2014-2015 P3 PROJECT REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

Due: Thursday, March 12, 2015, No Later Than 11:59:59 p.m., Eastern Time

Please Note:

- Submission instructions will be distributed at a later date.
- Submissions that come in after the deadline on March 12, 2015, will not be considered for a P3 Award or a P3 Phase II grant.
- Judges are directed to read only the number of pages set for each section. Material on additional pages will not be considered in the evaluation of the written proposal.

BACKGROUND

The P3—People, Prosperity & the Planet—Competition was developed to enable college and university students from across the United States to design scientific, technical and policy solutions to sustainability challenges anywhere in the world. The 42 projects being developed by this year's P3 teams will be displayed on April 11-12, 2015, at the P3 Competition and National Sustainable Design Expo (the Expo) in the Washington, DC metro area. The Expo provides an opportunity to showcase the P3 teams' results and ideas for continuing their research and designs (Phase II proposals). In addition to presenting their designs at the Expo, the teams are required to prepare a written report summarizing progress on their Phase I project and identifying their proposed next steps. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is arranging to convene a panel of judges to evaluate the written reports and the oral presentations at the Expo relative to the evaluation criteria presented in this document.

Winners of the P3 Award will be determined by EPA and their Phase II proposals will be recommended for a Phase II grant to support further development or implementation. A P3 Award does not guarantee a grant award, only that the proposal will be forwarded to EPA's grants office with a recommendation for award. Grant awards are made by EPA's Office of Grants and Debarment. Up to $75,000 is available for each Phase II grant, including direct and indirect costs. Proposals exceeding $75,000 will not be considered. The total Phase II project period for an application submitted in response to this Request for Applications (RFA) may not exceed two years.

The team's project report will serve two purposes. It should:

(1) Describe the team's achievements with respect to the stated P3 Phase I project purpose and objectives, and

(2) Provide a proposal for P3 Phase II funding detailing development and implementation strategies of the Phase I P3 project design.

REQUIRED MATERIALS

(Provide material as appropriate for items I-XII below)

I. STANDARD FORM 424

The applicant must complete SF-424. Instructions for completing the SF-424 are available at http://www.epa.gov/ncer/rfa/forms/ or via grants.gov. However, note that EPA requires that the entire requested dollar amount appear on the SF-424, not simply the proposed first year expenses. **This form must contain the original signature of an authorized representative of the applying organization**.

Block 11:
The CFDA Number for the P3 program is 66.516.
The title of the program is: P3 Award: National Student Design Competition for Sustainability.

Block 12:
The P3 Phase II applications are submitted in response to the same solicitation as the Phase I grant applications. That original solicitation is linked here: http://epa.gov/ncer/rfa/2014/2014_p3.html#.

Block 13:
Can be left blank.

Block 19:
Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental review of Federal programs," does not apply to the Office of Research and Development's research and training programs unless EPA has determined that the activities that will be carried out under the applicant's proposal (a) require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or (b) do not require an EIS but will be newly initiated at a particular site and require unusual measures to limit the possibility of adverse exposure or hazard to the general public, or (c) have a unique geographic focus and are directly relevant to the governmental responsibilities of a State or local government within that geographic area.

If EPA determines that Executive Order 12372 applies to an applicant's proposal, the applicant must follow the procedures in 40 CFR Part 29. The applicant must notify their state's single point of contact (SPOC). To determine whether their state participates in this process, and how to comply, applicants should consult http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc/. If an applicant is in a State that does not have a SPOC, or the State has not selected research and development grants for intergovernmental review, the applicant must notify directly affected State, area wide, regional and local entities of its proposal.

II. KEY CONTACTS (available at http://epa.gov/ncer/rfa/forms/)

The applicant must complete the Key Contacts Form (Form 5700-54) found in the Grants.gov application package or available at http://epa.gov/ncer/rfa/forms/. The Key Contacts form should also be completed for major sub-agreements (i.e., primary investigators). Do not include information for consultants or other contractors. Please make certain that all contact information is accurate.

III. TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

IV. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (3-5 PAGES)

The executive summary will be placed on EPA's P3 web page along with a list of publications and presentations, if any, that resulted from the P3 Phase I project. The summary should be in the following format (3-5 pages) in language clear of technical jargon:

NCER Assistance Agreement Project Report Executive Summary
Date of Project Report:
EPA Agreement Number: SU83####
Project Title:
Faculty Advisor(s), Departments and Institutions:
Student Team Members, Departments and Institutions:
Project Period: 8/31/2014 – 8/30/2015
Description and Objective of Research:
Summary of Findings:
Conclusions:
Proposed Phase II Objectives and Strategies:
Publications/Presentations:
Supplemental Keywords:
Relevant Websites:

V. BODY OF THE REPORT

The body of the report should not exceed fifteen (15) consecutively numbered (bottom center), 8.5x11-inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins. (Judges are instructed not to read beyond 15 pages.)

The project report should include the following sections:

A. Summary of Phase I Results (8-10 pages; contributes to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*)

In the project report summary for Phase I projects, P3 teams must provide a comprehensive overview of the research objectives and results, as well as publications and presentations, in language that would be understood by the educated public. Teams should describe their conclusions and the implications for further research, development or implementation. Teams are also encouraged to provide website links to their publications or related research efforts.

1. **Background and Problem Definition**
    - Relationship to people, prosperity and the planet
    - Relevance and significance to developing or developed world
    - Implementation of the P3 project as an educational tool

2. **Purpose, Objectives, Scope**

3. **Data, Findings, Outputs/Outcome**
    - Include a comparison of actual accomplishments with the anticipated outputs/outcomes specified in the original proposal, and reasons why anticipated outputs/outcomes were not met. P3 teams will notify EPA of problems, delays, or adverse conditions which materially impair the ability to meet the outputs/outcomes specified in the assistance agreement.

4. Discussion, Conclusions, Recommendations

- Streamlined life cycle costing and analysis, if appropriate
- Quantifiable benefits to people, prosperity and the planet
- Qualitative benefits to people, prosperity and the planet
- Other pertinent information, including, if appropriate, analysis and explanation of cost overruns or high unit costs.

5. Assurance that research misconduct has not occurred during the reporting period

- EPA defines research misconduct as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results [65 FR 76262. I], or ordering, advising or suggesting that subordinates engage in research misconduct.

6. Publications/Presentations of Phase I work

B. Proposal for Phase II (5-7 pages; contributes to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*)

Applications should be focused on a limited number of research objectives that adequately and clearly meet the solicitation's requirements. Explicitly state how Phase II will build on the successes achieved in Phase I. Detail the methods and approaches that will be used to further the design in terms of development or implementation.

The Phase II portion of the P3 project report must provide the following information:

1. P3 Phase II Project Description (Contributes to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*)

Address the evaluation criteria provided with this document. Include the criteria subheadings:

- Project Description, Novelty and Evaluation
- Overall Sustainability of Proposed Project
- Educational and Teamwork Aspects of the Proposal

2. Quality Assurance Statement (Contributes to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*)

For projects involving environmental data collection or processing, conducting surveys, modeling, method development, or the development of environmental technology (whether hardware-based or via new techniques), provide a brief Quality Assurance Statement (1-2 paragraphs) regarding the plans for processes that will be used to ensure that the products of the research satisfy the intended project objectives.

3. Project Schedule (Contributes to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*)

Show significant steps and milestones in the project. Clearly depict the project's duration, and include key milestones and project tasks building on the timeline from research to design (Phase I) through development to implementation (Phase II). Describe the approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner and detail how project objectives will be successfully achieved within the grant period. Describe how progress toward achieving the expected results (outputs and outcomes) of the research will be monitored and measured. Indicate anticipated role and tasks of each team member or department represented. Also, indicate anticipated interactions with any and all partners (see 4 below), if applicable.

4. Partnerships (if applicable) (In addition to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*)
Partnerships are strongly encouraged and considered particularly important for the implementation strategies. Formal partnerships should be established prior to submitting the Phase I *Project Report*. As such, detail any and all partnerships established for the purposes of competing for the P3 Award including the type of partner (educational institution, industry and/or NGOs), matching contributions (funding and/or in-kind) provided by the partner, the nature of the partnership, and the role of the partner in the project. Formal letters of understanding or commitment including anticipated support for Phase II of the project from any and all partners should be submitted in support of the application, when available and appropriate.

5. EPA Human Subjects Research Statement, HSRS (If applicable) (In addition to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report,* limited to 6 pages in length*)*

All applications submitted under this solicitation must include a HSRS.

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

If the proposed research **does** involve human subjects, then please reference the 11th Annual P3 solicitation and follow the instructions for the Phase I proposal to develop the HSRS for your Phase II proposal. Human Subjects are discussed in Sections 1.A. Introduction; I.G. Special Requirements of the solicitation and necessary details for preparing an HSRS when human subjects are involved are provided in Section IV.B.5.c. EPA Human Subjects Research Statement (HSRS).

C. References (In addition to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*)

ATTACHMENTS (These materials are in addition to the 15-page limit for the *Body of the Report*.)

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

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

Note: Letters of intent or support must be part of the application; letters submitted separately will not be accepted. Any letter of intent or support that exceeds one brief paragraph (excluding letterhead and salutations) is considered part of the Research Plan and is included in the 15-page Research Plan limit. Any transactions between the successful applicant and parties providing letters of intent or support financed with EPA grant funds are subject to the contract and subaward requirements described here: http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/solicitation_provisions.htm#Contracts_subawards .

VII. BUDGET

EPA anticipates funding six (6) Phase II projects at a level up to $75,000 for two years, dependent on the availability of funds. Proposals with budgets exceeding the award limit will not be considered.

NOTE: OMB-approved form SF-424A "Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs," (aka 424A) is *required* for the budget. Review these instructions carefully to determine which sections must be completed.

Prepare a master budget table using "SF-424A Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs" (aka SF-424A), available in the Grants.gov package and also at http://www.epa.gov/ncer/rfa/forms/. USE ONLY THE OBJECT CLASS BUDGET CATEGORIES PROVIDED IN "Section B-Budget Categories" of this form. Under the "Grants Program, Function or Activity" heading of Section B, put Year 1 totals for each Object Class Category under (1) and Year 2 totals under (2). The proposed Year 1 and Year 2 totals will be reflected in separate columns. The total budget will be automatically tabulated in column (5). All other sections of the form may be left blank. It is not necessary to complete Section A of the form.

If a subaward is included in the application, provide a separate SF-424A and budget justification for the subaward. Include the total amount for the subaward under "Other" in the master SF-424A.

Applicants may not use subagreements to transfer or delegate their responsibility for successful completion of their EPA assistance agreement. Therefore, EPA expects that subawards or subcontracts should not constitute more than 40% of the total direct cost of the total project budget. If a subaward/subcontract constitutes more than 40% of the total direct cost, additional justification may be required before award, discussing the need for the subaward/subcontract to accomplish the objectives of the research project. Please refer to http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/solicitation_provisions.htm#Contracts_subawards if your organization intends to identify specific contractors, including consultants and subawardees, in your proposal.

Please note that institutional cost-sharing is not required. However, if voluntary cost-sharing is proposed, a brief statement concerning cost-sharing should be added to the budget justification.

For P3 Phase II proposals there is a limit on the budget that can be allocated to Personnel and associated Fringe Benefits.

- **Personnel costs are ONLY permitted to pay students working on the P3 Phase II project (or a portion of their tuition and fees).**
- **The total direct charges for Personnel and Fringe Benefits or for tuition and fees may not exceed $15,000.**

VIII. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

In addition to the tabular presentation of the budget, please provide a detailed written "Budget Justification" that describes the basis for calculating the travel, equipment, supplies, contractual support, and other costs identified in the itemized budget and explain the basis for their calculation. A "Budget Detail Guidance" document is provided at this link, which provides a template and sample entries for the various budget categories: http://www.epa.gov/ogd/recipient/ogd_budget_detail_guidance.pdf. PLEASE REFERENCE THIS LINK WHEN DEVELOPING YOUR BUDGET JUSTIFICATION DOCUMENTS.

The "Budget Justification" should not exceed two consecutively numbered (bottom center), 8.5x11-inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins.

Please abide by the following limits in the submitted budgets:

a. Personnel and b. Fringe Benefits – Total costs for "Personnel" plus "Fringe Benefits" are limited to no more than $15,000 in direct costs to pay student(s) working on the Phase II grant or a portion of their tuition or expenses.

c. Travel – Travel: Specify the estimated number of trips, purpose of each trip, number of travelers per trip, destinations, and other costs for each type of travel. Explain the need for any travel, paying particular attention to travel outside the United States. Phase II grantees have the option to return to future Expos. If desired, travel costs for that trip can be included in Phase II budget proposals.

Below is a sample computation for Travel:

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
Student present research findings	DC	Lodging	2 people x $100 per night x 2 nights	$400
		Airfare	2 people x $500 round trip	$1,000
		Per Diem	2 people x $50 per day x 2 days	$200
Total Travel				$1,600

d. Equipment – Identify all tangible, non-expendable property to be purchased that has an estimated cost of $5,000 or more per unit and a useful life of more than one year. Details such as the type of equipment, cost, and a brief narrative on the intended use of the equipment for project objectives are required. Each item of equipment must be identified with the corresponding cost. General-purpose equipment (office equipment, etc.) must be justified as to how it will be used on the project. (Note: Items with a unit cost of less than $5,000 are considered "Supplies".)

e. Supplies – All tangible property other than "equipment." Identify supplies to be used under the project. This may include: software, office supplies, and laboratory supplies such as reagents, chemicals and glassware. Specifically identify computers to be purchased or upgraded.

f. Contractual – Specify the amount you anticipate expending for services/analyses or consultants and specify the purpose of the contracts and estimated cost. **Any procurement of services from individual consultants or commercial firms (including space for workshops) must comply with the competitive procurement requirements of 40 CFR Part 30.40-30.48 or 40 CFR 31.36, as appropriate. Please see http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/solicitation_provisions.htm#Contracts_subawards for more details.**

Examples of Contractual costs include:

i. Consultants – Consultants are individuals with specialized skills who are paid at a daily or hourly rate. EPA's participation in the salary rate (excluding overhead) paid to individual consultants retained by recipients or by a recipient's contractors or subcontractors is limited to the maximum daily rate for a Level IV of the Executive Schedule (formerly GS-18), to be adjusted annually.

ii. Equipment Rental – When there is a need to rent equipment for use on the project, provide information on the type of equipment to be rented, the purpose or use on the project, the length of time needed and the rental rate. Renting or leasing of equipment will require a lease vs. purchase cost analysis prior to approval.
iii. Facility Rental – When it is necessary to rent office or other facilities spaces for project implementation, and the space(s) are located off-site from the organization's main facility in space not owned by the applicant organization, the cost of the rent may be charged against the award as a contractual expense if the space is used specifically for the project. The budget justifications should provide details on the monthly rental charge and if the rent is pro-rated to the project.
iv. Service or Maintenance Contracts – Costs should be in direct correlation to the use of the equipment for the project (i.e., if a particular machine is used 50% of the time for the project, the project should only be charged 50% of the service/maintenance costs). Provide details of the type of equipment and the amount of the service contract to be paid from EPA funds.
v. Speaker/Trainer Fees – Information on speakers should include the fee and a description of the services they are providing.

g. Construction Costs – None for P3 grants.

h. Other – List each item in sufficient detail for EPA to determine the reasonableness of its cost relative to the research to be undertaken. "Other" items may include publication costs, long distance telephone charges and photocopying costs. Note that subawards, such as those with other universities for members of the research team, are included in this category. Subawards must have a separate 424A and budget justification, not to exceed one additional page each. **Subawards may not be used to acquire services from consultants or commercial firms. Please see http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/solicitation_provisions.htm#Contracts_subawards for more details.**

i. Direct Charges – Summary of items in budget categories a. through h.

j. Indirect Charges – Indirect costs are those incurred by the applicant for a common or joint purpose that benefit more than one cost objective or project, and are not readily assignable to specific cost objectives or projects as a direct cost. In order for indirect costs to be allowable, the applicant must have a negotiated indirect cost rate (e.g., fixed, predetermined, final or provisional), or must have submitted a proposal to their cognizant agency. If indirect costs are included in the budget, identify the cognizant agency and the approved indirect rate. If your organization does not have a cognizant agency, please note that in the budget justification and provide a brief explanation for how you calculated your indirect cost rate.

The application of indirect charges is at the discretion of the institution.

IX. RELEVANCE AND PAST PERFORMANCE (Not to exceed 2 additional pages)

The internal programmatic review will assess (relevance is more important than the Principal Investigator's (PI) past performance):

A. Relevance to EPA

Please state the proposed project/designs relevance to the following: EPA's research priorities (see Research Programs) and the degree to which the proposed project/design is supported by EPA's authorizing statutes.

B. Past Performance of the Principal Investigator

Provide the information necessary to evaluate the PI's past performance under Federal agency assistance agreements (assistance agreements include grants and cooperative agreements but not contracts). **Note: If applicable, include a statement that no prior past performance information and/or reporting history exists.**

The EPA will evaluate the PI's past performance and reporting history under prior Federal agency assistance agreements initiated within the last three years that were similar in size and scope to the proposed project in two areas: first, in successfully managing and completing these prior Federal agency assistance projects, including whether there is a satisfactory explanation for any lack of success; second, in reporting progress toward achieving results (outputs/outcomes) under these agreements, including the proposed PI's history of submitting timely progress/final technical reports that adequately describe the progress toward achieving the expected results under the agreements. Any explanation of why progress toward achieving the results was not made will also be considered. Applicants whose proposed PI has no relevant past performance and/or reporting history, or for whom this information is not available, will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on these elements.

X. RESUMES

Provide the resumes of all principal investigators and all student team members. The resume for each individual must not exceed two consecutively numbered (bottom center), 8.5x11-inch pages of single-spaced, standard 12-point type with 1-inch margins.

XI. CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT

Complete a current and pending support form (provided at http://epa.gov/ncer/rfa/forms) for each investigator and important co-worker. Do not include current and pending support for consultants or other contractors. Include all current and pending research regardless of source.

XII. CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality

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

P3 Phase II Evaluation Criteria
(Excerpted from 11th Annual P3 Solicitation)

B. Review Process for Phase II Applications

1. External Peer Review

All phase I projects/designs will be evaluated by an external panel of judges made up of non-EPA scientists, engineers, social scientists, economists and/or other professionals who are accomplished in their respective disciplines and proficient in the technical subjects they are evaluating. All Phase I teams will submit a written *Project Report* that will summarize their Phase I activities and include their proposed Phase II activities. This report will be due in mid-March 2015. In addition, all Phase I teams are required to participate in the National Sustainable Design Expo in April 2015. At the Expo, the teams will be expected to display and discuss their projects to interested attendees and provide a presentation to an external panel of judges.

Each *Project Report* and each Expo presentation/discussion will be evaluated by two sets of external judges; one set of judges will evaluate the *Project Report* and the other will evaluate the Expo presentation/discussion for each team. The judges will individually assign a score of excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor to each *Project Report* and to each Expo presentation/discussion based on the criteria presented below. EPA translates the individual scores from the judges into the final peer review score by equally weighting the average scores for the *Project Report* and the Expo presentation/discussion. Proposals receiving a final score of Excellent or Very Good as a result of this evaluation will undergo an internal programmatic review as described below. Reviewers may consider the education level of the team members when applying the criteria below.

2. Criteria for External Review of Phase II Grant Awards

The external panel of judges will base their evaluations of the written *Project Reports* and the presentations/discussions that take place at the National Sustainable Design Expo on the criteria below. Each of the three criteria categories are equally weighted by the judges and the weightings for the bullets within each category are as indicated.

a. Project Description, Novelty and Evaluation (bullets listed in descending order of importance).
   - The proposed project is scientifically sound, feasible, and appropriate to address the identified challenge.
   - The innovative research and/or innovative demonstration aspects of the design/project are clearly identified, and supported by a literature review.
   - A qualitative and/or quantitative evaluation method is proposed to assess the projected environmental, economic, and social benefits of the project.
   - The scope of the project and its associated goals and objectives are clearly stated and appropriate for a two-year grant.
   - The proposed budget and project schedule are reasonable and appropriate for the project.
   - The approach for ensuring successful achievement of project objectives is adequate and in accordance with the proposal's project schedule and milestones. The approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring timely and efficient expenditure of awarded grant funds are well defined and acceptable.

b. Overall Sustainability of Proposed Project (bullets equally weighted).

This criterion addresses both the overall sustainability of the project/design as well as its potential for broader impacts.

- The proposed project is defined in terms that are relevant, significant, and related to sustainability and clearly promotes sustainable development in the developed or developing world.
- The potential for broader impacts (e.g., launch of green business, scale-up within a community, or transfer of the concept to new locations) as a result of Phase II funding are made clear.

c. Educational and Teamwork Aspects of the Proposal (bullets equally weighted).

- The proposed student design reflects the contributions of an interdisciplinary team representing a breadth of skills and knowledge.
- The proposed project has an educational aspect whereby basic sustainability concepts will be shared among participants, the institution(s), and/or the surrounding or involved communities.
- The composition of the team with respect to undergraduate and graduate students, and whether the project has a unique component related to sustainability education or environmental justice.

3. **Internal Programmatic Review** (See Section IX of the *Project Report* Instructions above for details on what is to be provided for this review.)

Applications receiving final scores of excellent or very good as a result of the external judging process will undergo an internal programmatic review, as described below, conducted by at least one technical expert from the EPA. All other applications will not be considered for a P3 Phase II grant award. The purpose of the programmatic review is to ensure an integrated research portfolio for the Agency and help determine which applications to recommend for award. In conducting the programmatic review, the EPA will consider information provided by the applicant and may consider information from other sources, including prior and current grantors and agency files.

C. Human Subjects Research Statement (HSRS) Review

Applications being considered for funding after the Programmatic Review that involve human subjects research studies will have their HSRS reviewed by EPA's Human Subjects Research Review Official (HSRRO) prior to award. The HSRRO will review the information provided in the HSRS and the Research Plan to determine if the ethical treatment of human subjects is described in a manner appropriate for conditional approval to be granted.

D. Funding Decisions

Final funding decisions are made by the NCER Director based on the results of the peer review and the internal programmatic review and, where applicable, the EPA HSRRO's assessment of the applicant's HSRS (see Section IV.B.5.c). In addition, in making the final funding decisions, the NCER Director may also consider program balance and available funds. Applicants selected for funding will be required to provide additional information listed below under "Award Notices." The application will then be forwarded to EPA's Grants and Interagency Agreement Management Division for award in accordance with the EPA's procedures.