant and reuse strategy/projected site reuse(s) will address, or help identify and reduce, threats to populations in the target area(s) with a greater-than-normal incidence of diseases or conditions (including cancer, asthma, or birth defects) that may be associated with exposure to hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or petroleum. *(Note, if the response does not quantitatively demonstrate that the populations in the target area(s) suffer from a greater-than-normal incidence of cancer, asthma, or birth defects, then the response may only earn up to 2 points.)*

[17] There is no statutory definition of what constitutes a "small" population, so EPA leaves it to the applicant to make their case as to why the community is small. However, the Brownfields Program considers communities of 10,000 people and less as "micro" communities, 15,000 people and less as "small" communities, 50,000 people and less as "rural," and less than 100,000 people as "nonurban." Communities with less than 50,000 in population may be considered small.

[18] Sensitive populations are those populations that are likely to experience elevated health risks from pollution, including populations based on age (young children and the elderly), pregnant women, and serious disease burden (such as, high rates of cancer, asthma, chronic respiratory disease, coronary heart disease, low birth weights, etc.), as well as low-income populations. See CERCLA § 104(k)(6)(C)(x). The Brownfields Program will implement this provision in accordance with all applicable law.

[19] For more information on health and welfare issues, please refer to the FY27 FAQs.

[20] For the purposes of this criterion, "greater-than-normal" refers to when the incidence of disease or an adverse health condition exceeds what is typically expected or considered average. Applicants should provide information or data to establish a baseline for what is considered average and demonstrate how the incidence of disease or adverse health condition(s) among the populations in the target area(s) is greater.

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
2.d. Disaster Preparedness (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Provide a brief description of any extreme weather events and/or natural disasters[21] that have occurred and their impact on populations in the target area(s). • Describe how the proposed program will improve local resilience to the impacts of extreme weather events and/or natural disasters.	The extent to which the proposed program will improve local resilience to the impacts of extreme weather events and/or natural disasters.
Community Engagement Applicants may consolidate information for 2.e. – 2.f. into one response and/or use the suggested table format in Section 4.C.2.	
2.e. Program Involvement (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Identify the local organizations/entities/groups that will assist with the RLF Program. Program involvement may be provided by a broad variety of entities including, but not limited to, community-based organizations (e.g., neighborhood groups, citizen groups, business organizations, etc.), community liaisons representing residents directly affected by the project work, property owners, lenders, developers, cities/towns within a regional organization's target area(s), and the general public.	The degree to which the applicant involves a variety of local organizations/entities/groups that are relevant to the RLF Program.
2.f. Program Roles (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe each identified local organization/entity/group's role in the program. • Include which organization(s)/entity(ies)/group(s) will be meaningfully involved in decision-making for site selection, cleanup, and future reuse of the brownfield sites, including the priority site(s). RLF Coalition Applications:	The degree to which each identified local organization/entity/group will have a meaningful role in the program and the extent to which there will be involvement in decision-making for site selection, cleanup, and future reuse of the brownfield sites, including the priority site(s). *(Note: Responses that indicate there will be meaningful involvement in decision-making for site selection, cleanup, and reuse will be evaluated more favorably.)*

[21] For more information on the impacts of extreme weather events and natural disasters, please refer to the FY27 FAQs.

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
• Additionally, discuss how each non-lead coalition member will be engaged and informed throughout the program.	Additionally, for RLF Coalition applications, EPA will evaluate the extent to which the plan also demonstrates that each non-lead coalition member will be effectively engaged and informed throughout the program.
2.g. Incorporating Community Input (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Discuss your plan to communicate project progress to engage the local community, including residents directly affected by the project work, and the involved organizations/entities/groups. • Include the frequency and method(s) you will use (including an appropriate alternative(s) to in-person engagement) and how you will meaningfully solicit, consider, and respond to community input.	The extent to which the plan to communicate project progress will effectively engage the local community, including residents directly affected by the project work, and the involved organizations/entities/ groups. The extent to which the plan provides appropriate alternative(s) to in-person engagement, and meaningfully solicits, considers, and responds to community input.

3. TASK DESCRIPTIONS, COST ESTIMATES, AND MEASURING PROGRESS

65 Points

The cost share is calculated as 20% of the total EPA funds requested and must only include costs associated with eligible activities under the grant. The cost share requirement is waived for RLF Grant projects located in U.S. Territories.

Local government applicants may use up to 10% of the total grant award for health monitoring activities. The health monitoring activities must be associated with brownfield sites at which at least a Phase II environmental site assessment is conducted and that are contaminated with hazardous substances. Coordination with the local health agency is required. Please review the Health Monitoring Fact Sheet for more information.

Cooperative agreements with successful applicants under this funding opportunity will be subject to the administrative cost limitation described at CERCLA § 104(k)(5)(E). Successful applicants may only use up to 5% of the total award amount (EPA funds plus the recipient's cost share) for their own administrative costs (direct costs for grant administration and indirect costs). For example, if EPA awards $1,000,000 to an applicant, the applicant's cost share is $200,000 (20%) and the total award amount is $1,200,000. Therefore, the 5% limit for administrative costs is based on the $1,200,000 total award amount and equals $1,200,000. Costs must be classified as direct or indirect consistently and applicants may not classify the same cost in both categories. The limitation on administrative costs does not apply to otherwise allowable programmatic costs (including indirect costs) charged by procurement contractors. Note that EPA considers costs for performance and financial reporting to be allowable programmatic costs that are not subject to the 5% limitation.

For applications that include indirect costs in the budget and are selected for funding, an EPA Grants Specialist or Grants Management Officer may request a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement that was negotiated with the cognizant agency before the cooperative agreement is awarded.

Do not include activities that are ineligible uses of EPA RLF Grant funds (e.g., land acquisition; building demolition that is not necessary to remediate contamination at the site; building construction, or site preparation).

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
Please refer to the FY27 FAQs for additional examples of eligible and ineligible uses of funds (including administrative costs). For questions not covered by the FY27 FAQs, contact your Regional Brownfields Contact listed in Section 1.E.	
Program Description and Marketing Strategy	
3.a. Program Management (5 points)	
Applicants should describe how your RLF program will: • Build and maintain a competent team to ensure an effective program; • Select borrowers/subgrantees and projects; and • Structure and administer loans and subgrants, and facilitate financial underwriting.	The degree to which the RLF program will effectively build and maintain a competent team to manage the program; select borrowers, subgrantees, and projects; and structure and administer subawards, and facilitate financial underwriting.
3.b. Revolution of the RLF Program (10 points)	
Applicants should describe how your RLF program will: • Incorporate reasonable and prudent lending practices to encourage the funds to revolve and be sustained after the cooperative agreement is closed; and • Be properly maintained and report outcomes and outputs to EPA so long as program income exists, even after the cooperative agreement has ended. (Note: this requires a long-term commitment of resources.)	The extent to which the RLF program will incorporate reasonable and prudent lending practices to encourage the funds to revolve and be sustained after the cooperative agreement is closed. The degree to which the RLF program will be properly maintained, and outcomes and outputs will continue to be reported to EPA so long as program income is retained after the cooperative agreement has ended.
3.c. Marketing Strategy (5 points)	
Applicants should describe your program's marketing strategy including: • The types of applicants and projects you are targeting; • Whether a potential borrower or subgrantee has expressed interest in a loan or subgrant for the priority site(s); and • How you will market your program to ensure you reach other potential borrowers/subgrantees.	The degree to which the program's marketing strategy will successfully target potential applicants and projects, including the degree to which a potential borrower or subgrantee has expressed interest in a loan or subgrant for the priority site(s). The extent to which the applicant will successfully market the program to reach other potential borrowers/subgrantees. *(Note, a project that does not have interest from any borrowers or subgrantees will be evaluated less favorably.)*
Description of Tasks/Activities and Outputs Applicants should provide a list and description of the tasks/activities required to implement the proposed program. Applicants may respond to 3.d. – 3.g. using the Sample Format for Tasks/Activities in Section 4.C.3.	

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
3.d. Program Implementation (10 points)	
Applicants should: • Discuss the proposed EPA-funded and cost share-funded tasks/activities under this grant. • If you plan to issue a subaward(s), in addition to loans/subgrants, indicate what tasks/activities or services will be provided. • If you plan to include participant support costs in your project, describe the process you will follow for determining the allowable stipend(s) amounts, procedures for accounting for participant support cost payments (including receipts), and documenting that the costs are allowable. Do not duplicate other support provided through other Federal, State, Tribal, or local programs. • If applicable, identify tasks/activities needed to support or complement the grant that will be contributed by sources other than the EPA grant, such as leveraged resources or funding contributed by your organization. (For example, the applicant does not charge the EPA grant for salary dollars and therefore contributes its own resources to carry out programmatic oversight activities or grant administration.) *(Do not duplicate sources listed in 1.f. Resources Needed for Site Reuse or sources used to meet the cost share.)* Typical eligible tasks/activities may include executing loans, procuring a Qualified Environmental Professional, submitting and obtaining approval of Quality Assurance Project Plans, enrollment of sites in the State's Voluntary Cleanup Program, certifying cleanup is complete, coordination with the local health agency on health monitoring activities, community engagement (including using participant support costs (see Section 3.A.2. for details)), etc.	The degree to which the proposed EPA-funded and cost share-funded tasks/activities under this grant are eligible, specific, and appropriate to the goals of the project/program, and the degree to which the response demonstrates a sound plan to address the priority site(s) in the target area(s). *(Note, a response that includes ineligible tasks/activities will be evaluated less favorably.)* When the project includes a subaward(s) in addition to loans/subgrants, the extent to which the tasks/activities or services to be provided by the subawardee(s) clearly support the project. When the project includes participant support costs, the extent to which the applicant's process and procedures are sound for determining the amounts of the allowable stipend(s), accounting for participant support cost payments (including receipts), and documenting that the costs do not duplicate support provided through other Federal, State, Tribal, or local programs. When applicable, the extent to which the tasks/activities that are needed to support or complement the grant that will be contributed by sources other than the EPA grant (e.g., leveraged resources) will help bring the grant to successful completion. *(Note, a response may not earn full points if the applicant duplicates sources that are listed in 1.f. Resources Needed for Site Reuse or sources used to meet the cost share.)*
3.e. Anticipated Project Schedule (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Discuss the anticipated schedule milestones and timeline for the EPA-funded activities outlined in *3.d.*	The extent to which the anticipated project schedule milestones are achievable and the likelihood that the activities will be completed within the 5-year period of performance.

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
Program Implementation during the 5-year period of performance. EPA may reimburse successful applicants for eligible programmatic pre-award costs incurred up to 90 days prior to award. Applicants may include pre-award costs for eligible activities in their proposed project. Travel expenses associated with brownfields-related training, such as the National Brownfields Training Conference, are eligible expenses. The budget/project period start date must be before the date that any proposed pre-award costs are incurred. For more information on pre-award costs, please see the FY27 FAQs.	
3.f. Task/Activity Lead (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Identify the lead entity(ies) overseeing each task/activity (i.e., the applicant, qualified environmental professional, or other identified entity). If not the applicant, explain why the lead entity(ies) is appropriate. *(Note, the local health agency must be involved in health monitoring activities.)*	The extent to which the lead entity(ies) for each task/activity is appropriate. When applicable, the degree to which the local health agency is appropriately involved in health monitoring activities.
3.g. Outputs (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Identify and quantify the anticipated outputs/deliverables for each task/activity. Outputs may include, but are not limited to, loans and subgrants awarded, cleanup plans, community involvement plans, final Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives (ABCA) documents, administrative records, and cleanup completion reports or letters. *(Refer to Section 3.A.4. for an explanation of outputs.)*	The extent to which the anticipated outputs/deliverables identified and quantified for each task/activity are reasonable and clearly correlate with the proposed project.
Cost Estimates and Plan to Measure and Evaluate	
3.h. Cost Estimates (15 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe how cost estimates for each task were developed per budget category, including the cost share, and direct and indirect administrative costs (if	The degree of clarity on how each cost estimate was developed, including the cost share, and when applicable, direct and/or indirect administrative costs. The extent to which each proposed cost estimate and costs per unit are

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
applicable). Present costs per unit where appropriate. *(Note, the total amount of direct and indirect administrative costs cannot exceed 5% of the total award amount (EPA funds plus the recipient cost share).)* Applicants may use the suggested Sample Format for Budget in Section 4.C.3. Examples of costs per unit may include: ***Task 2, Site Cleanup(s)*** – *Personnel Costs*: 20 hours at an average rate of $50/hr = $1,000 – *Contractual Costs*: Cleanup oversight of 5 sites at an average cost of $5,000 = $25,000 – *Loans*: 5 loans for cleanup of 5 sites at an average of $100,000/site = $500,000 – *Subgrant*: Amount of loan forgiveness to eligible subgrantee = $25,000[22] For information on best practices for preparing budgets for EPA grant applications, refer to the General Budget Development Guidance for Applicants and Recipients of EPA Financial Assistance.	reasonable, realistic, and correlated to the proposed program and tasks/activities. (*Notes: Projects that allocate at least 50% of the total award amount (i.e., EPA funds for the RLF Grant plus the applicant's cost share) to provide loans for the cleanup of eligible brownfield sites and associated eligible programmatic costs will be evaluated more favorably.* *A response that includes administrative costs that exceed 5% of the total award amount (requested EPA funds plus the applicant's cost share) will be evaluated less favorably.* *A response that includes cost estimates that are not reasonable or realistic to implement the project/grant will be evaluated less favorably. For example, applicants that request more funding than is reasonably justified in the Narrative Criteria Responses to complete the proposed project/grant.)*
3.i. Plan to Measure and Evaluate Environmental Progress and Results (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Discuss your plan and the tool(s) you will use to track, measure, and evaluate progress in achieving expected program outputs, overall results, and eventual outcomes, including how you will implement corrective action measures if issues arise during the grant's period of performance. *(Definitions of outputs and outcomes are provided in Section 3.A.4.)*	The extent to which the plan and tool(s) to track, measure, and evaluate progress in achieving expected program outputs, overall results, and eventual outcomes, including how corrective action measures will be implemented if issues arise, are reasonable, appropriate, and clearly correlate with information previously presented in the Narrative Criteria Responses.

4. PROGRAMMATIC CAPABILITY AND PAST PERFORMANCE

40 Points

Provide responses for the organization that is applying for funding (i.e., the applicant/lead coalition member).

[22] The subgrant agreement for loan forgiveness may be incorporated into the loan document. A separate subgrant agreement is not required.

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
Programmatic Capability Applicants may consolidate information for 4.a. – 4.c. into one response. Reviewers must evaluate the response against the sub-criteria outlined below.	
4.a. Organizational Capacity (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Discuss the applicant's organizational capacity to oversee grant tasks/activities and carry out and manage the program and grant's programmatic, administrative, and financial requirements.	The degree to which the applicant's organization has the capacity to oversee grant tasks/activities and successfully carry out and manage the program and grant's programmatic, administrative, and financial requirements.
4.b. Organizational Structure (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe the organizational structure you will utilize to ensure the timely and successful expenditure of funds and completion of the program and grant's technical, administrative, and financial requirements. RLF Coalition Applications: • Additionally, describe the proposed governance/decision-making structure among your coalition members.	The degree to which the organizational structure will lead to the timely and successful expenditure of funds and the completion of the program and grant's technical, administrative, and financial requirements. Additionally, for RLF Coalition applications, EPA will evaluate the extent to which the proposed governance/decision-making structure ensures non-lead coalition members will be meaningfully involved in determining how grant funds will benefit each member's community.
4.c. Description of Key Staff (10 points)	
Applicants should: • Briefly describe the key staff who will successfully administer the grant and RLF program, including their roles, expertise, qualifications, and experience. • Specifically, discuss the roles, expertise, qualifications, and experience of the financial and/or program manager, Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP), and other team members that will work together to successfully implement your program, identified in *3.a. Program Management*.	The degree to which the key program staff's expertise, qualifications, and experience will result in the successful administration of the grant and RLF program, including the financial and/or program manager, QEP, and other team members.
4.d. Acquiring Additional Resources (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe your system(s) and/or procedure(s) to appropriately acquire additional expertise and	The degree to which the applicant's system(s) and/or procedure(s) to acquire additional expertise and resources (e.g., contractors or subrecipients) are appropriate to complete projects and carry out the program. *(Note, if an*

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
resources (e.g., contractors or subrecipients) necessary to complete projects and carry out the program. *(Refer to Section IV of EPA NOFO Clauses regarding the difference between contractors and subrecipients.)*	*applicant has selected a contractor or subrecipient without complying with applicable requirements as described in Section 2.B.5., the response will be evaluated less favorably.)*
Past Performance and Accomplishments **Review the information on 4.e. – 4.g. below and only respond to the single criterion that pertains to your organization's circumstances.** **4.e.: If your organization directly received an EPA Brownfields Multipurpose Grant, Assessment Grant, Revolving Loan Fund Grant, Cleanup (MARC) Grant, and/or 128(a) Grant that is currently open or closed[23] in 2016 or later, please respond to 4.e. below.** (Do not include information on Targeted Brownfields Assessments, Area-Wide Planning Grants, Job Training Grants, subawards from another Brownfields Grant recipient, or experience as a non-lead member of an Assessment Coalition Grant or RLF Coalition Grant. Do not include information on Brownfields MARC or 128(a) Grants that closed in 2015 or earlier.) **4.f.: If your organization never directly received an EPA Brownfields MARC or 128(a) Grant but received other federal or non-federal financial assistance agreements that are currently open or closed in 2016 or later (including only receiving an Area-Wide Planning Grant or Job Training Grant), please respond to 4.f. below**. (Do not include information on financial assistance agreements that closed in 2015 or earlier.) **4.g.: If your organization has never directly received any type of federal or non-federal financial assistance agreement, or the only financial assistance agreement(s) the organization has received closed in 2015 or earlier, or if your organization has recently received a financial assistance agreement (including a Brownfields Grant) but has not had an opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the award requirements, please indicate this in response to 4.g. below.** *In evaluating an applicant's response to this criterion, in addition to the information provided by the applicant, EPA may consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and/or from other federal or non-federal grantors to verify or supplement information provided by the applicant. Applicants will only be evaluated using a single sub-criterion below that is appropriate to their situation.*	
4.e. Currently Has or Previously Received an EPA Brownfields Grant That Closed in 2016 or Later (15 points) The period of performance for the organization's EPA Brownfields Grant(s) must have ended in 2016 or later to qualify for this category. Applicants should identify and provide information regarding each of their organization's current and/or most recent EPA Brownfields Grants. Demonstrate how the organization successfully managed the grant(s) and performed all phases of work by providing information on the items listed below. EPA will evaluate the degree to which the applicant demonstrates its ability to successfully manage the grant and perform all phases of work under the grant based on current/past EPA Brownfields Grant(s) (i.e., MARC Grant, or 128(a) Grant).	
(1) Accomplishments (5 points)	
Applicants should:	The extent to which meaningful accomplishments (including specific outputs and outcomes) were achieved

[23] For the purposes of this criterion, the term "closed" refers to a grant period of performance that has ended.

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
• Describe the accomplishments (including specific outputs and outcomes) achieved under the current/most recent grant(s) (no more than three), including at a minimum, the number of sites assessed and/or cleaned up. • Discuss whether these outputs and outcomes were accurately reflected in the Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) at the time of this application submission; if not, explain why.	under the current/most recent grant(s), including at a minimum, the number of sites assessed and/or cleaned up, and the extent to which outputs and outcomes were accurately reflected in ACRES at the time of this application submission. If outputs and outcomes were not accurately reflected in ACRES at the time of this application submission, the extent to which the explanation is adequate.
(2) Compliance with Grant Requirements (10 points) EPA will not penalize the applicant for closure of a Revolving Loan Fund cooperative agreement per the FY23 RLF Policy Memo.	
Applicants should: • Discuss your organization's compliance with the workplan, schedule, and terms and conditions under the current/most recent grant(s) (no more than three), including your organization's history of timely and acceptable quarterly performance, grant deliverables, and ongoing ACRES reporting. Include whether your organization has made and has reported progress towards achieving the expected results of the grant in a timely manner. If not, discuss what corrective measures your organization took and how the corrective measures were effective, documented, and communicated. • For all open EPA Brownfields Grants, indicate the grant period (start and end date), if funds remain, and the plan to expend the funds on eligible activities by the end of the period of performance as defined in 2 CFR § 200.1. • For all closed EPA Brownfields Grants (including RLF Grants that closed without a Closeout Agreement), indicate if there were funds remaining, the amount of remaining funds, and a brief explanation for why any remaining funds were not expended within the period of performance.	The extent of compliance with the workplan, schedule, and terms and conditions under the current/most recent grant(s), and the extent to which the history of quarterly performance, grant deliverables, and ongoing ACRES reporting demonstrates timely and acceptable reporting. The degree to which progress was made (and reported) towards achieving the expected results of the grant(s) in a timely manner. If expected results were not achieved and reported, the extent to which the measures taken to correct the situation were reasonable and appropriate, or the extent to which the explanation for the lack of reporting is adequate. (5 points) The extent to which funds from any open EPA Brownfields Grants (i.e., Multipurpose Grants, Assessment Grants, Cleanup Grants, and/or 128(a) Grants) are committed to eligible grant activities. The likelihood that all grant funds under the current grant(s) will be expended by the end of the period of performance as defined in 2 CFR § 200.1. For all closed EPA Brownfield Grants (including RLF Grants that closed without a Closeout Agreement), if funds remained, the extent to which the explanation for why is reasonable, and the degree to which the applicant made every effort to spend the remaining funds within the period of performance. (5 points)
– OR –	

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
4.f. Has Not Received an EPA Brownfields Grant but has Received Other Federal or Non-Federal Financial Assistance Agreements That Closed in 2016 or Later (15 points) The period of performance for the organization's financial assistance agreement(s) must have ended in 2016 or later to qualify for this category. Applicants should identify and describe each of their organization's current and/or most recent federally and non-federally funded financial assistance agreements (no more than three) *that are most similar in scope and relevance in terms of structure, community engagement, and/or deliverables to the proposed project*. Demonstrate how the organization successfully managed the agreement(s), and performed all phases of work by providing the following information. EPA will evaluate the degree to which the applicant demonstrates its ability to successfully manage the grant and perform all phases of work under the grant based on current/most recent federal or non-federal financial assistance agreements.	
(1) Purpose and Accomplishments (5 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe the awarding agency/organization, funding amount, and purpose of your organization's current/most recent assistance agreement(s). • Discuss the project accomplishments (including specific outputs, outcomes, and measures of success) achieved under the current/most recent assistance agreement(s).	The extent to which the current/most recent financial assistance agreement(s) is similar in terms of scope and relevance in terms of structure, community engagement, and/or deliverables to the proposed project. The extent to which meaningful project accomplishments (including specific outputs, outcomes, and measures of success) were achieved under the current/most recent financial assistance agreement(s).
(2) Compliance with Grant Requirements (10 points)	
Applicants should: • Describe your organization's compliance with the workplan, schedule, and terms and conditions under the current/most recent financial assistance agreement(s), including your organization's history of timely and acceptable reporting, as required by the awarding agency/organization. • Include whether your organization has made and has reported progress towards achieving the expected results of the agreement in a timely manner. If not, discuss what corrective measures your organization took and how the corrective measures were effective, documented, and communicated.	The extent of compliance with the workplan, schedule, and terms and conditions under the current/most recent financial assistance agreement(s), and the extent to which the history of reporting is timely and acceptable, as required by the awarding agency/organization. The degree to which progress was made (and reported) towards achieving the expected results of the agreement(s) in a timely manner. If expected results were not achieved, the extent to which the measures taken to correct the situation were reasonable and appropriate.
– OR –	

Narrative Criteria Responses ***Instructions for Applicants***	**Review Criteria** ***Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it addresses the following:***
4.g. No or Limited Financial Assistance Agreements (8 points)	
Applicants should: • Affirm that your organization has not received any type of federal or non-federal financial assistance agreement (grant or cooperative agreement). • Or, affirm that the only financial assistance agreement(s) your organization has received closed over 10 years ago (i.e., the period of performance ended in 2015 or earlier). • Or, affirm that your organization has recently received a financial assistance agreement, but has not had an opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the award requirements.	Whether it is clearly affirmed that the organization has never received any type of federal or non-federal financial assistance agreement, or the only financial assistance agreement(s) the organization has received closed over 10 years ago (i.e., the period of performance ended in 2015 or earlier), or has recently received a financial assistance agreement, but has not had an opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the award requirements. *(These applicants will receive a "neutral" score of 8 points. Failure to indicate anything in response to this sub-criterion may result in zero points.)*

C. Review and Selection Process

Timely submitted applications will initially be reviewed by OBLR and the EPA Regional Office, which covers the location of the project, to determine compliance with the applicable threshold eligibility criteria for RLF Grants (Section 2.B.). All applications that pass the threshold eligibility criteria review will be evaluated by national evaluation panels. The national evaluation panels will be comprised of EPA staff and potentially other federal agency representatives chosen for their expertise in the range of activities associated with the Brownfield RLF Grants. Eligible applications will be evaluated based on the criteria described in Section 6.B. and a ranking list of applications will be developed.

OBLR will provide the list to the Headquarters Selection Official, who is responsible for further consideration of the applications and final selection of grant recipients. Applications will be selected for award based on their evaluated point scores, the availability of funds, and, as appropriate, the other factors and considerations described in Section 6.C.1. below.

1. Other Evaluation Factors

In making the final selections from among the most highly ranked applications, EPA's Headquarters Selection Official may consider the factors below as appropriate. Other factors include:

- whether the community population is 15,000 or less;
- whether the applicant is a federally recognized Indian Tribe or United States Territory or whether the project is assisting a Tribe or territory;
- whether the priority site(s) is impacted by mine-scarred land;
- whether the priority site(s) is adjacent to a body of water (i.e., the border of the priority site(s) is contiguous or partially contiguous to the body of water, or would be contiguous or partially contiguous with a body of water but for a street, road, or other public thoroughfare separating them);
- whether the priority site(s) is in a federally designated flood plain;
- whether reuse of the priority site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy;
- whether reuse of the priority site(s) will incorporate energy efficiency measures;
- whether the proposed project will improve local resilience to the impacts of extreme weather events and natural disasters; and
- whether a target area(s) is impacted by a coal-fired power plant that has recently closed (2016 or later) or is closing.

Additionally, EPA's Headquarters Selection Official may take the following considerations into account when making final selections:

- distribution of funds between urban and non-urban areas;
- whether the applicant's jurisdiction/geographic boundary(ies) is located within, or includes, a county experiencing "persistent poverty" where 20% or more of its population has lived in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses and the most recent Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates;
- distribution of funds among EPA's ten Regions;
- whether the applicant has not received any type of federal or non-federal financial assistance agreements or only had an assistance agreement(s) that closed in 2015 or earlier;

- whether the applicant's jurisdiction/geographic boundary(ies) lacks access to Brownfields RLF resources from an open RLF cooperative agreement; and
- whether the applicant has not previously been awarded a Brownfields MARC Grant.

D. Risk Review

EPA will consider any comments by the applicant, along with information available in the responsibility/qualification records in SAM.gov, when doing the risk review as required by 2 CFR § 200.206.

EPA will conduct a risk review of selected applications before making awards, as required by 2 CFR § 200.206. As part of this review, EPA may consider the following:

- Information available in the responsibility/qualification records in SAM.gov, including any comments made by the applicant.
- If the applicant is a new recipient, whether they have completed the mandatory training requirement outlined in RAIN-2024-G01 New Recipient Training Requirement.
- Any unresolved administrative findings in EPA records.
- Reported issues related to financial stability and/or management systems.
- Past performance or audit issues.

7. Award Notices

EPA anticipates notification to successful applicants will be made by OBLR's Director**.** The notification will be sent to the Project Director and Chief Executive/Highest-Ranking Elected Official listed in the Application Information Sheet in Section 4.B. This notification is not an authorization to begin work. The applicants that are selected for award will work with an EPA Project Officer to finalize the required federal application package, the proposed budget, and to negotiate the cooperative agreement workplan. The official notification of an award will be made by the Regional Award Official (EPA Grants Officer) assigned to the cooperative agreement. Selection does not guarantee an award will be made. Statutory authorization, funding, or other issues during the award process may affect the ability of EPA to make an award. The award notice, signed by an EPA grants officer, is the authorizing document and will be provided through electronic or postal mail. The successful applicant may need to prepare and submit additional documents and forms, which must be approved by EPA, before the grant can officially be awarded. The time between notification of selection and award of a grant can take up to 90 days or longer.

8. Post-Award Requirements and Administration

A. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

The recipient and any sub-recipient must comply with the applicable General Terms and Conditions. These terms and conditions are in addition to the assurances and certifications made as part of the award, terms and conditions, and restrictions reflected on the official assistance award document.

Awards issued as a result of this funding opportunity are subject to the requirements of the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards; Title 2 CFR Part 200 and 2 CFR Part 1500.

B. Reporting

EPA's General Terms and Conditions in the Notice of Award will have information on performance and financial reports, including:

- How often you will report.
- Any required form or formatting.
- How to submit them.

C. Subaward and Executive Compensation Reporting

The Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) requires:

- Data entry at SAM.gov for all subawards and subcontracts issued for $30,000 or more.
- Reporting executive compensation for both recipient and subaward organizations.

D. Brownfield Programmatic Requirements

Approved cooperative agreements will include terms and conditions (including any applicable Davis-Bacon labor standards and prevailing wage requirements for construction) that will be binding on the recipient. Brownfield Grant recipients must comply with all applicable federal and State laws to ensure that the assessment and cleanup protect human health and the environment. Brownfield Grant recipients also must comply with the program's technical requirements, which may include, but are not limited to, requirements for: reporting of progress and site-specific accomplishments, Quality Assurance requirements, historic properties or threatened and endangered species, all appropriate inquiries, environmental cleanup responsibilities, sufficient progress, collection of post-grant information, and protections of nearby and sensitive populations. The assistance agreement will include terms and conditions implementing these requirements. For additional information, please review the Brownfield Programmatic Requirements.

E. Build America, Buy America

Certain projects under this competition are subject to the Buy America Sourcing requirements under the Build America, Buy America (BABA) provisions of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (P.L. 117-58, §§ 70911-70917) when using funds for the purchase of goods, products, and materials on any form of construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of infrastructure in the United States. The Buy America preference requirement applies to all of the iron and steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used for an infrastructure project under an award identified in EPA's financial assistance funding programs subject to BABA report.

These sourcing requirements require that all iron, steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used in Federally funded infrastructure projects must be produced in the United States. The recipient must implement these requirements in its procurements, and this article must flow down to all subawards (including loans and subgrants) and contracts at any tier. For legal definitions and sourcing requirements, the recipient must consult the EPA's Build America, Buy America website.

Please consider this information when preparing budget information. EPA has and will continue to provide further guidance on which projects are subject to BABA provisions and will work with grant recipients to support implementation as necessary.

When supported by rationale provided in IIJA § 70914, the recipient may submit a waiver request to EPA. The recipient should request guidance on the submission instructions of an EPA waiver request from the EPA Point of Contact listed in Section 1.E. A list of approved EPA waivers is available on the Build America, Buy America website.

In addition to BABA requirements, all procurements under grants may be subject to the domestic preference provisions of 2 CFR § 200.322.

See "Build America, Buy America" clause in EPA NOFO Clauses.

9. Other Information

A. Additional Provisions for Applicants

Additional provisions that apply to this funding opportunity and/or awards made under this funding opportunity can be found at EPA NOFO Clauses. If you are unable to access these provisions electronically at the website above, please contact the EPA point of contact to obtain the provisions.

These provisions are important for applying to this funding opportunity and applicants must review them when preparing applications.