

**Questions and Answers  
for  
RFP EPA-R3-CBP-19-02**

***Development and Implementation of the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership's Conowingo  
Watershed Implementation Plan***

**03/04/19**

**Q:** The RFA requires separate applications for each of the three specified Activities. Elsewhere, the RFA indicates that EPA may award one to three cooperative agreements to execute on the totality of those three Activities. This would seem to indicate EPA may award just a single agreement under this RFA that could incorporate or encompass selected individual applications for two or more of the specified Activities. Can EPA confirm this assessment?

**A:** EPA expects to select one application for each activity. If an applicant submits applications for multiple activities and is selected for more than one activity, EPA may request that the applicant submit a revised application that includes the activities they are selected for and EPA may choose to issue one award to the applicant with multiple activities.

**Q:** The RFA requires separate applications for each of the three specified Activities. However, there may be value in a more coordinated consortium-style approach to completing this work that would intentionally integrate separate applications for each Activity in a more cohesive and complementary manner. Does EPA have any interest or preference for such consortium approach in either the application for or ultimate execution of these Activities?

**A:** Although EPA does not have a preference on the approach style for completing the work, this RFA is soliciting *cost-effective* applications (see pages 1 & 6 of the RFA). EPA will evaluate all eligible applications that adhere to the application and submission requirements and will be evaluated and ranked using the criteria stated in Section V.B. of this RFA. EPA expects to select one application for each activity. If an application includes sub-awards and/or contracts, the selected applicant must adhere to the procurement standards and requirements for pass-through entities under CFR [PART 200—UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS, COST PRINCIPLES, AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL AWARDS](#).

**02/19/19**

**Q:** Can EPA confirm that, at this time, it is not seeking proposals from organizations interested in directly serving as such a “regional authority” for “leveraging, receiving, managing, and disbursing” pooled funds for Conowingo WIP implementation?

**A:** That is correct. EPA is not seeking proposals at this time from interested organizations to serve as a “regional authority.” The decision to establish such an authority has not yet been made by the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee and the PSC. It is intended that the cooperative agreement recipient shall work with the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee to determine if such a regional authority should be established.

**Q:** Can EPA further confirm that decisions on establishment, management, and financing of such a “regional authority” would be made at a later date in coordination with the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee and the PSC, based in part on the outputs anticipated from this RFA?

**A:** That is correct. The decision to establish such a regional authority will be made by the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee and the PSC.

02/05/19

**Q:** Can foreign organizations be eligible to participate in this work?

**A:** If an eligible party is awarded a grant under the RFA referenced above, then a sub-award to a foreign entity is *allowable* under the regulations and EPA policy. See item 9 of the [sub-award policy](#). However, even if the sub-award is allowable is not a guarantee that it would be approved. The EPA project officer—responsible for the programmatic side of the project—would determine whether such a sub-award is reasonable and beneficial to the project. If they determine such to be the case, s/he must submit a request to the EPA Office of International and Tribal Affairs (OITA) recommending the sub-award be approved. Thereafter, OITA would make the final determination.