Agenda Item #: 3DD-1

PALM BEACH COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: May 7, 2024 **[X] Consent [ ] Regular [ ] Ordinance [ ] Public Hearing**

Department: County Administration

Submitted By: Office of Resilience

I. EXECUTIVE BRIEF

Motion and Title: Staff recommends motion to:

A) **approve** a Memorandum of Agreement with Broward County, Miami-Dade County, and Monroe County for an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (CPRG) implementation grant application, which would begin upon grant execution and end after five (5) years, and includes a $72,859,120 sub-award to Palm Beach County (PBC) to fund energy-efficiency housing retrofits, solar photovoltaic rebates, and electric vehicle charger rebates, and 10 staff positions, which would be requested upon the grant being awarded and eliminated when grant funding is discontinued; and

B) **delegate to** the County Administrator, or designee, the signatory authority on additional forms, certifications, contracts/agreements and amendments thereto, and any other necessary documents related to the CPRG implementation grant application that do not substantially change the scope of work, terms or conditions of the Memorandum of Agreement.

Summary:
Broward County is applying for $268,648,142 on behalf of the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact (Compact) through the EPA CPRG program to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe Counties. Southeast Florida is one of the most vulnerable U.S. regions to climate change impacts. The project will reduce GHG emissions and increase economic development through the following measures in low-income and disadvantaged communities (LIDACs): energy-efficiency housing retrofits (~$200M), solar photovoltaic rebates ($~52M), and electric vehicle charging rebates (~$17M). If awarded, PBC will receive $72,859,120 of the total award to implement the projects in PBC LIDACs. The PBC Department of Housing and Economic Development and the Office of Resilience will collaborate to implement these measures. **No match is required.** Countywide RM

Background and Justification: Continued on Page 3

Attachments:
1. CPRG Implementation Grant MOA
2. CPRG Implementation Grant NOFO
3. Broward CPRG Implementation Grant Application

Recommended by: Meya S Houston 4/8/24
Department Director **Date**

Approved By: 4/10/24
Deputy County Administrator **Date**

II. FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

A. Five-Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:

Fiscal Years	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Capital Expenditures	0				
Operating Costs	0				
External Revenues	0				
Program Income(County)	0				
In-Kind Match(County)	0				
NET FISCAL IMPACT	0				
#ADDITIONAL FTE	0				
POSITIONS (CUMULATIVE)	0				

Is Item Included in Current Budget? Yes____ No_X___
Is this item using Federal Funds? Yes____ No_X___
Is this item using State Funds? Yes____ No_X___

Budget Account No: Fund 0001 Dept 261 Unit 2101 Object 3401

Reporting Category _____

B. Recommended Sources of Funds/Summary of Fiscal Impact:

*There is no fiscal impact associated with this item. When the final award letter is received from the EPA, an agenda item will be prepared in which the budget will be adjusted to reflect the actual award.

C. Departmental Fiscal Review:

III. REVIEW COMMENTS:

A. OFMB Fiscal and/or Contract Dev. and Control Comments

OFMB 4/9/2024 JA 4/9 MF 4/9 MD 4/9

Contract Dev. & Control 4/11/24 BM 4/11/24

B. Legal Sufficiency

4/16/24
Assistant County Attorney

C. Other Department Review

Jonathan Brown
Department Director

(THIS SUMMARY IS NOT TO BE USED AS A BASIS FOR PAYMENT.)

Background and Justification:
The 2022 Inflation Reduction Act established the CPRG program to fund planning grants to develop regional plans to reduce GHGs and implementation grants to fund GHG reduction measures. Miami-Dade County, on behalf of the Compact and the Miami–Fort Lauderdale–West Palm Beach Metropolitan Statistical Area, received a $1M planning grant to develop a regional Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP). Broward County is now submitting a CPRG implementation grant application on behalf of the Compact counties to fund measures identified in the PCAP and supported by community feedback provided via surveys and community workshops. The EPA anticipates awarding approximately 30 to 115 grants under this announcement ranging between $2M and $500M.

CLIMATE POLLUTION REDUCTION GRANT PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION GRANT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This Memorandum of Agreement ("MOA") is being executed by Broward County ("County"), Miami-Dade County, Monroe County, and Palm Beach County ("Participating Agencies") (collectively "Parties").

A. The Parties are signatories to the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact ("Compact"), collaboratively working to reduce regional greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, implement adaptation strategies, and build climate resilience across the region.

B. Through the Compact, the Parties published the Regional Climate Action Plan 3.0 ("RCAP3.0"), which brought together members of the business and private sectors; educational institutions; state, local, and tribal governments; utilities; and professional and community organizations to make recommendations and identify strategies aimed at transforming southeast Florida into a more resilient, equitable, and thriving home for all.

C. RCAP3.0 recommended the counties coordinate the development and adoption of local GHG emissions reduction, adaptation, and climate resilience policies. It proposed to accomplish this, in part, by 1) pursuing funding and technical assistance that supports climate reduction and climate resilience work across the region; and 2) developing processes for regional and/or intergovernmental review, coordination, and harmonization of carbon pollution reduction and climate resilience initiatives, such as regional transportation infrastructure and GHG inventories.

D. The Parties are eligible jurisdictions able to collectively implement the objectives and goals of the Climate Pollution Reduction Grant ("CPRG") Program.

E. The Parties formed a coalition and developed a course of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the CPRG Planning Grant. On August 4, 2023, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") awarded a CPRG Planning Grant to the Parties to develop a Priority Climate Action Pan and Comprehensive Climate Action Plan covering the entire geographic scope of the Compact region.

F. On December 15, 2023, EPA released the Notice of Funding Opportunity for CPRG Implementation Grants. The Parties wish to continue the collaboration to apply for EPA grant funding to implement mitigation projects and strategies identified in the Priority Climate Action Plan and Comprehensive Climate Action Plan.

G. This collaboration will enable the implementation of carbon reduction programs focused on residential energy efficiency and weatherization, community electric vehicle infrastructure, and residential solar installation for the citizens of southeast Florida within and adjacent to the Metropolitan Service Areas as required by the CPRG Implementation Grant.

H. Through this MOA, County was selected to apply for the CPRG Implementation Grant, administer the program, and serve as the fiscal agent for the disbursement of all funds received for the CPRG Implementation Grant.

I. This MOA establishes the relationship between the Participating Agencies related to the CPRG Implementation Grant Application and the administration of the grant awarded as a result of said application.

Now, therefore, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the County and Participating Agencies agree as follows:

1. The above Recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference.

2. County as Lead Agency. County will serve as the lead agency and grant administrator for the Participating Agencies for the CPRG Implementation Grant. Pursuant to the CPRG guidelines, funding for the CPRG Implementation Grant will be provided to County, and County will disperse the funds to the Participating Agencies in the amounts determined by County and submitted to the EPA. County accepts full responsibility for the Parties' performance and will be accountable to EPA for effectively carrying out the full scope of work and the proper financial management of the grant.

3. Resources. The Parties will contribute resources for the following projects and grant deliverables when implementing said projects within their respective jurisdictions:

a. Managing and implementing a residential energy efficiency and weatherization program for its citizens that is in alignment with the terms outlined in the proposal and grant agreement.

b. Managing and implementing a residential and commercial solar installation program for its citizens that is in alignment with the terms outlined in the proposal and grant agreement.

c. Managing and implementing a community-wide electric vehicle infrastructure program for its citizens that is in alignment with the terms outlined in the proposal and grant agreement.

d. Reporting on project status updates and information to Broward County in support of their progress reports in accordance with EPA's reporting requirements.

4. Funding. County will distribute the funds to each Participating Agency in accordance with the CPRG Implementation Grant and a separate Subgrant Award Agreement (as described in Section 5 below).

5. Subgrant Award Agreement. To receive the CPRG Implementation Grant funds, the Participating Agency and County must negotiate and execute a Subgrant Award Agreement.

The County, as the grant recipient, will serve as the pass-through entity. The Participating Agency will serve as the subrecipient. Through the Subgrant Award Agreement, the Participating Agency, consistent with federal requirements, will be accountable to the County for the proper use of EPA funding and successful project implementation.

6. Compliance with EPA Requirements. In performing its duties, responsibilities, and obligations pursuant to this MOA, each Participating Agency agrees to adhere to the requirement standards set forth in the Uniform Grant Guidance 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.331 – 200.333 (2024), as amended, EPA's Subaward Policy 16-01, as applicable, and all conditions and requirements of the CPRG Implementation Grant.

7. Contract Administrator Authority. Contract Administrator means the County's Director of Resilient Environment Department, the Deputy Director of Resilient Environment Department, or such other person designated by the Director of Resilient Environment Department in writing. The Contract Administrator is authorized to coordinate and communicate with Participating Agencies to manage and supervise the performance of this MOA. Participating Agencies acknowledge that the Contract Administrator has no authority to make changes that would materially modify the terms of this MOA except as expressly set forth in this MOA or, to the extent applicable, in the Broward County Procurement Code. Unless expressly stated otherwise in this MOA or otherwise set forth in the Broward County Code of Ordinances or the Broward County Administrative Code, the Contract Administrator may exercise ministerial authority in connection with the day-to-day management of this MOA by Broward County. The Contract Administrator may also approve in writing minor modifications to the MOA that do not increase the total cost to County or waive any rights of County.

8. Term and Termination. This MOA shall commence on execution by the Parties and end consistent with the period of performance specified in the CPRG Implementation Grant. However, the continuation of this MOA is subject to the availability of funding from the CPRG Implementation Grant. If the EPA does not award the CPRG Implementation Grant to the County, the MOA shall terminate contemporaneously with the County's transmittal of written notice to the Participating Agencies that the EPA did not award the CPRG Implementation Grant. If EPA awards a CPRG Implementation Grant to the County, the Participating Agencies may not terminate (i.e., end in its entirety) this MOA.

If a Participating Agency no longer wishes to participate in the MOA, before or after the award of a CPRG Implementation Grant, the Participating Agency may withdraw (i.e., remove itself from participation) from this MOA by providing thirty (30) days written notice of its intent to withdraw to all other Participating Agencies and County. County shall provide prompt notice to the EPA. Any resulting guidance provided by EPA shall be communicated to the Participating Agency and adhered to and carried out in a timely manner by all Parties. If a Participating Agency effectively withdraws from this MOA, County may reallocate the withdrawing Participating Agency's funding to another Participating Agency in accordance with the terms of the CPRG Grant.

9. Public Records. Each Participating Agency understands that all records created as a result of participating in the CPRG Implementation Grant may be subject to public disclosure pursuant Section 119.07, Florida Statutes. Each Participating Agency is responsible for compliance with applicable public records law regarding any public records request seeking records relating to this MOA, including assisting County by providing the responsive records to County upon request. Each Participating Agency shall be responsible for any award of attorneys' fees or costs for that Participating Agency's noncompliance with applicable public records law.

10. Access to Records. Each Participating Agency, its employees, and agents shall allow access to its records concerning this MOA at reasonable times as may be requested by County, the EPA, the U.S. Comptroller General, or any of their duly authorized representatives. The term "reasonable" shall be construed according to the individual facts and circumstances but ordinarily shall mean during normal business hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., local time, Monday through Friday. Upon reasonable notice, the Participating Agency shall provide County with any additional documentation, information, or reports as may be required by County.

11. Sovereign Immunity. Nothing herein is intended to serve as a waiver of sovereign immunity by the Parties nor shall anything included herein be construed as consent to be sued by third parties in any matter arising out of this MOA.

12. Third-Party Beneficiaries. The Parties do not intend to primarily or directly benefit a third party by this MOA. Therefore, the Parties acknowledge that there are no third-party beneficiaries to this MOA and that no third party shall be entitled to assert a right or claim against any of them based upon this MOA.

13. Notice. Unless otherwise stated herein, for notice to be effective under this MOA, notice must be sent via U.S. first-class mail, hand delivery, or commercial overnight delivery, each with a contemporaneous copy via email, to the addresses listed below and shall be effective upon mailing or hand delivery (provided the contemporaneous email is also sent). Addresses may be changed by the applicable Party giving notice of such change in accordance with this section.

FOR COUNTY:
Broward County Resilient Environment Department
Attn: Dr. Jennifer Jurado
115 South Andrews Avenue, Room 329
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Email address: jjurado@broward.org

FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY:
Miami-Dade County Office of Resilience
Attn. Dr. Patricia Gomez
111 NW 1st Street, 12th Floor
Miami, Florida 33128
Email address: patricia.gomez@miamidade.gov

FOR MONROE COUNTY:
Monroe County Board of County Commissioners
1100 Simonton Street
The Gato Building, RM 2-205
Key West, Florida 33040
Email address: Haag-Rhonda@MonroeCounty-FL.gov

FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY:
Palm Beach County Office of Resilience
Attn: Megan Houston
2300 North Jog Road, 4th Floor
West Palm Beach, FL 33411
Email address: MSHouston@pbc.gov

14. Severability. If any part of this MOA is found to be unenforceable by any court of competent jurisdiction, that part shall be deemed severed from this MOA and the balance of this MOA shall remain in full force and effect.

15. Joint Preparation. This MOA has been jointly prepared by the Parties and shall not be construed more strictly against any Party.

16. Interpretation. The titles and headings contained in this MOA are for reference purposes only and shall not in any way affect the meaning or interpretation of this MOA. All personal pronouns used in this MOA shall include any other gender, and the singular shall include the plural, and vice versa, unless the context otherwise requires. Terms such as "herein" refer to this MOA as a whole and not to any particular sentence, paragraph, or section where they appear, unless the context otherwise requires. Whenever reference is made to a section or article of this MOA, such reference is to the section or article as a whole, including all subsections thereof, unless the reference is made to a particular subsection or subparagraph of such section or article. Any reference to "days" means calendar days, unless otherwise expressly stated. Any reference to approval by County shall require approval in writing, unless otherwise expressly stated.

17. Priority of Provisions. If there is a conflict or inconsistency between any term, statement, requirement, or provision of any document or exhibit attached to, referenced by, or incorporated in this MOA and any provision within an article or section of this MOA, the article or section shall prevail and be given effect.

18. Law, Jurisdiction, Venue, Waiver of Jury Trial. This MOA shall be interpreted and construed in accordance with and governed by the laws of the State of Florida. The exclusive venue for any lawsuit arising from, related to, or in connection with this MOA shall be in the state courts of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County, Florida. If any claim arising from, related to, or in connection with this MOA must be litigated in federal court, the exclusive venue for any such lawsuit shall be in the United States District Court or United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Florida. **EACH PARTY HEREBY EXPRESSLY WAIVES ANY RIGHTS IT MAY HAVE TO A TRIAL BY JURY OF ANY CIVIL LITIGATION RELATED TO THIS MOA.**

19. Amendments. Unless expressly authorized herein, no modification, amendment, or alteration of any portion of this MOA is effective unless contained in a written document executed with the same or similar formality as this MOA and by duly authorized representatives of County and each Participating Agency.

20. Prior Agreements. This MOA represents the final and complete understanding of the Parties regarding the subject matter of this MOA and supersedes all prior and contemporaneous negotiations and discussions regarding the same. All commitments, agreements, and understandings of the Parties concerning the subject matter of this MOA are contained herein.

21. Counterparts and Multiple Originals. This MOA may be executed in multiple originals, and may be executed in counterparts, whether signed physically or electronically, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, but all of which, taken together, shall constitute one and the same MOA.

(The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank.)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have made and executed this Agreement: BROWARD COUNTY through its BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, signing by and through its Mayor or Vice-Mayor, authorized to execute same by Board action on the _____ day of _____, 2024; MIAMI-DADE COUNTY through its BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, signing by and through its Mayor or Vice-Mayor, authorized to execute same by Board action on the _____ day of _____, 2024; MONROE COUNTY through its BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, signing by and through its Mayor or Vice-Mayor, authorized to execute same by Board action on the _____ day of _____, 2024; and PALM BEACH COUNTY through its BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, signing by and through its Mayor or Vice-Mayor, authorized to execute same by Board action on the _____ day of _____, 2024, all duly authorized to execute same.

COUNTY

ATTEST:

BROWARD COUNTY, by and through
its Board of County Commissioners

By: _____
Broward County Administrator, as
ex officio Clerk of the Broward County
Board of County Commissioners

By: _____
Mayor

____ day of _____, 2024

Approved as to form by
Andrew J. Meyers
Broward County Attorney
115 South Andrews Avenue, Suite 423
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Telephone: (954) 357-7600

By_____
Jennifer D. Brown (Date)
Assistant County Attorney

By_____
Maite Azcoitia (Date)
Deputy County Attorney

JDB/gmb
CPRG Implementation Grant MOU
04/03/2024

CLIMATE POLLUTION REDUCTION GRANT PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION GRANT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

ATTEST:

_____
COUNTY CLERK

By: _____
Print Title _____

_____
Print Name

_____ day of _____, 20___

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have approved this MOA as to form and legal sufficiency subject to execution by the parties:

_____
County Attorney

CLIMATE POLLUTION REDUCTION GRANT PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION GRANT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

MONROE COUNTY

ATTEST:

By: _____
Print Title _____

_____
COUNTY CLERK

_____
Print Name

_____ day of _____, 20___

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have approved this MOA as to form and legal sufficiency subject to execution by the parties:

_____
County Attorney

CLIMATE POLLUTION REDUCTION GRANT PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION GRANT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

PALM BEACH COUNTY

PALM BEACH COUNTY

By: _____
Maria Sachs, Mayor

_____ day of _____, 2024

ATTEST:

_____
COUNTY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGAL SUFFICIENTCY:

By: _____
Ryan Maher, Assistant County Attorney

Date: 4/23/2024

APPROVED AS TO TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

By: _____
Megan S. Houston, Department Director

Date: 4/22/24

ATTACHMENT 2

AGENCY: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

TITLE: Climate Pollution Reduction Grants Program: Implementation Grants General Competition

ACTION: **Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO):** Request for Applications

FUNDING OPPORTUNITY NUMBER: EPA-R-OAR-CPRGI-23-07

ASSISTANCE LISTING NO: 66.046

FUNDING AVAILABLE: Approximately $4.3 Billion

KEY DATES

September 20, 2023	NOFO: REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS ISSUANCE
February 1, 2024	OPTIONAL NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY IS DUE
March 15, 2024	DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING QUESTIONS
April 1, 2024	NOFO CLOSES – APPLICATIONS DUE BY 11:59 PM (ET)
July 2024	ANTICIPATED NOTIFICATION OF FUNDING SELECTION
October 2024	ANTICIPATED AWARD

APPLICATION SUBMISSION DEADLINE: Application packages must be submitted electronically to EPA through Grants.gov (www.grants.gov) no later than **April 1, 2024, at 11:59 p.m. (ET)** in order to be considered for funding. Questions related to this NOFO should be submitted to CPRG@epa.gov. The deadline for submitting questions is **March 15, 2024**. EPA will not respond to questions submitted after that date.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY: To allow for efficient management of the competitive process, EPA requests submittal of an informal Notice of Intent (NOI) to Apply by **February 1, 2024** to CPRG@epa.gov. Please include in the body of the email the dollar amount of the anticipated funding request and one to two sentences about the scope and sector(s) of the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction measures likely to be included in the potential implementation grant application. Additionally, if intending to apply as the lead applicant representing a coalition, please list all anticipated coalition members (coalition members must also be eligible applicants; see Section III.A for more details). Submission of an NOI is optional and non-binding; it is a process management tool that will allow EPA to better anticipate the resources required for efficient evaluation of submitted applications.

CONTRACTS AND SUBAWARDS: If the applicant intends to name a contractor (including an individual consultant or equipment vendor) or a subrecipient as a project partner or otherwise in the application, EPA recommends that applicants carefully review and comply with the directions contained in Section IV of this NOFO and at EPA Solicitation Clauses. Refer to EPA's

Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements for additional guidance. Applicants must demonstrate that named contractors (including individual consultants and equipment vendors) were selected in compliance with the competitive requirements of the Procurement Standards in 2 CFR Part 200 as interpreted in EPA guidance and/or that named subrecipients meet the eligibility requirements in EPA's Subaward Policy for EPA to consider their qualifications and role in the proposed project.

Climate Pollution Reduction Grants Program
Implementation Grants General Competition

Table of Contents

I. Funding Opportunity Description

A. Background and Summary

The 2022 Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) established the Climate Pollution Reduction Grants (CPRG) program,[1] which provides funds in two distinct but related phases:

1. **Planning grants:** $250 million for states, U.S. territories,[2] municipalities,[3] air pollution control agencies, tribes,[4] and groups thereof[5] to develop plans to reduce greenhouse gases (GHGs).[6] The Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP) is the first deliverable due under the CPRG planning grants.
2. **Implementation grants:** $4.6 billion for competitive grants to eligible applicants to implement GHG reduction programs, policies, projects, and measures (collectively referred to as "GHG reduction measures," or "measures") identified in a PCAP developed under a CPRG planning grant.

This notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) announces the availability of up to $4.3 billion for the CPRG implementation grants general competition. Lead organizations for CPRG planning grants must submit their PCAPs to EPA by the deadline of March 1, 2024, in order for lead organizations and other eligible applicants under this announcement to submit grant applications to fund measures contained in those plans. EPA anticipates awarding approximately 30 to 115 grants ranging between $2 million and $500 million under this general competition. Further detail on award tiers can be found in Table 1 of Section II.B.

A separate NOFO, issued under Funding Opportunity Number EPA-R-OAR-CPRGT-23-09, announces the availability of approximately $300 million for competitive CPRG implementation grants exclusively for eligible tribes and territories. While eligible tribes and territories may also apply for grants under this CPRG implementation grants general competition, those interested

---

[1] See IRA section 60114, "Climate Pollution Reduction Grants."

[2] For purposes of the CPRG program, "U.S. territories" means the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

[3] Clean Air Act section 302(f) defines "municipality" as a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law. For purposes of awarding the CPRG planning grants to municipalities, EPA used 2020 U.S. Census data for metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) to identify the country's most populous metropolitan areas, comprised of municipalities. The general concept of an MSA is that of a core area containing a substantial population nucleus, together with adjacent communities having a high degree of economic and social integration with that core. MSAs contain at least one urbanized area of 50,000 or more population. An MSA may include one or more counties.

[4] EPA has determined that based on the exclusion of Alaskan Native Corporations (ANCs) from the definition of "Indian tribe" in section 302(r) of the Clean Air Act that ANCs are not eligible for direct grants from EPA under this program. ANCs may, however, receive "non-coalition member" subawards from eligible CPRG grantees.

[5] As of the date of publication of this announcement, CPRG planning grant funding has been or is expected to be awarded to support development of climate action plans for 46 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, 79 of the country's most populous MSAs, more than 200 tribes, and four U.S. territories.

[6] For purposes of the CPRG program, greenhouse gases, or GHGs, are defined as carbon dioxide, hydrofluorocarbons, methane, nitrous oxide, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (see Clean Air Act section 137 (d)(2)).

in the CPRG implementation grant competition for tribes and territories should seek the Funding Opportunity Number EPA-R-OAR-CPRGT-23-09 for more information.

Applications for this implementation grant general competition are due on April 1, 2024. Entities eligible to apply for an implementation grant under this competition include lead organizations that were direct recipients of CPRG planning grants and other state, municipal, tribal, and territorial entities that seek to implement GHG reduction measures included in an applicable PCAP developed under a CPRG planning grant. Section III.A provides more detail on eligible applicants for this NOFO.

B. Program Goals and Objectives

Recognizing the urgency to address GHG pollution contributing to climate change, the Biden-Harris Administration and Congress established the $5 billion CPRG program as part of the 2022 IRA. EPA takes seriously its responsibility to protect human health and the environment as the United States faces the increasingly harmful impacts of climate change. Across the country, communities are experiencing more deadly wildfires and storm surges, more extreme drought and water scarcity, and dangerous levels of flooding, among other impacts. The Fourth National Climate Assessment found that intense extreme weather and climate-related events, as well as changes in average climate conditions, are expected to continue to damage infrastructure, ecosystems, and social systems that provide essential benefits to communities. If left unchecked, future climate change is expected to further disrupt many areas of life and exacerbate existing challenges to prosperity posed by aging and deteriorating infrastructure, stressed ecosystems, and long-standing inequalities. However, with this challenge comes an opportunity to invest in a cleaner economy that will spur innovation and economic growth while building more equitable, resilient communities.

Accordingly, the CPRG general competition for implementation grants is designed to enable states, municipalities, tribes, and territories to achieve the following goals:

1. Implement ambitious measures that will achieve significant cumulative GHG reductions by 2030 and beyond;
2. Pursue measures that will achieve substantial community benefits (such as reduction of criteria air pollutants (CAPs) and hazardous air pollutants (HAPs)), particularly in low-income and disadvantaged communities;
3. Complement other funding sources to maximize these GHG reductions and community benefits; and,
4. Pursue innovative policies and programs that are replicable and can be "scaled up" across multiple jurisdictions.

The CPRG general competition is also designed to incentivize eligible applicants to apply for funding together as a coalition to implement GHG reduction measures regionally, across multiple municipalities, state boundaries, or even state and tribal boundaries. Details on eligible applicants and coalitions are available in Section III.A.

Relationship Between CPRG PCAPs and Implementation Grant Eligibility

Applications for grants under this NOFO must seek funding to implement measures that are included in a PCAP developed with funding from a CPRG planning grant. Implementation grant applications can be submitted not just by the lead organization that received CPRG planning grant funds ("lead organization"), but also by state and territorial agencies, municipalities, air pollution control agencies, and tribes that did not directly receive planning grant funds but that seek funding to implement one or more measures included in an applicable PCAP.

The CPRG planning grant program guidance specified that when developing a PCAP, lead organizations must coordinate and collaborate with other eligible entities within their jurisdictions and ensure that priority measures are included in the plan that are implementable by those entities. In all cases, the lead organizations for CPRG planning grants are required to make their PCAPs available to other entities for their use in developing implementation grant applications, and EPA will publicly post all PCAPs received on the CPRG website.

EPA strongly encourages lead organizations to make draft versions of their PCAPs available as early as possible so that entities considering whether to submit an implementation grant application can begin development of their applications well before the April 1, 2024, application deadline. EPA also encourages eligible applicants that are considering applying for a CPRG implementation grant to participate in the PCAP development process and provide input on priority measures to include in the plan, in collaboration with other participants and stakeholders. EPA will not award multiple grants to implement the same measure in the same location; therefore, communication and coordination between entities that may be considering applying to fund similar measures should occur prior to applications being submitted. See Section III of this NOFO for more details on eligible applicants.

GHG Reduction Measures in CPRG Implementation Grant Applications

EPA encourages eligible applicants to seek implementation funds for GHG reduction measures that will significantly reduce cumulative GHG emissions by 2030 and beyond, and that will accelerate decarbonization across one or more major sectors responsible for GHG emissions (i.e., industry, electric power, transportation, commercial and residential buildings, agriculture/natural and working lands, and waste and materials management). EPA will score grant applications based on multiple evaluation criteria described in Section V.A of this NOFO, with an emphasis on the magnitude of near-term GHG reductions that will be achieved by the proposed measures.

Applications may include one or more proposed GHG reduction measures. A GHG reduction measure may reduce GHG emissions or enhance carbon removal.[7] Documentation must be provided to support the estimated GHG emission reductions for each proposed measure. In

[7] Measures that enhance "carbon removal" are those that increase the removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through, for example, the uptake of carbon and storage in soils, vegetation, and forests. Such measures may include actions related to management of lands in their current use, or as lands are converted to other uses.

general, EPA anticipates that applications may seek funding for the following types of measures:

- A new, stand-alone GHG reduction measure that will be implemented solely through CPRG funding;
- An expansion of a GHG reduction measure that is already being implemented, where the expansion of the measure will be funded through CPRG funding; and,
- A new GHG reduction measure for which the applicant has already secured partial funding and needs additional funding from the CPRG program to secure the total funding needed to fully implement the measure.

Applications should provide details on each measure as laid out in Section IV.B. Applications will be evaluated as a whole and will not be assessed by individual GHG reduction measures; therefore, applicants should include only those measures that are eligible and meet the requirements described in this announcement.

EPA expects to receive implementation grant applications covering a broad range of potential GHG reduction measures. Applicants have flexibility to tailor the new or expanded GHG reduction measures included in their applications to the specific plans and needs of their jurisdictions. Applications that successfully address the specific evaluation criteria in Section V will also be consistent with the following program objectives:

- Stimulate transformation toward a decarbonized economy and demonstrate approaches that are replicable to unlock opportunities for even greater emissions reductions;
- Result in benefits (and do not result in negative impacts) to low-income and disadvantaged communities, such as CAP and HAP reductions, equitable economic growth, and improved quality of life outcomes, where applicable;
- Support measures for which dedicated funding or financing from other sources (e.g., under other provisions of the 2022 IRA, the 2021 Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), the 2021 American Rescue Plan Act (ARP), and the 2021 Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors and Science Act (CHIPS)) is unavailable or that leverage other sources of public and private funding to the fullest extent possible prior to seeking CPRG funding;
- Achieve GHG emission reductions that are long-lasting and certain;
- Incorporate high labor standards, emphasize job quality, and support equitable workforce development; and,
- Ensure accountability by providing clear assumptions, metrics, timelines, authorities, and budget details.

EPA is partnering with other federal agencies to strategically design funding opportunities and efficiently deploy resources provided by the IRA, BIL, ARP, and CHIPS, among others. Applications for CPRG implementation grants will be evaluated on the degree to which they demonstrate a strong need for CPRG implementation funding that is unmet by other funding sources. Applicants should explain how they have explored the availability of other federal and

state grants, tax incentives, and other funding streams to implement their GHG reduction measure(s) and why these sources are not sufficient (see Section IV.B and criterion 1.b in Section V.A).

GHG Reduction Measure Examples

Drawing on a variety of information – including workplans submitted by CPRG planning grantees, measures highlighted in the CPRG Request for Information, and input received during CPRG stakeholder listening sessions – EPA has prepared the following illustrative list of potential GHG reduction measures for which applicants may choose to seek CPRG implementation grant funding. This list is neither exhaustive nor definitive with respect to the measures that may be included in competitive applications under this NOFO. Applicants should consider the evaluation criteria in Section V.A when deciding on which measure or measures to include in their applications.

Transportation Sector

- Programs to increase the share of electric light-, medium-, and heavy-duty vehicles, and to expand electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- Electrification requirements for state, municipal, territorial, and tribal vehicle, transit, or equipment fleets
- Transportation pricing programs that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), such as parking pricing and congestion and road pricing
- Policies to support transportation management incentive programs to reduce vehicle trips or travel and expand transit use, such as van-pool programs, ridesharing, transit fare subsidies, and bicycle facilities
- New or expanded transportation infrastructure projects to facilitate public transit, micro-mobility, car sharing, bicycle, and pedestrian modes
- Incentive programs to purchase zero-emission vehicles and equipment to replace older heavy-duty diesel vehicles and equipment
- Programs to increase efficiency and reduce GHG emissions at ports and freight terminals, such as vehicle or equipment idle reduction, vessel-speed reduction, equipment electrification, and shore power
- Update building and zoning codes to encourage walkable, bikeable, and transit-oriented development
- Encourage mode shift from private vehicles to walking, biking, and public transportation (e.g., complete streets, bike share programs, bike storage facilities, low-speed electric bicycle subsidies, public transit subsidies)

Electric Power Sector

- Renewable portfolio standards and/or clean electricity standards
- Energy efficiency portfolio standards
- Emission trading systems (e.g., cap-and-trade programs) and carbon pricing measures
- GHG performance standards for electric generating units
- Installation of renewable energy and energy storage systems on municipal facilities

- Programs to support smart-grid and/or behind-the-meter technologies to reduce power losses, reduce peak demand, and enable consumer participation in distributed generation
- Targeted incentives for installation of renewable energy and energy storage systems on commercial and residential buildings, such as net metering, tax credits, rebates, and streamlined interconnection standards
- Policies and measures to streamline permitting for renewable energy projects
- Development of distributed or community-scale renewable energy generation, microgrids, or vehicle-to-grid infrastructure in disadvantaged communities, including remote and rural regions

Buildings Sector

- Adoption and implementation of the most up-to-date building energy codes or stretch codes for new commercial and residential buildings
- Implementation of a clean heat standard
- Incentive programs for implementation of end-use energy efficiency measures in existing government-owned, commercial, and residential buildings
- Incentive programs for the purchase of certified energy-efficient appliances, heating and cooling equipment, lighting, and building products to replace inefficient products
- Programs and policies to promote electrification of government-owned, commercial, and residential buildings
- Programs and policies to accelerate the incorporation of efficient electric technologies and electric vehicle charging at new single-family, multi-unit, or affordable residential buildings and commercial buildings, including building codes related to electric vehicle charging
- Implementation of a building energy performance management program for government-owned buildings
- Implementation of a new benchmarking and building performance standards
- Programs to promote recovery and destruction of high-global warming potential (GWP) hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) used in existing appliances, air conditioning systems, and commercial chillers

Industrial Sector

- Standards addressing GHG emissions from industrial facilities and from energy production sectors, including emissions from industrial process heat and industrial processes
- Programs to support or incentivize implementation of energy efficiency measures in industry, including energy audits, strategic energy management, equipment upgrades, and waste heat utilization
- Programs to support or incentivize GHG reductions in industrial energy use and industrial processes, including use of low/no carbon fuels, electrification, renewable energy, and process improvements
- Programs to develop, expand, and support markets for low-embodied carbon materials and products, such as cement and steel

Waste, Water, and Sustainable Materials Management Sector

- Standards and incentives to reduce methane emissions from landfills and wastewater treatment facilities, including through collection for use or destruction
- Programs and incentives to reduce or divert waste (including food and/or yard waste) through improved production practices, improved collection services, and increased reuse or recycling rates
- Programs and incentives to reduce GHG emissions associated with plastics production, use, and waste management
- Programs to expand composting and bio-digestion infrastructure to reduce GHG emissions and increase beneficial use of organic waste
- Policies and programs to reduce construction and demolition waste through building reuse, deconstruction, and material diversion and reuse
- Installation of renewable energy and energy efficiency measures at wastewater treatment facilities

Agricultural Sector

- Incentive programs to fund electric agricultural equipment technologies
- Incentives for technologies and techniques that reduce nitrous oxide emissions from fertilizer application
- Incentives to promote anaerobic digesters to capture methane and generate renewable energy or produce renewable fuel

Carbon Removal Measures

- Policies to promote improved forest management to enhance carbon stocks on forested land
- Urban afforestation and green infrastructure programs and projects
- Restoration of degraded lands (e.g., brownfields, mine reclamation) and forested lands to enhance carbon sequestration
- Policies to enhance carbon stocks in coastal estuaries, such as wetlands and mangroves.

Low-Income and Disadvantaged Communities

Applications for CPRG implementation grants will be evaluated for benefits to low-income and disadvantaged communities (see criterion 4 in Section V.A). For the purposes of this NOFO, EPA defines low-income and disadvantaged communities as any community that meets at least one of the following characteristics:

- Any census tract that is included as disadvantaged in the Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST)[8];
- Any census block group that is at or above the 90th percentile for any of EJScreen's

[8] CEJST has an interactive map and uses datasets that are environmental and socioeconomic indicators of burdens. Percentiles show how much burden each Census tract experiences compared to other tracts. To qualify as a disadvantaged community in the CEJST, one of the burden indicators must be above the 90th percentile.

Supplemental Indexes when compared to the nation or relevant state[9]; or,

- Any geographic area within tribal lands as included in EJScreen.[10] (The CPRG program considers that federally recognized tribes meet the definition of disadvantaged communities for the purposes of this grant program.)

EPA recognizes that these areas may include a wide range of communities, such as communities with environmental justice concerns, traditional energy communities, and rural communities.

EPA provides a GIS map layer that combines the CEJST and EJScreen information above to facilitate identification of low-income and disadvantaged communities (as defined for EPA IRA programs). This map layer can be found on the EJScreen website.[11] Although some states may have state-specific definitions of low-income and disadvantaged communities, applicants for CPRG implementation grants must use EPA's definition.

EPA is committed to meeting the objectives of the Justice40 Initiative set forth in Executive Order 14008, which sets the goal that 40 percent of the overall benefits of relevant federal investments flow to disadvantaged communities, which have been or are marginalized, underserved, and overburdened by pollution. Individual applicants do not have to explicitly demonstrate that 40 percent of the benefits of each measure or project will flow to disadvantaged communities. Instead, EPA will conduct an analysis of the GHG emission reduction measures and the benefits to disadvantaged communities resulting from the CPRG program as a whole.

Environmental Justice

EPA is committed to accelerating environmental justice (EJ) in communities overburdened by pollution through its IRA investments, including through the CPRG program. This program is responsive to the Administration's call for agencies to advance EJ in Executive Order 14096: *Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All*.

---

[9] EJScreen is EPA's environmental justice mapping and screening tool that uses national datasets for environmental and socioeconomic indicators to show how a selected area compares to the state, EPA region, or the nation. EJScreen operates at a finer geographic scale of Census block groups than the CEJST, allowing EJScreen Supplemental Indexes to identify smaller areas that may be disadvantaged within a larger non-disadvantaged area. To identify areas in EJScreen that meet one of the above definitions of a low-income or disadvantaged community, applicants should use the "Supplemental Indices" option under the tool's map layers.

[10] The Tribal Lands category in EJScreen to use for this purpose includes Alaska Native Allotments (EPA Metadata Record), Alaska Native Villages (EPA Metadata Record), American Indian Reservations (EPA Metadata Record), American Indian Off-reservation Trust Lands (EPA Metadata Record), and Oklahoma Tribal Statistical Areas (EPA Metadata Record).

[11] The EJScreen mapping tool is available at: https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/. To locate the map layer displaying areas that meet the EPA definition of low-income and disadvantaged communities, go to the "Places" Tab, then select "Justice40/IRA" from the drop-down menu, and then select "EPA IRA Disadvantaged Communities." At the time of release of this NOFO, EJScreen version 2.2 was the current version.

C. Environmental Results and Strategic Plan Information

Pursuant to Section 6.a of EPA Order 5700.7A1, "Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements," EPA must align proposed grant programs and assistance agreements with the Agency's Strategic Plan. EPA also requires that grant applicants and recipients adequately describe environmental outputs and outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements. Applicants must include specific statements describing the environmental results of the proposed project in terms of well-defined outputs and, to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes that will demonstrate how the project will contribute to the Strategic Plan goals listed below. EPA will evaluate "outputs and outcomes" under criterion 3 in Section V. More guidance on outputs and outcomes is provided in Section IV.B.

(1) Linkage to EPA Strategic Plan: The activities to be funded under this announcement must support EPA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2026 Strategic Plan. Awards made under this announcement will support Goal 1, "Tackle the Climate Crisis"; Objective 1.1, "Reduce Emissions that Cause Climate Change." Under this objective, EPA will "aggressively reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases from all sectors while increasing energy and resource efficiency and the use of renewable energy." All applications must be for projects that support this goal and objective. For more information see EPA's FY 2022 – 2026 EPA Strategic Plan.

(2) Outputs: The term "output" means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work product related to an environmental goal and 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 able to be assessed during an assistance agreement funding period.

Examples of outputs from the implementation of GHG reduction measures funded under this announcement may include, but are not limited to:

- Number of: equipment or technology installations, such as zero-emission vehicles; renewable energy installations and smart meters; electrified appliances (e.g., heat pumps) installed; buildings retrofitted; industrial equipment electrified; biodigesters installed; trees planted;
- Policies and measures enacted, adopted, and/or expanded, and related procedural milestones in implementing GHG reduction measures; and/or,
- Staff hired to implement GHG reduction measures, associated low-income and disadvantaged community provisions, and associated trainings for workforce development.

Progress reports and a final report will also be required outputs, as specified in Section VI.B.

(3) Outcomes: The term "outcome" means the result, effect, or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related,

or programmatic in nature but must also be quantifiable. They may not necessarily be achievable within a grant funding period.

At a minimum, the application should list the following outcomes from the GHG reduction measures proposed for CPRG implementation grant funding:

- Reduction in cumulative metric tons of GHG emissions:
  - From 2025 through calendar year 2030, and
  - From 2025 through calendar year 2050.

If applicable, the application should also list the following outcomes from the GHG reduction measures proposed for CPRG grant funding:

- Reduction in annual amount of CAP and/or HAP emissions in 2030, and
- Reduction in annual amount of CAP and/or HAP emissions in low-income and disadvantaged communities in 2030.

Other potential outcomes may include, but are not limited to:

- Lower energy demand and residential/commercial energy expenditures;
- Reduced energy bills for residents in low-income and disadvantaged communities, and throughout the applicant's jurisdiction;
- Reduced exposure to hazardous air pollution or unhealthy ambient air quality;
- Increased staff capacity to implement GHG reduction measures;
- Enhanced level of community engagement, as measured by an increased number of ongoing actions to engage with organizations and residents of disadvantaged communities, and other interested parties;
- Number of high-quality jobs created throughout the applicant's jurisdiction and in low-income and disadvantaged communities; and/or,
- Increased resilience to climate change impacts as measured by the number of buildings or Census tracts that meet certain resiliency standards.[12]

D. Statutory Authority

The IRA (Public Law 117-169) amended the Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 U.S.C. § 7401 *et seq.*) to include section 137 (42 U.S.C. § 7437), which authorizes EPA to make grants for greenhouse gas air pollution reduction plans and implementation activities. CAA section 137(a)(1) appropriates $250 million to EPA to award climate pollution planning grants to eligible entities comprised of states, air pollution control agencies, municipalities, tribes, or a group of one or more of these entities. CAA sections 137(a)(2) and (c) appropriate $4.75 billion (less three percent to EPA for

[12] The U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit defines climate resilience as "the capacity of a community, business, or natural environment to prevent, withstand, respond to, and recover from a disruption." To find EPA resources for local governments on climate resilience, including strategies, tools, and case studies, visit the Climate Change Adaptation Resource Center (ARC-X).

administrative costs) to EPA to make competitive grants to states, air pollution control agencies, municipalities, tribes, or a group of one or more of these entities to implement the programs, policies, measures, and projects developed under a climate pollution planning grant. CAA section 137 also requires that implementation grant applicants address the degree to which a grant application would reduce GHG emissions in total and with respect to low-income and disadvantaged communities. CAA section 137(d)(2) defines "greenhouse gas" as the air pollutants carbon dioxide, hydrofluorocarbons, methane, nitrous oxide, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride.

E. Additional Provisions for Applicants Incorporated into the Solicitation

Additional provisions that apply to Sections III, IV, V, and VI, and/or awards made under this solicitation can be found at EPA Solicitation Clauses. These provisions are important for applying to this solicitation and applicants must review them when preparing applications for this solicitation. They include requirements and restrictions applicable to all EPA grant funding. If an applicant is unable to access these provisions electronically at the website above, please contact the EPA point of contact listed in Section VII of this solicitation to obtain a copy of the provisions.

II. Federal Award Information

A. Amount of Funding Available

The total funding expected to be available for awards under the CPRG implementation grants general competition is approximately $4.3 billion. Funding is dependent upon Agency appropriations, funding availability, Agency priorities, and other applicable considerations. EPA has issued a separate NOFO under Funding Opportunity Number EPA-R-OAR-CPRGT-23-09 for a competition reserved exclusively for eligible tribes and territories. Eligible tribes and territories may also apply for grants under this CPRG implementation grants general competition.

B. Number and Amount of Awards

EPA anticipates awarding a total of approximately 30 to 115 grants under this announcement subject to the availability of funds, the quantity and quality of applications received, Agency priorities, and other applicable considerations. Awards are expected to range between $2 million and $500 million. EPA expects to award grants within five tiers described in Table 1 with funds targeted for each tier. EPA has established these tiers to provide funding opportunities for a range of potential applicants. These ranges reflect differences in the scope, scale, and cost of GHG reduction measures and are intended to help applicants structure their applications to best reflect the cost of their proposed measures and their ability to implement the grant. The total grant amount requested in an application will determine the tier within which the application will be evaluated. Applications will be evaluated against other applications within the same tier.

Table 1: Grants Ranges and Funding by Tier

Tier	Grant Ranges	Funds Targeted for Each Tier	Anticipated Number of Grants to be Awarded
Tier A	$200,000,000 – $500,000,000	$2 billion	4-10
Tier B	$100,000,000 – $199,999,999	$1.3 billion	6-13
Tier C	$50,000,000 – $99,999,999	$0.6 billion	6-12
Tier D	$10,000,000 – $49,999,999	$0.3 billion	6-30
Tier E	$2,000,000 – $9,999,999	$0.1 billion	10-50

The actual award amounts, total amount of funding, and number of awards made under each of the tiers described in this section may differ from the estimated amounts for many reasons including but not limited to the number of meritorious applications received in each tier, Agency priorities, and funding availability. In addition, EPA reserves the right to increase or decrease (including decreasing to zero) the total dollar amount for awards under each tier.

C. Partial Funding

In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund applications by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed GHG reduction measures in overall applications. If EPA decides to partially fund an application, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the application, or portion thereof, was evaluated and selected for award, thereby maintaining the integrity of the competition and selection process.

D. Additional Awards

EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this solicitation, consistent with Agency policy and guidance, if additional funding remains or becomes available after the original selections are made. EPA intends that any additional selections for awards may be made no later than six months after the original selection decisions. In addition, EPA reserves the right to reject all applications and make no awards under this announcement or to make fewer awards than anticipated.

E. Award Funding and Incremental/Full Funding

Awards will be fully funded at the start of the grant period. EPA award recipients may incur allowable costs 90 calendar days before EPA makes the award. Pre-award expenses more than 90 calendar days prior to the date of award require prior approval by EPA. All costs incurred before EPA makes the award are at the applicant's risk. EPA is under no obligation to reimburse such costs if for any reason the applicant does not receive a federal award, or if the federal award is less than anticipated and inadequate to cover such costs. See 2 CFR 1500.9.

F. Period of Performance

The estimated period of performance for awards resulting from this solicitation will be up to five years. The estimated project start date for awards is October 1, 2024.

G. Funding Type

Successful applicants will be awarded funding as a grant.

III. Eligibility Information

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at EPA Solicitation Clauses.

A. Eligible Applicants

Section 137(c)(1) of the CAA states that CPRG implementation grants shall be awarded to eligible entities to implement plans developed under CPRG planning grants. The eligible entities under this competition are consistent with assistance listing 66.046 and CAA section 137.

Table 2 describes the eligible applicants for the CPRG implementation grants competition under this NOFO. In general, entities eligible to apply for an implementation grant under this announcement are states, municipalities, air pollution control agencies, tribes,[13] territories, and groups thereof. More specifically, states, municipalities, tribes, and territories that directly received a CPRG planning grant are eligible to apply for an implementation grant. In addition, municipalities, air pollution control agencies, and tribes that did not directly receive a planning grant but that seek funding to implement one or more GHG reduction measures that are included in an applicable PCAP (submitted to EPA by March 1, 2024) are eligible to apply. An applicable PCAP is one that geographically covers the entity and contains GHG reduction measures that can be implemented by the entity.

Table 2. Entities Eligible to Apply for CPRG Implementation Grants

Entity	Eligible	Ineligible
State (including District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)	A state (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico but excluding Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, and South Dakota) can apply for funding to implement measures included in its PCAP. Eligible applicants are: • Lead organizations for state CPRG planning grants • Other state agencies (including state air pollution control agencies), departments, or other executive branch-level offices	• State agencies (including state air pollution control agencies) in Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, and South Dakota

[13] EPA has determined that based on the exclusion of Alaskan Native Corporations (ANCs) from the definition of "Indian tribe" in section 302(r) of the Clean Air Act that ANCs are not eligible for direct grants from EPA under this program. ANCs may, however, receive "non-coalition member" subawards from eligible CPRG grantees.

Entity	Eligible	Ineligible
Municipality	A municipality can apply for funding to implement measures included in an applicable state, MSA, or territorial PCAP. Eligible applicants are: • Lead organizations for MSA CPRG planning grants • Other municipal agencies (including local air pollution control agencies), departments, or other municipal government offices • Councils of government, metropolitan planning commissions, or other regional organizations comprised of multiple municipalities	• Municipalities and local air pollution control agencies in Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, and South Dakota that are not covered by a MSA PCAP developed for one of the 12 MSAs in these states that received a planning grant
Tribe or Tribal Consortium	A tribe or tribal consortium can apply for funding to implement measures included in an applicable tribal, state, or MSA PCAP. Eligible applicants are: • Lead organizations for tribal CPRG planning grants • Other tribal agencies (including tribal air pollution control agencies), departments, or other tribal government offices or tribal consortia	• Non federally recognized tribes • Alaska Native Corporations • Tribes or tribal consortia not covered by a state, MSA, or tribal PCAP
Territory	Each territory covered by CPRG (American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) can apply for funding to implement measures included in its PCAP. Eligible applicants are: • Lead organizations for CPRG planning grants for one of the territories above • Other territorial agencies (including territorial air pollution control agencies), departments, or other territorial government offices	

Entity	Eligible	Ineligible
Coalition of Eligible Applicants	A coalition consisting of two or more eligible applicants (including tribal consortia, and coalitions of agencies from states, municipalities, tribes, and/or territories) can apply to jointly implement one or more measures included in an applicable state, MSA, tribal, or territorial PCAP	

Because the State of Florida, State of Iowa, Commonwealth of Kentucky, and State of South Dakota declined to participate in the planning grant phase of this program, no state agencies, departments, or other executive branch-level offices in those four states can be eligible applicants for the CPRG implementation grant phase. Similarly, no municipal government office or air pollution control agency within those four states is eligible to apply under this NOFO, except for those municipalities and air agencies covered by PCAPs developed for the following MSAs:

1. Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL Metro Area
2. Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL Metro Area
3. Orlando–Kissimmee–Sanford, FL Metro Area
4. Jacksonville, FL Metro Area
5. North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL Metro Area
6. Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA Metro Area
7. Cedar Rapids, IA Metro Area
8. Iowa City, IA Metro Area
9. Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN Metro Area
10. Lexington-Fayette, KY Metro Area
11. Bowling Green, KY Metro Area
12. Rapid City, SD Metro Area.

Note that for tribes, tribal consortia, and territories to be considered eligible applicants for implementation grants under this general competition NOFO, the relevant tribe, tribal consortium, or territory that received the CPRG planning grant must have submitted its PCAP to EPA by March 1, 2024 (the same date that PCAPs are due from states and MSAs). Otherwise, tribal and territorial PCAPs are due to EPA by April 1, 2024, in advance of the application deadline for the separate CPRG implementation grant competition reserved for tribes and territories under Funding Opportunity Number EPA-R-OAR-CPRGT-23-09.

An eligible applicant may apply to this competition either as an individual applicant or as a "lead applicant" in a coalition. An *individual applicant* may make subawards to partners (subrecipients) to carry out a portion of the grant's activities provided that the subawards are consistent with the grant's terms and conditions and with all applicable requirements, including

the EPA Subaward Policy. For individual applicants that plan to make subawards to partners, EPA encourages those applicants to include letters of commitment from such partners.

A *coalition* is a special type of partnership, also subject to subaward requirements, including the EPA Subaward Policy. However, for purposes of this grant program, a coalition is a group of two or more eligible applicants that share a strong and substantial commitment to the proposed measures (e.g., financially, materially, or operationally) such that withdrawal by any single member from the coalition would fundamentally alter the design or expected outputs and outcomes of the proposed measures. Coalition members must demonstrate their commitment to the coalition and to fulfilling their role to ensure success of the proposed measures through a signed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Such a memorandum should include, among other things, the proposed operating model and roles and responsibilities of all coalition members. The lead applicant for the coalition must submit the MOA as an attachment as described in Section IV.B and Appendix E ("Guidelines for a Memorandum of Agreement for a Coalition"). See Section IV.C for more information about partnership and coalition coverage.

Each eligible applicant is limited to submitting two grant applications: one as the individual applicant and one as the lead applicant for a coalition. Applicants may participate in more than one coalition but may only serve as lead applicant for one coalition.

B. Voluntary Cost Sharing or Matching Funds

No cost sharing/matching funds or leveraged resources are required as a condition of eligibility under this competition. Funds awarded under this program cannot be used to meet the matching funds requirement under another federal grant program.

C. Threshold Eligibility Criteria

All applications will be reviewed for eligibility and must meet the eligibility requirements described in Section III to be considered eligible. If necessary, EPA may contact applicants to clarify threshold eligibility questions prior to making an eligibility determination. Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration due to the threshold eligibility review or due to a lack of timely response to EPA inquiries will be notified within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

1. Applications must substantially comply with the application submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV or else they will be rejected. Pages in excess of the page limitations expressed in Section IV.B, including the 25-page limitation for the workplan, will not be reviewed. Applications should use a legible font type and size.
2. All applications must be submitted through Grants.gov as stated in Sections IV.A and B (except in the limited circumstances where another mode of submission is specifically allowed for as explained in Section IV) on or before the application submission deadline of April 1, 2024, 11:59 PM ET (see Section IV.A). Applicants are responsible for following the submission instructions in Section IV.A to ensure that the application is timely and properly submitted. Please note that applicants experiencing technical issues with

submitting through Grants.gov should follow the instructions provided in Section IV.A, which include both the requirement to contact Grants.gov and the requirement to email a full application to EPA at CPRG@epa.gov prior to the April 1, 2024, deadline.

EPA will only consider accepting applications outside of Grants.gov from applicants that are able to demonstrate that they are unable to submit through Grants.gov due to Grants.gov or relevant SAM.gov system issues or for unforeseen exigent circumstances, such as extreme weather interfering with internet access. Failure of an applicant to submit prior to the application submission deadline because they did not properly or timely register in SAM.gov or Grants.gov is not an acceptable reason to justify acceptance of an application outside of Grants.gov. **NOTE: Registering in SAM.gov or Grants.gov can take a month or more. Applicants are advised to begin their registration process early so it does not interfere with drafting the application near the deadline.**

3. Applications must support Goal 1, "Tackle the Climate Crisis;" Objective 1.1, "Reduce Emissions that Cause Climate Change" of EPA's Strategic Plan described in Section I.C.

4. Applications must request EPA assistance funds to implement GHG reduction measures contained in a PCAP developed under a CPRG planning grant.

5. Applications must request EPA assistance funds within the range of $2 million to $500 million, as specified in Section II.B. Applications that request EPA assistance funds less than $2 million or in excess of $500 million are not eligible and will not be reviewed.

6. Applications may only be submitted by eligible applicants as described in Section III.A. If a lead applicant submits an application for a coalition without a Memorandum of Agreement signed by all eligible applicants participating in the coalition, that application will be treated as an individual application for the lead applicant (see Threshold Eligibility Criteria 8).

7. A group of eligible applicants applying as a coalition as defined in Section III.A may not submit multiple applications for the same set of GHG reduction measures using different lead applicants (i.e., submitting the same application under different lead applicants). In the event that EPA receives more than one such application, EPA will review the most recent application submitted and will disregard all others.

8. An eligible applicant as defined in Section III.A may submit one application as the individual applicant and one application as the lead applicant for a coalition. In the event that an applicant exceeds these limits, EPA will contact the applicant prior to review to determine which application(s) to withdraw from the competition. If the applicant does not respond to EPA within two business days of being contacted, EPA will review the last application(s) submitted and will disregard all others.

D. Ineligible Costs and Activities

All expenses must meet the allowability requirements in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E and applicable provisions of 2 CFR Part 1500. To be considered eligible, costs must be necessary and

reasonable to implement the GHG reduction measures described in the application. Applications that include ineligible expenses are ineligible to receive funding for such costs, and inclusion of ineligible expenses may render the full application unsuitable for funding.

Successful applications for this program must focus on the implementation of PCAPs for states, MSAs, tribes, and territories to reduce climate pollution through GHG reduction measures and include the required elements and qualities outlined in Section IV.B. 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 integrity of the application, render the entire application ineligible for funding. Applications that include measures not considered to be GHG reduction measures, and those that do not include elements required in the application, may be considered ineligible for funding for this reason.

Using CPRG funds to aid regulated entities (e.g., subaward from a state to private entity) to comply with EPA regulatory requirements is not an eligible activity under this program.

Applicants may seek funding for projects outside the scope of this grant program by applying for federal grant programs better tailored to their needs. Federal BIL and IRA funding opportunities for which applicants to this program may be eligible can be found here or at Grants.gov.

IV. Application and Submission Information

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at EPA Solicitation Clauses.

A. How to Register to Apply for Grants Under This Competition

Note: The registration process can take a month or more. EPA advises applicants to start the process as soon as possible so that it does not overlap or interfere with finalizing the application.

Applicants should visit How to Register to Apply for Grants for additional information. All EPA grant applications must be submitted online, except in limited circumstances. Organizations must be registered in two government systems to apply for EPA grants:

1. The System for Award Management (SAM.gov) registers organizations to conduct business with the U.S. Government, which includes federal grants.
2. Grants.gov is the official system for managing all federal grant applications.

These two systems share information. Together, they provide access to everything needed to identify federal grant opportunities and to complete the online application process.

Note that individuals access both systems through a single user account set up in Login.gov. Creating a Login.gov account is easy. If the applicant does not have a Login.gov account, they will be prompted to create one when they register with SAM.gov or Grants.gov. Learn more about Login.gov.

If the applicant has done business with the federal government previously, they can and should check their entity status using their government issued Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) to determine if their registration is active. SAM.gov requires entities to renew their registration every 365 days to keep it active. Organizations should ensure that their SAM.gov registration includes a current e-Business (EBiz) Point of Contact (POC) name and email address. The EBiz POC is critical for Grants.gov registration and system functionality. If the point of contact has changed, the applicant may need to contact the Federal Service Desk for help with their SAM.gov account: (866) 606-8220. The Federal Service Desk hours of operation are Monday – Friday 8am – 8pm ET.

Please note that SAM.gov registration is different than obtaining a UEI only. Obtaining a UEI only validates the applicant's organization's legal business name and address. Please review the Federal Service Desk's Frequently Asked Questions document for additional details.

Follow these steps to register to apply for EPA grants. **Start the registration process early**. The process can take a month or more. Errors or inconsistencies in registration in the two systems can prolong the process. Applicants are encouraged to start the registration process **before beginning the application**. Applicants that have registered in SAM.gov in the past should check their registration status at least a month before applying under this competition.

Step 1. Register the Organization in SAM.gov

Organizations must register with SAM.gov to obtain a UEI, which is a 12-character alphanumeric identifier assigned to each unique organization. There is no fee for registering with SAM.gov and registration must be renewed annually.

Registration in SAM.gov requires providing assertions, representations and certifications, and other information so that the federal government can verify the existence and uniqueness of the organization. Follow these steps to get started:

1. Go to the SAM.gov Entity Registration page. Review the "Before You Get Started" section and download the Entity Registration Checklist to help prepare.
2. Click the "Get Started" button when ready. Applicants may be prompted to accept the usage terms and sign in through Login.gov. If necessary, click the "Get Started" button again after signing in.
3. Applicants will be prompted to choose what they want to do. Most grant applicants will select the option to "Register for Financial Assistance Awards Only."
4. Select the appropriate option and click the "Next" button.
5. Proceed through the registration process by answering the questions and providing the necessary information.

Organizations will need to designate an EBiz POC. The EBiz POC is likely to be the organization's chief financial officer or authorizing official. There can be only one EBiz POC for each unique organization. The EBiz POC will:

- Manage the SAM.gov account and login.
- Set up the Grants.gov profile for the organization (see Step 2 below).
- Oversee all activities for the organization within Grants.gov.
- Assign all roles in Grants.gov for individuals from the organization who will be involved in applying for grants, including the Authorized Organization Representative (AOR), Expanded AOR roles, Workspace Manager, and Custom roles (see Step 3 below).

Note that the EBiz POC does not submit grant proposals for the organization. Proposals are submitted by the AOR in Grants.gov. After the information submitted through the registration process is authenticated, the EBiz POC will receive an email from SAM.gov indicating that the registration is active.

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

Once the applicant's SAM.gov account is active, the applicant must register in Grants.gov. Grants.gov will electronically receive the applicant's organization information, such as EBiz POC email address and UEI.

Step 2. Create a User Account and Applicant Profile in Grants.gov

After obtaining a UEI, an organization must create an applicant profile in Grants.gov.

The EBiz POC will set up the applicant profile in 2 steps:

1. Create a user account in Grants.gov with the same email address used by the EBiz POC in SAM.gov. The email address is used to match the EBiz POC from SAM.gov to Grants.gov.
2. Create the applicant profile in Grants.gov using the UEI obtained from SAM.gov.

Grants.gov registration is FREE. If the applicant has never applied for a federal grant before, they should review the Grants.gov Applicant Registration instructions. As part of the Grants.gov registration process, the EBiz POC is the only person that can affiliate and assign applicant roles to members of an organization. In addition, at least one person must be assigned as an AOR. Only person(s) with the AOR role can submit applications in Grants.gov. Please review the Intro to Grants.gov - Understanding User Roles and Learning Workspace - User Roles and Workspace Actions for details on this important process. Applicants need to ensure that the AOR who submits the application through Grants.gov and whose UEI is listed on the application is an AOR for the applicant listed on the application. Additionally, the UEI listed on the application must be registered to the applicant organization's SAM.gov account. If not, the application may be deemed ineligible.

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

Step 3. Create Individual Grants.gov Accounts for Organization Members

There is no fee for registering with Grants.gov. Each member of the organization who will participate in the online grant application process needs to register an individual account on Grants.gov.

1. Go to the Grants.gov registration page.
2. Complete the form, which includes specifying a username and password. This username and password are used to create the Grants.gov account. Applicants will be prompted to link the Grants.gov account to their Login.gov account.
3. Associate the applicant's individual account with the organization's UEI. The applicant will also enter the organization's Profile Name and the applicant's Job Title.

The organization's EBiz POC can delegate administrative roles to other Grants.gov users associated with the UEI, as necessary. Learn more about managing roles in Grants.gov.

Step 4. Learn How to Use Workspace in Grants.gov

Workspace is the application in Grants.gov that an organization's grant team uses when applying for federal grants. Workspace is a role-based tool, in which the user's assigned role controls permissions to perform specific actions, such as accessing and editing application forms. As noted in Step 3 above, the EBiz POC has the initial responsibility to assign roles to individuals.

The core roles include:

- Expanded AOR: has the most privileges.
- Standard AOR: allows user to submit the final application and perform other actions.
- Workspace Manager: the minimum role required to create a workspace and begin work on an application.

Custom roles can also be created. Becoming familiar with Grants.gov Workspace roles and understanding the process will help applicants be better prepared to submit applications. The videos on this page are just two of many Grants.gov training resources to help applicants get started.

If the applicant's organization has no access to the internet or access is very limited, the applicant may request an exception by following the procedures outlined in Exceptions to the Grants.gov Submission Requirement website. Please note that the request must be received at

least 15 calendar days before the application due date to allow enough time to negotiate alternative submission methods.

B. Application Process

To begin the application process under this grant announcement, go to Grants.gov and click the "Search Grants" tab. Search the opportunity number associated with this opportunity – EPA-R-OAR-CPRGI-23-07. Once the opportunity has been selected, click the red "Apply" button at the top of the "View Grant Opportunity" page.

The electronic submission of applications to this funding opportunity must be made by an official representative of the organization who has been registered as an AOR and is authorized by the organization to sign applications for federal financial assistance. If the submit button is grayed out, it may be because an individual does not have the appropriate role to submit for their organization. Contact the organization's EBiz POC or contact Grants.gov for assistance at 1-800-518-4726 or support@grants.gov.

Applicants need to ensure that the AOR who submits the application through Grants.gov and whose UEI is listed on the application is an AOR for the applicant listed on the application, specifically on the SF-424. Additionally, the UEI listed on the application must be registered to the applicant organization's SAM.gov account. If not, the application may be deemed ineligible. Applications submitted through Grants.gov will be time and date stamped electronically. Please note that successful submission of the application through Grants.gov does not necessarily mean the application is eligible for award. Any application submitted after the application's deadline will be deemed ineligible and not be considered.

Technical Issues with Submission

If applicants experience technical issues during the submission of an application that they are unable to resolve, follow these procedures **before** the application deadline of April 1, 2024 at 11:59 PM ET:

- Contact Grants.gov Support Center **before** the application deadline.
- Document the Grants.gov ticket/case number.
- Send an email with "EPA-R-OAR-CPRGI-23-07" in the subject line to CPRG@epa.gov **before** April 1, 2024 at 11:59 PM ET and **include the following**:
    - Grants.gov ticket/case number(s)
    - Description of the issue
    - The entire application package in PDF format.

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

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

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

1. Application Materials

The following forms and documents are required under this announcement. See Appendix D for an application checklist.

Mandatory Documents

- Standard Form 424, *Application for Federal Assistance*. Please note that the organizational Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) must be included on the SF-424.
- Standard Form 424A, *Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs*
- EPA Form 4700-4, *Pre-Award Compliance Review Report*. See EPA's Applicant Tips for completing this form.
- EPA Form 5700-54, *Key Contacts Form*
- Project Narrative Attachment Form, *Project Narrative,* prepared as described in Section IV.B.2 below, including the following:
    - Cover page
    - Workplan (up to 25 pages)
    - Budget narrative (optional budget spreadsheet and up to 10 additional pages of descriptive budget narrative)
    - Technical appendix that explains the assumptions and methodology for determining the estimated GHG emission reductions for each measure (up to 10 additional pages). See Appendix C.
- Grants.gov Lobbying Form
- *Other Attachments* Form – Use this form to attach the following mandatory documents:
    - PDF copy of the applicable PCAP(s) serving as the basis for the application
    - For coalition applications: Memorandum of Agreement signed by all coalition members. See Appendix E (no page limit).
    - List of Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST) Census tract IDs or EPA's EJScreen Census block group IDs for each community that may be affected by a proposed measure in the application.

Optional Documents

- Standard Form LLL, *Disclosure of Lobbying Activities*.

(Note: To submit the optional documents listed below, use the "*Other Attachments*" form identified under the "Mandatory Documents" tab in Grants.gov.)

- Optional GHG emission reduction calculations spreadsheet that provides the GHG emission reduction calculations for each measure (no page limit). See Appendix C.
- Optional budget spreadsheet for budget narrative (no page limit).
- Team biographies. Resumes or curriculum vitae for key staff, managers, and any other key personnel. If submitted, this should be referenced under Section 6.C of the workplan.
- Letters of commitment. Letters that demonstrate strong, long-term involvement throughout the project from project partners are encouraged. Letters should specifically indicate how project partners and supporting organizations, including applicable labor organizations, will participate in or directly assist in the design and performance of the project. Letters should also explain how obtaining support from project partners will allow the applicant to more effectively perform the project. Letters should be addressed to the applicant organization and should be included as attachments to the application. Partners **should not** submit letters directly to EPA.

When saving application files, please ensure that the following characters are ***not*** included in the file names: ~ " # % & * : < > ? / \ { | }. Including these characters may cause problems with application files.

Applications submitted through Grants.gov will be time and date stamped electronically. If applicants wish to confirm receipt of their application from EPA (not from Grants.gov), please contact CPRG@epa.gov within 30 days of the close of this solicitation.

The organization's AOR must submit the complete application electronically to EPA through Grants.gov no later than **April 1, 2024, 11:59 PM ET**.

2. Project Narrative Instructions, Format, and Content

The "project narrative" for the set of GHG reduction measures included in the application should substantially comply with the instructions, format, and content described below. It should also address the evaluation criteria in Section V.A of this NOFO. The project narrative should include a cover page and workplan. The workplan must not exceed a maximum of 25 pages. Pages in excess of the 25-page limit for the workplan will not be reviewed. EPA recommends applicants use the Calibri font, a font size of 11, and 1-inch margins. Applicants must submit the following documents, either in the same or different file as the cover page and workplan:

- Budget narrative (optional budget spreadsheet and up to 10 additional pages of descriptive budget narrative), and
- Technical appendix that explains the assumptions and methodology for developing the estimated GHG emissions reductions associated with the measures (up to 10 additional pages).

The budget narrative and technical appendix do not count toward the 25-page limit for the workplan.

Optional supporting materials can be submitted as attachments and are not included in the 25-page limit for the workplan. Supporting materials should be submitted using the *"Other Attachments"* form, as described in Section IV.B.1.

Applicants should ensure that their narratives are written clearly using understandable terms. Doing so will help ensure that EPA's evaluation team members understand the purpose, outputs, and outcomes of the overall project.

Cover Page

The cover page serves as an application summary and does not count toward the 25-page limit for the workplan. The cover page should include the following information:

- **Applicant Information**
  - Applicant organization
  - Primary contact name, phone number, and email address
- **Type of Application: individual application or coalition application**
  - If applying as the lead applicant for a coalition, provide list of other coalition members.
- **Funding Requested:** Total CPRG implementation grant funding requested.
- **Application Title**
- **Brief Description of GHG Measures:** Describe each GHG reduction measure contained in the application (1-2 sentences each).
- **Sector(s):** Indicate the sector(s) associated with the GHG reduction measures included in the application: industry; electric power; transportation; commercial and residential buildings; agriculture/natural and working lands; waste and materials management; or, other.
- **Expected Total Cumulative GHG Emission Reductions:** Identify the total cumulative GHG emission reductions in metric tons for the measures in the application for the period 2025 through 2030, and for the period 2025 through 2050.
- **Location(s)**: List the primary location(s) where the GHG reduction measures will be implemented (e.g., city and state).
- **Applicable PCAP Reference(s):** Provide references to applicable PCAP(s) under which each GHG reduction measure is covered (including PCAP lead organization, PCAP title, PCAP website link, list of GHG reduction measures, and PCAP page numbers).

EPA has provided an example Cover Page on the posting for this NOFO on Grants.gov. Use of this example Cover Page is optional.

Workplan

Applicants must ensure that the workplan addresses the evaluation criteria in Section V.A. Applicants should use the section and subsection numbers and headings below which correspond with the evaluation criteria in Section V.A. The workplan should be written clearly using understandable terms. EPA has provided an optional workplan outline on the posting for this NOFO on Grants.gov.

Section 1: Overall Project Summary and Approach (45 possible points)

a. Description of GHG Reduction Measures (20 possible points)

Provide a detailed description of each of the proposed GHG reduction measures to be undertaken, consistent with Section I.B. These descriptions should include the major features, tasks, and milestones for each measure. The application should also explain how these features, tasks, and milestones will ensure success of the measures. The application should also describe underlying assumptions and risks associated with those features, tasks, and milestones. At a minimum, the application should discuss risks that could reasonably lead to delays or interruptions in the development or implementation of a GHG reduction measure or could impact its effectiveness. The application should discuss the extent to which GHG emission reductions may be affected by these risks. If the application is from a coalition of eligible applicants, it should briefly describe the role(s) and responsibilities of each coalition member in the project design and implementation. The application should also include an explanation of how each GHG reduction measure included in the application relates to a GHG reduction measure included in the relevant PCAP(s), why each measure was selected as a priority, and a description of how each measure will meet the goals of the CPRG program. Applications may include additional key information in Section 1.a of the workplan not otherwise covered in another section of the application.

b. Demonstration of Funding Need (10 possible points)

Applicants must demonstrate a strong need for CPRG implementation funding that is unmet by other funding sources. Applicants should explain if and how they have explored the availability of other federal and state grants, tax incentives, and other funding sources to implement their GHG reduction measures and why these sources are not sufficient. The application should include a list of federal and non-federal funding sources (e.g., EPA's GHG Reduction Fund Solar for All program) that the applicant has applied for, secured, and/or will secure to implement the GHG reduction measures, if applicable. For GHG reduction measures for which the applicant has secured partial funding, which may include tax incentives, the applicant should explain why CPRG funds are also needed. Applicants should review funding opportunities on the White House BIL Guidebook and IRA websites prior to applying under this announcement.

c. Transformative Impact (15 possible points)

Applicants should describe the extent to which the proposed GHG reduction measures have the potential to create transformative opportunities or impacts that can lead to significant additional GHG emission reductions. Transformative impacts could include:

- Pioneering, replicable, and scalable policies or programs to increase the deployment of existing GHG emission reduction technologies or mitigation approaches;
- GHG emission reductions from hard-to-abate sectors where GHG emission

reduction measures are not widely adopted; or,

- Market transformations that accelerate the deployment and market adoption of emerging GHG emission reduction technologies or practices.

Section 2: Impact of GHG Reduction Measures (60 possible points)

Applications should describe the magnitude of both near-term and long-term cumulative GHG emission reductions, the relative cost-effectiveness of those reductions, and the reasonableness and quality of the assumptions and calculations used to determine the reductions and cost-effectiveness of those reductions.

Applicants should provide quantitative totals of estimated GHG emission reductions in terms of metric tons of CO_2-equivalent, calculated using the global warming potentials in the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (see Appendix B of this NOFO). The application should include estimated reductions for the following GHGs, as relevant, for each GHG reduction measure: carbon dioxide, hydrofluorocarbons, methane, nitrous oxide, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride.

For applications that include multiple GHG reduction measures, applicants should provide individual calculations, explanations, and documentation for each GHG reduction measure. Applications should also include the cumulative total amount of estimated CO_2-equivalent emission reductions and overall cost-effectiveness for the entire suite of GHG reduction measures (see Appendix C).

Applications should only quantify emission reductions that will occur as a result of EPA's CPRG implementation grant funding. If CPRG funding represents a fraction of the total funding for a GHG measure, the total estimated GHG emission reductions should be scaled by the same fraction in order to quantify GHG emission reductions associated with CPRG funding. In other words:

> Quantified GHG reductions from CPRG funding = [(Requested CPRG funding)/(Total funding to implement measure)] x (Total estimated GHG reductions of measure)

Quantified reductions should not include those that would already occur because of federal, state, tribal, territorial, local and/or other regulatory requirements or other funding sources.

a. Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025 through 2030 (20 possible points)

   Applications should describe the magnitude of cumulative GHG emission reductions and the durability of the reductions that will be achieved through implementation of each GHG reduction measure for the period 2025 through 2030. Emission reductions should be estimated for the period 2025 through 2030 on a cumulative basis. For each GHG reduction measure, applicants should provide estimated metric tons of CO_2-equivalent emission reductions resulting from the measure. Applicants should also provide the sum total of GHG reductions resulting from all measures in the application. In describing the durability of the GHG emission reductions, applicants should discuss the extent to which

the measures will result in a permanent reduction in cumulative GHG emissions.

b. Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025 through 2050 (10 possible points)

Applications should describe the magnitude of cumulative GHG emission reductions and the durability of the reductions that will be achieved through implementation of each GHG reduction measures for the period 2025 through 2050. Emission reductions should be estimated for the period 2025 through 2050 on a cumulative basis. For each GHG reduction measure, applicants should provide estimated metric tons of CO_2-equivalent emission reductions resulting from the measure. Applicants should also provide the sum total of GHG reductions resulting from all measures in the application. In describing the durability of the GHG emission reductions, applicants should discuss the extent to which the measures will result in a permanent reduction in cumulative GHG emissions.

c. Cost Effectiveness of GHG Reductions (15 possible points)

Applications should include information demonstrating the cost effectiveness of the GHG reductions anticipated from the measures included in the application. Applicants should include a calculation of the requested CPRG implementation grant dollars divided by the quantified GHG emission reductions for the period 2025-2030 calculated to meet criterion 2.a for the set of measures included in the application. For applications with more than one GHG reduction measure, the quantified emission reductions of all measures should be added together before conducting the calculation. Applicants may also provide a qualitative narrative explaining any factors that affect the measures' cost-effectiveness (e.g., sector dynamics, expected beneficiaries of the measures, prevailing costs in the implementation areas, or other circumstances). In other words:

> Cost effectiveness of GHG reductions = (Requested CPRG funding) / (Sum of Quantified GHG reductions from CPRG funding from 2025-2030)

d. Documentation of GHG Reduction Assumptions (15 possible points)

Applicants must provide a technical appendix, along with the project narrative, demonstrating the reasonableness of their GHG emission reduction estimates. The technical appendix should explain the methodology and assumptions used by the applicant for developing the estimated GHG emission reductions associated with each measure (up to 10 additional pages). EPA will not review any technical appendix pages in excess of 10 pages. The requirements of this document are explained in Appendix C.

For each GHG reduction measure, applications should demonstrate the quality, thoroughness, reasonableness, and comprehensiveness of the methodology, assumptions, and calculations described for developing the estimated GHG emission reductions. In the technical appendix, annual GHG emission reduction estimates should also be provided for each measure, in addition to cumulative GHG emission reductions. These annual and cumulative estimates should be provided for two time periods: 2025-2030 and 2025-2050. The application should document the method for estimating GHG emission reductions, including the basis for emission scenarios, relevant assumptions,

and models or methods used and any uncertainties in these calculations. Applicants should use the latest available information, whenever possible, including the latest enacted federal, state, tribal, territorial, local, and/or other requirements and policies, where applicable.

All applicants should provide measure-specific assumptions and data elements needed to calculate GHG emission reductions. The rigor of the methodology and assumptions used in GHG emission reduction calculations should be commensurate with the level of funding requested in the application.

Applicants may provide an optional GHG emission reduction calculations spreadsheet that includes information on the quantification used to calculate the anticipated emission reductions for each GHG reduction measure. The GHG emission reduction calculations spreadsheet does not have a page limit.

Both the technical appendix and GHG emission reduction calculations will not count toward the 25-page limit for the workplan.

Section 3: Environmental Results – Outputs, Outcomes, and Performance Measures (30 possible points)

a. Expected Outputs and Outcomes (10 possible points)

Applicants should identify the expected outputs and outcomes (see Section I.C) for each GHG reduction measure. Specific outputs and outcomes should be provided and may include short- and longer-term activities. At a minimum, applicants must list GHG emission reductions as outcomes. Furthermore, for measures that are reasonably expected to have direct co-pollutant (e.g., CAPs and/or HAPs) emissions changes, applicants should also list CAP and/or HAP emissions reduced in general and in low-income and disadvantaged communities as expected outcomes. While applicants are expected to quantify GHG reductions, EPA does not expect applicants to quantify CAP and/or HAP emission reductions in their application.

Grant recipients will be required to track progress toward achieving these specific outcomes, as discussed in Section VI.B.

b. Performance Measures and Plan (10 possible points)

Applicants should describe the proposed performance measures that will be the mechanism to track, measure, and report progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes for each GHG reduction measure. Applicants should describe their plan for tracking and measuring progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes established in Section 3.a of the workplan and explain how the results of each GHG reduction measure will be evaluated. This should include details on the approach to quantify and disclose the actual GHG emission reductions and associated CAP and HAP changes (if applicable) accomplished by each GHG measure.

c. Authorities, Implementation Timeline, and Milestones (10 possible points)

The applicant should describe the parties responsible for implementing each GHG reduction measure, including roles and responsibilities for each party, including sub-awardees (including other members of a coalition), contractors, and other entities, whose cooperation is necessary for success of the measures. Applicants should also articulate which party or parties have the authority to carry out each proposed measure or, in the case where they do not currently have authority, provide a clear plan and timeline to obtain it during the grant period. Applicants should also list all other entities whose cooperation or participation is necessary for GHG reduction measure implementation.

Applicants should include a detailed implementation timeline for each GHG reduction measure included in the application, including milestones for completing specific tasks by the end of the grant period, such as quality assurance project plans, bidding, procurement, installation, and reporting, along with estimated dates. Applicants should account for semi-annual and final report preparation in the project timeline.

Section 4: Low-Income and Disadvantaged Communities (35 possible points)

Applications should include GHG measures that are designed to deliver benefits and/or avoid disbenefits to low-income and disadvantaged communities and should demonstrate ongoing meaningful engagement with those communities.

a. Community Benefits (25 possible points)

Applications should discuss and quantify, where possible, direct and indirect benefits and potential disbenefits to low-income and disadvantaged communities. Applicants should use the definition of low-income and disadvantaged communities as provided in Section I.B. Only communities qualifying as low-income and disadvantaged communities according to EPA's IRA definition and the benefits associated with those communities will be considered under this evaluation criterion. The application should also thoroughly describe any anticipated negative impacts to low-income and disadvantaged communities and concrete strategies for mitigating those risks.

Applicants are required to include a list of the CEJST Census tract IDs or EPA's EJScreen Census block group IDs and name of the relevant jurisdiction (e.g., city, town, etc.) for areas that may be affected by the proposed GHG reduction measures.[14] This required attachment to the application will not count towards the 25-page limit for the workplan. See Sections I.B and IV.B.

Furthermore, applications should clearly identify a plan and process for continuing to assess, quantify, and report benefits and avoided disbenefits to these communities, including co-pollutant impacts (e.g., CAP and HAP emission reductions), throughout the grant period. Grant recipients will be required to submit to EPA an analysis of these

[14] EPA will use this information in determining the "degree to which greenhouse gas air pollution is projected to be reduced in total and with respect to low-income and disadvantaged communities," consistent with section 137(c)(2) of the Clean Air Act.

benefits (see Section VI.B).

In some cases, GHG reduction measures may benefit low-income and disadvantaged communities in a broad geographic area. For instance, a state-wide program may benefit all such communities within the state. Furthermore, GHG reduction measures implemented in a geographic region may provide co-pollution benefits to downwind communities outside of their jurisdiction. In these cases, applicants should list the communities reasonably expected to be impacted.

Examples of expected direct and indirect benefits to these communities from GHG reduction measures could include:

- Direct and indirect benefits from mitigating climate impacts (e.g., reduced risk of wildfires, drought, extreme weather events, and/or sea level rise);
- Increased resilience to climate change from GHG reduction measures that have both GHG reduction benefits and climate adaptation benefits (e.g., heat island mitigation strategies help reduce GHG emissions by reducing energy demand and help reduce health impacts due to extreme heat);
- Improved public health resulting from reductions in co-pollutants (e.g., CAPs, such as NOx, ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and HAPs), such as reductions in new asthma cases and reductions in hospital admissions and emergency department visits;
- Creation of high-quality jobs and new workforce training opportunities in low-income and disadvantaged communities with an emphasis on expanding opportunities for individuals that face barriers to employment;
- Improved access to services and amenities;
- Decreased energy costs and improved energy resilience;
- Reduced noise pollution;
- New green space and/or community beautification;
- Increased access to transportation alternatives;
- Improved housing quality, comfort, and safety; and/or,
- Other benefits identified during consultation with residents of low-income and disadvantaged communities.

Regarding creation of high-quality jobs and training opportunities, applications may request funding to be used for high-quality workforce development activities tied to a proposed measure that benefit individuals in low-income and disadvantaged communities. Workforce development can be a community benefit through its creation of equitable career pathways and training opportunities. Specifically, this includes preparing individuals for high-quality, middle-skill career pathways that enable economic mobility, rather than short-term, low-wage jobs. This could involve using high-quality training models, such as:

- Pre-apprenticeship programs with connections to one or more Registered Apprenticeship Programs;

- Registered Apprenticeship Programs;
- Joint Labor-Management Training Programs;
- Paid internships; and/or,
- Partnerships with community colleges that award an industry-recognized credential.

Workforce development programs should have a strategy for including individuals with barriers to employment and can request funding for case management and supportive services, such as childcare and transportation, for participants to address common barriers. Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate with partners with expertise in job quality and workforce development on this portion of the application. This may include partnering with a state Department of Labor or state or local workforce board. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to partner with worker representatives, including labor unions or worker centers, to promote worker-centric, high-quality workforce development opportunities.

EPA provides a technical reference document for developing a low-income and disadvantaged communities benefits analysis here.

b. Community Engagement (10 possible points)

Community engagement through meaningful involvement means people have an opportunity to participate in decisions about activities that may affect their environment and/or health; the public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision; community concerns will be considered in the decision-making process; and, decision makers will seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected. Applicants should provide a qualitative discussion of:

1. How input by low-income and disadvantaged communities has been incorporated into this application; and
2. How meaningful engagement with low-income and disadvantaged communities will be continuously included in the development and implementation of the GHG reduction measures throughout the life of this grant. Applicants should specify how they plan to ensure early and consistent inclusion of various linguistic, cultural, institutional, geographic, and other perspectives throughout project development and implementation.

Letters of commitment should be included in the application as an attachment if applicable and will not count toward the 25-page workplan page limit; see Section IV.B. These letters of commitment should describe the partners' support for and/or involvement with the project.

Grant recipients will be expected to report on their community engagement and, as applicable, their strategy for mitigating environmental risks (see Section VI.B).

Examples of meaningful community involvement could include, but are not limited to:

- Developing an outreach and engagement strategy; promoting the use of a wide variety of techniques to create early, frequent, and continuing opportunities for community engagement;
- Creating a transparent planning process that also provides opportunity for early risk mitigation;
- Holding community consultations or public input meetings;
- Providing a publicly accessible list of all upcoming community engagement opportunities (e.g., listening sessions, outreach, questions and answers sessions, door-to-door visits, and community meetings);
- Creating a community work group or advisory board made up of community members;
- Having a community-elected member(s) on the planning and project team; and/or,
- Getting community feedback on local benefits and prioritizing what they value most.

Section 5: Job Quality (5 possible points)

In alignment with Executive Order 14082: *Implementation of the Energy and Infrastructure Provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022*, EPA is committed to using IRA investments, including the CPRG program, to support the creation of high-quality, family-sustaining jobs with the free and fair choice to join a union. This includes an emphasis on the quality of jobs, not just the number of jobs created by these federal investments.

Applications should describe concrete, specific strategies to ensure CPRG implementation grant funds and the implementation of the GHG reduction measures generate high-quality jobs with a diverse, highly skilled workforce and support "high road" labor practices. Job quality should be thought of expansively and should consider opportunities to incorporate strong labor standards for all partners involved in implementing the GHG reduction measures, including contractors, sub-contractors, and sub-awardees. Applicants are strongly encouraged to review the eight Good Jobs Principles developed by the U.S. Department of Labor and Department of Commerce and the Good Jobs Toolkit when developing their application.
If an applicant does not believe this job quality criterion is relevant for their proposed measures, they should indicate this in the application and provide a clear justification (e.g., a targeted policy measure using the applicant's existing government workforce may not be expected to create new job opportunities directly).

Examples of strategies include, but are not limited to:

- Clear commitments to paying at least the median area income for all workers (where prevailing wage is not required by law);
- Requiring employers, including contractors and subcontractors, to provide family-sustaining benefits and retirement contributions;
- Employees are represented by a collective bargaining agreement;
- Formal partnerships with labor organizations and other workers' rights groups;

- Clear examples of how you will protect employees' rights to freely and fairly join a union and collectively bargain, such as agreeing to voluntary recognition/ majority sign-up and requiring participating contractors to commit to remaining neutral in union organizing and operations;
- Use of Project Labor Agreements or Community Workforce Agreements on construction projects;[15]
- Incorporating labor and job quality standards into procurement activities associated with the measure;
- Health and safety plans that are developed in conjunction with workers, including anti-harassment training for workers and management, OSHA training to minimize workplace hazards (e.g., OSHA 10 and OSHA 30), and supplemental health and safety training as needed;
- Use of Registered Apprenticeship labor to expand the pool of highly skilled workers (e.g., a commitment to using qualified apprentices for at least 10% of the total labor hours on a project);
- Use of second-chance hiring policies, or the practice of hiring individuals with a criminal record, to expand opportunity for individuals with justice-system involvement;
- Benchmarks and goals to hire individuals from disadvantaged communities, in alignment with applicable law;
- Providing supportive services, such as childcare and transportation assistance, for employees that need them; and/or,
- Promoting stable, predictable employment through minimizing the use of temporary or contract workers, and an explanation of how workers will be properly classified.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate with partners with expertise in job quality and labor standards for this component of the application, such as their state Department of Labor and labor unions. Applicants may attach any letters of commitment from applicable labor organizations including unions and other workers' rights groups they plan to partner with as optional attachments (does not contribute to the workplan 25-page limit).

Section 6: Programmatic Capability and Past Performance (30 possible points)

Applicants to all EPA grants must report on programmatic capability and past performance from federally funded or non-federally funded assistance agreements. If the applicant does not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, they should indicate this in the application.

a. Past Performance (10 possible points)

   Submit a list of up to five federally funded or non-federally funded assistance agreements that the applicant is performing or has performed within the last three years. Assistance agreements include federal grants and cooperative agreements, but

[15] Executive Order 14063, Use of Project Labor Agreements for Federal Construction Projects, February 4, 2022, https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2022/02/04/executive-order-on-use-of-project-labor-agreements-for-federal-construction-projects/.

not federal contracts. These assistance agreements should be awards made directly to the applicant. For each of these agreements, include:

- Project title
- Assistance agreement number (if applicable)
- Federal funding agency and assistance listing number (formerly known as the CFDA number) (if applicable)
- Brief description of the agreement (no more than two sentences)
- Contact from organization that funded the assistance agreement.

Include a discussion of whether and, if so, how the applicant was able to successfully complete and manage the listed agreements.

b. Reporting Requirements (10 possible points)

For each of the assistance agreements listed, the applicant should describe their history of meeting the reporting requirements under the agreement(s). This should include:

- Whether the applicant submitted acceptable interim and/or final reports under those agreements;
- The extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on its progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements; and,
- If progress was not being made, whether the applicant adequately reported why not.

Note: In evaluating applicants under the past performance criteria in 6.a and 6.b, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current/prior grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant).

c. Staff Expertise (10 possible points)

The applicant should include information on their organization, including a description of the staff's knowledge, expertise, qualifications, and resources, and/or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the proposed project's goals and GHG reduction measures. Biographical sketches, including resumes or curriculum vitae for key staff, managers, and any other key personnel can be included as an optional project team biography attachment, as listed in Section IV.B. The optional attachment does not count towards the 25-page limit of the workplan.

Section 7: Budget (45 possible points)

Applicants must submit a budget narrative attached to their project narrative (including an optional budget spreadsheet and up to 10 additional pages). The budget narrative is a detailed description of the budget found in the SF-424A and should include a discussion of the

applicant's approach to ensuring proper management of grant funds, and itemized budget table(s) (see example below). The budget spreadsheet and additional pages for the budget narrative will not count toward the 25-page limit for the workplan. EPA will not review any additional budget documents beyond those described here, including pages of the budget narrative in excess of 10 pages. If an applicant chooses to include any federal and non-federal voluntary cost share, they must account for those funds in the budget table and budget narrative. Selected applicant(s) may need to submit a copy of their current indirect cost rate that has been negotiated with a federal cognizant agency prior to award. (Additional indirect cost guidance is available in RAIN-2018-G02, "Indirect Cost Guidance for Recipients of EPA Assistance Agreements.") Additional guidance for developing the applicant's budget is available in RAIN-2019-G02, "Interim General Budget Development Guidance for Applicants and Recipients of EPA Financial Assistance."

a. Budget Detail (20 possible points)

Applicants should provide a detailed breakout for each GHG reduction measure in their application by funding type included in the proper budget category for each activity requesting funds. Applicants should consult EPA's "Interim General Budget Development Guidance for Applicants and Recipients of EPA Financial Assistance." Costs for implementing GHG reduction measures may include:

- Staffing and contractual costs necessary to implement GHG reduction measures;
- Building, materials, equipment, and infrastructure costs to implement GHG reduction measures;
- Programs to disburse funds to consumers, businesses, and other parties, in the form of subsidies, incentives, or other mechanisms, that result in GHG emission reductions;
- Subawards to municipalities, other states, air pollution control agencies, regional planning organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academic institutions, etc.;
- Studies, assessments, data collection, etc., needed to develop and implement GHG reduction measures;
- Evaluation and metrics-tracking activities;
- Planning and implementing meetings, workshops, and convenings to foster collaboration among and between levels of government, the public, and key stakeholders;
- Outreach and education for stakeholders and members of the public;
- Modeling and analytical costs, including purchase or licensing of software, data, or tools;
- Training and staff capacity-building costs to implement GHG reduction measures;
- Supplies (e.g., office supplies, software, printing, etc.) related to implementing GHG reduction measures;
- Incidental costs related to the above activities, including but not limited to travel, membership fees, and indirect costs; and/or,

- Other allowable activities as necessary to implement the GHG reduction measures.

Applicants should use the instructions and budget object class descriptions below and may use the example table below to complete the detailed budget section of the project narrative. EPA has provided an optional budget spreadsheet to aid applicants in developing the required budget table(s) for the budget narrative. The budget spreadsheet can be found on the posting for this NOFO on Grants.gov. Applicants may submit a budget spreadsheet (no page limit) with their application, in addition to the budget narrative (up to 10 pages). Applicants should include applicable rows of costs for each budget category in their budget table(s) to accurately reflect the proposed budget for each GHG reduction measure. Applicants must itemize costs related to personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, installation or labor supplies, contractual costs, other direct costs (i.e., subawards, participant support costs), indirect costs, and total costs.

Note: Funds disbursed under the CPRG are subject to Davis Bacon Prevailing Wage requirements as explained in Section VI.C and to Build America, Buy America (BABA) as explained in Section VI.D.

For applicants proposing to implement a participant support cost or rebate program, the rebates are appropriately listed under the "Other" budget category as "Participant Support Costs." For more information on participant support costs, see Appendix A and RAIN-2018-G05, "EPA Guidance on Participant Support Costs."

Budget Categories

- **Personnel - List all staff positions by title. Give annual salary, percentage of time assigned to the project, and total cost for the budget period.** This category includes only direct costs for the salaries of those individuals who will perform work directly for the project (paid employees of the applicant organization as reflected in payroll tax records). If the applicant organization is including staff time (in-kind services) as a cost-share, this should be included as Personnel costs. Personnel costs do not include: (1) costs for services of contractors (including individual consultants), which are included in the "Contractual" category; (2) costs for employees of subrecipients under subawards or non-employee program participants (e.g., interns or volunteers), which are included in the "Other" category; or (3) effort that is not directly in support of the proposed project, which may be covered by the organization's negotiated indirect cost rate. The budget detail must identify the personnel category type by Full Time Equivalent (FTE), including percentage of FTE for part-time employees, number of personnel proposed for each category, and the estimated funding amounts.

- **Fringe Benefits - Identify the percentage used, the basis for its computation, and the types of benefits included**. Fringe benefits are allowances and services provided by employers to their employees as compensation in addition to

regular salaries and wages. Fringe benefits may include, but are not limited to, the cost of leave, employee insurance, pensions, and unemployment benefit plans. If the applicant's fringe rate does not include the cost of leave, and the applicant intends to charge leave to the agreement, it must provide supplemental information describing its proposed method(s) for determining and equitably distributing these costs.

- **Travel - Specify the mileage, per diem, estimated number of trips in-state and out-of-state, number of travelers, and other costs for each type of travel.** Travel may be: integral to the purpose of the proposed project (e.g., inspections); related to proposed project activities (e.g., attendance at meetings); or, related to a technical training or workshop that supports effective implementation of the project activities. Only include travel costs for employees in the travel category. Travel costs do not include: (1) costs for travel of contractors (including consultants), which are included in the "Contractual" category; (2) travel costs for employees of subrecipients under subawards and non-employee program participants (e.g., trainees), which are included in the "Other" category. Further, travel does not include bus rentals for group trips, which would be covered under the "Contractual" category. EPA will not award any funds for travel outside of the U.S.

- **Equipment - Identify each item to be purchased that has an estimated acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit and a useful life of more than one year.** Equipment also includes accessories necessary to make the equipment operational. Equipment does not include: (1) equipment planned to be leased/rented, including lease/purchase agreement; or (2) equipment service or maintenance contracts that are not included in the purchase price for the equipment. These types of proposed costs should be included in the "Other" category. Items with a unit cost of less than $5,000 should be categorized as supplies, pursuant to 2 CFR § 200.1, "Equipment." The budget detail must include an itemized listing of all equipment proposed under the project. If installation costs are included in the equipment costs, labor expenses shall be itemized with the detailed number of hours charged and the hourly wage. If the applicant has written procurement procedures that define a threshold for equipment costs that is lower than $5,000, then that threshold takes precedence. Projects that include the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of infrastructure in the United States must comply with the BABA Term and Condition if selected for award. Please refer to Section VI.D for additional information and consider this information when preparing the budget. The procurement of equipment should follow EPA's Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements.

- **Supplies - "Supplies" means all tangible personal property other than "equipment."** The budget detail should identify categories of supplies to be

procured (e.g., laboratory supplies or office supplies). Non-tangible goods and services associated with supplies, such as printing service, photocopy services, and rental costs should be included in the "Other" category. The procurement of supplies should follow EPA's Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements.

- **Contractual – Identify each proposed contract and specify its purpose and estimated cost.** Contractual services (including consultant services) are those services to be carried out by an individual or organization, other than the applicant, in the form of a procurement relationship. EPA's Subaward Policy and supplemental Frequent Questions provide detailed guidance for differentiating between contractors and subrecipients. Leased or rented goods (equipment or supplies) should be included in the "Other" category. EPA does not require applicants to identify specific contractors. The applicant should list the proposed contract activities along with a brief description of the anticipated scope of work or services to be provided, proposed duration, and proposed procurement method (competitive or non-competitive), if known. Any proposed non-competed/sole-source contracts in excess of $10,000 must include a justification. Note that it is unlikely that EPA will accept proposed sole source contracts for goods and services (e.g., consulting) that are widely available in the commercial market. Refer to EPA's Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements for EPA's policies on competitive procurements and encouraging the use of small and disadvantaged business enterprises.

- **Other - List each item in sufficient detail for EPA to determine the reasonableness and allowability of its cost.** This category should include only those types of direct costs that do not fit in any of the other budget categories. Examples of costs that may be in this category may include the following: insurance; rental/lease of equipment or supplies; equipment service or maintenance contracts; printing or photocopying; participant support costs (such as non-employee training stipends, childcare support, transportation, and subsidies or rebates for purchases of pollution control equipment); and, subaward costs. Applicants should describe the items included in the "Other" category and include the estimated amount of participant support costs in a separate line item. Additional information about participant support costs is contained in RAIN-2018-G05, "EPA Guidance on Participant Support Costs."

  Subawards (e.g., subgrants to other members of a coalition) and participant support costs are a distinct type of cost under this category. The term "subaward" means an award of financial assistance (money or property) by any legal agreement made by the recipient to an eligible subrecipient even if the agreement is referred to as a contract. Rebates, subsidies, and similar one-time, lump-sum payments to program beneficiaries for purchase of eligible emission

control technologies are considered participant support costs. Please refer to Appendix A for detailed guidance on funding projects and partnerships and how to correctly categorize these costs in the workplan budget. "Other" does not include procurement purchases, technical assistance in the form of services instead of money, or other assistance in the form of revenue sharing, loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, insurance, or direct appropriations. Subcontracts are not subawards and belong in the contractual category. Applicants must provide the aggregate amount they propose to issue as subaward work as a separate line item in the "Other" category and must include a description of the types of activities to be supported. Refer to EPA's Subaward Policy and supplemental Frequent Questions for additional guidance.

- **Indirect Charges - If indirect charges are budgeted, indicate the approved rate and base.** Indirect costs are those incurred by the recipient 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. Examples of Indirect Cost Rate calculations are shown below:

    - Personnel (Indirect Rate x Personnel = Indirect Costs)
    - Personnel and Fringe (Indirect Rate x Personnel & Fringe = Indirect Costs)
    - Total Direct Costs (Indirect Rate x Total Direct Costs = Indirect Costs)
    - Direct Costs, less distorting or other factors such as contracts and equipment
      (Indirect Rate x (Total Direct Cost – Distorting Factors) = Indirect Costs)

  Additional indirect cost guidance is available in RAIN-2018-G02, "Indirect Cost Guidance for Recipients of EPA Assistance Agreements."

Example Budget Table (may be submitted as a budget spreadsheet or as part of the 10-page budget narrative)

Industrial Decarbonization GHG measure							
Categories	**Line Item & Itemized Costs**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Total EPA Funding**
PERSONNEL							
	Project Manager @ $80,000/yr 0.5 FTE, with salary increases	$40,000	$42,500	$45,000	$47,500	$50,000	$225,000
	Project Staff @ $60,000, 0.5 FTE, with salary increases	$30,000	$32,500	$35,000	$37,500	$40,000	$175,000
	TOTAL PERSONNEL	**$70,000**	**$75,000**	**$80,000**	**$85,000**	**$90,000**	**$400,000**
FRINGE BENEFITS							
	Full-time Employees @ 17% of salary	$11,900	$12,750	$13,600	$14,450	$15,300	$68,000
	TOTAL FRINGE	**$11,900**	**$12,750**	**$13,600**	**$14,450**	**$15,300**	**$68,000**
TRAVEL							
	Travel for conference and workshop presentations:						
	Airfare - $400 roundtrip @ 1 roundtrip per year	$400	$400	$400	$400	$400	$2,000
	Luggage Fees - $25 per flight @ 2 flights per year	$50	$50	$50	$50	$50	$250
	Hotel - $150 per day @ 3 days per year	$450	$450	$450	$450	$450	$2,250
	Per Diem - $71 per day @ 3.5 days per year	$249	$249	$249	$249	$249	$1,243
	Taxi - $45 per year	$45	$45	$45	$45	$45	$225
	Parking - $20 per day @ 4 days per year	$80	$80	$80	$80	$80	$400
	Mileage for local travel (500 miles per year at $0.655/mile)	$328	$328	$328	$328	$328	$1,638
	TOTAL TRAVEL	**$1,601**	**$1,601**	**$1,601**	**$1,601**	**$1,601**	**$8,005**
EQUIPMENT	2 Building Thermal Imagers @ $9,000 each	$18,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
	TOTAL EQUIPMENT	**$18,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

Industrial Decarbonization GHG measure							
Categories	**Line Item & Itemized Costs**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Total EPA Funding**
SUPPLIES							
	1 Laptop Computer @ $2,500	$2,500	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,500
	TOTAL SUPPLIES	**$2,500**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$2,500**
CONTRACTUAL							$0
	Contractor to perform 30 energy assessments per year at industrial facilities. Assumes 740 hours per assessment (pre-visit analysis, site visit, post-visit analysis, report with recommendations) @ $46/hr	$1,021,200	$1,021,200	$1,021,200	$1,021,200	$1,021,200	$5,106,000
	Contract for 10 small or medium-scale projects per year at industrial facilities (renewable energy, energy storage, energy efficiency, electrification, or energy planning). Assumes average cost $450,000/project	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$22,500,000
	Contract for 5 large-scale energy efficiency or decarbonization demonstration projects per year at industrial facilities (e.g., industrial heat pumps). Assumes average cost $3 million/project	$15,000,000	$15,000,000	$15,000,000	$15,000,000	$15,000,000	$75,000,000
	TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	**$20,521,200**	**$20,521,200**	**$20,521,200**	**$20,521,200**	**$20,521,200**	**$102,606,000**
OTHER							$0
	Participant Support Costs- 2 Environmental Interns @ $4,000 summer stipend	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$40,000

Industrial Decarbonization GHG measure							
Categories	**Line Item & Itemized Costs**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Total EPA Funding**
	Participant Support Cost- Industrial Retrofit Rebates 50 facilities/yr @ $200,000 each	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$50,000,000
	TOTAL OTHER	**$10,008,000**	**$10,008,000**	**$10,008,000**	**$10,008,000**	**$10,008,000**	**$50,040,000**
INDIRECT COSTS							
	Indirects Costs (23% of personnel costs)	$16,100.00	$17,250.00	$18,400.00	$19,550.00	$20,700.00	$92,000.00
	Total Indirect Costs	**$16,100.00**	**$17,250.00**	**$18,400.00**	**$19,550.00**	**$20,700.00**	**$92,000.00**
	TOTAL FUNDING FOR INDUSTRIAL PROGRAM	**$$30,649,301**	**$$30,635,801**	**$30,642,801**	**$30,649,801**	**$30,656,801**	**$193,216,505**

Note on Management Fees: When formulating budgets for applications, applicants must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicant's cognizant federal audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges cannot be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the workplan.

b. Expenditure of Awarded Funds (15 possible points)

Applicants should provide a detailed written description of the applicant's approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner within the grant period.

c. Reasonableness of Costs (10 possible points)

Applications should demonstrate the reasonableness of the budget for each GHG reduction measure in the narrative description of the budget and detailed breakout of requested funding for each work component or task. Applicants should provide a detailed description of every itemized budget item/cost, including how every budget item/cost relates to the project narrative and specific emission reduction activities. Instructions for what to include in the Budget Detail are described in Section 7.a above.

Applicants must itemize the cost categories as listed above and in the SF-424A: personnel, fringe benefits, contractual costs, travel, equipment, supplies, other direct costs (subawards, participant support costs), indirect costs, and total costs. Round up to the nearest dollar and do not use any cents.

Recipients may issue subawards, contracts, or participant support costs to implement projects. Please refer to Appendix A for detailed guidance on these funding options and how to correctly categorize these costs in the workplan budget.

C. Partnership and Coalition Coverage

One entity must be responsible for any grant awarded under this program. Eligible applicants applying as an individual applicant (the "pass-through entity") should identify any subrecipient(s) of the award. Coalition applications must identify which eligible applicant will be the recipient of the award (the lead applicant and "pass-through entity") and which eligible applicant(s) will be subrecipient(s) of the award. All members of the coalition identified in the coalition's MOA must be listed as subrecipients, except the eligible applicant that will be the recipient of the grant (the lead applicant).

Subawards must be consistent with the definition of that term in 2 CFR 200.1 and comply with EPA's Subaward Policy. The pass-through entity that administers the grant and subawards will

be accountable to EPA for proper expenditure of the funds and reporting and will be the point of contact for the coalition. As provided in 2 CFR 200.332, subrecipients are accountable to the pass-through entity for proper use of EPA funding and grantees are required to report on their subaward monitoring activities under 2 CFR 200.332(d). For-profit organizations are not eligible for subawards under this grant program but may receive procurement contracts.

Any contracts for services or products funded with EPA financial assistance must be awarded under the competitive procurement procedures of 2 CFR Part 200 and 2 CFR Part 1500, as applicable. The regulations at 2 CFR 1500.10 contain limitations on the extent to which EPA funds may be used to compensate individual consultants. Do not name a procurement contractor (including a consultant) as a "partner" or otherwise in the application unless the contractor has been selected in compliance with competitive procurement requirements. In accordance with 2 CFR 200.320l(2) and (4), EPA does not accept justifications for sole source contracts for services or products available in the commercial marketplace based on a contractor's role in preparing an application or existing relationships that an applicant may have established without complying with competitive procurement requirements. Refer to the Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements for guidance on competitive procurement requirements and consultant compensation.

Successful applicants that do not name procurement contractors in their applications must also comply with these requirements, regardless of if the contractor was procured before or after the EPA grant agreement is awarded. For example, 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).

D. Releasing Copies of Applications

Applications submitted under this NOFO may be released in part or in whole in response to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. Furthermore, copies or portions of the applications selected for award may be made publicly available on EPA's website or another public website for a period of time after selected applications are announced.

EPA strongly recommends that applications not include trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is confidential or privileged, or sensitive information that, if disclosed, would invade an individual's personal privacy (e.g., an individual's salary, personal email addresses, etc.). However, if such information is included, it will be treated in accordance with 40 CFR § 2.203. (Review EPA clause IV.a, Confidential Business Information, under EPA Solicitation Clauses.) Clearly indicate which portion(s) of the application the applicant is claiming as confidential, privileged, or sensitive information, or state 'n/a' or 'not applicable' if the application does not have confidential, privileged, or sensitive information. As provided at 40 CFR § 2.203(b), if no claim of confidential treatment accompanies the information when it is received by EPA, it may be made available to the public by EPA without further notice to the submitter.

V. Application Review Information

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at EPA Solicitation Clauses.

Only eligible applicants whose application meets the threshold eligibility criteria in Section III of this NOFO will be evaluated according to the criteria set forth in the table below. **Applicants should explicitly address these criteria as part of their application package submittal in the project narrative, following the content requirements set forth in Section IV and Appendix C. Applications will be evaluated for each criterion based on 1) the extent to which the response clearly meets the content requirements in Section IV and Appendix C, and 2) the quality and completeness of the overall response.** Each application will be rated using a point system based on a total of 250 possible points.

A. Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	**Points**
1. Overall Project Summary and Approach	45
a. (20 points) Description of GHG Reduction Measures. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: • Provides a detailed description of each of the proposed GHG reduction measures to be undertaken; • Describes the major features, tasks, milestones, and potential risks for each measure; • In the case of a coalition application, describes the roles and responsibilities of each coalition member in the project design and implementation; and, • Explains how each GHG reduction measure relates to a priority GHG reduction measure included in the relevant PCAP, why each measure was selected as a priority, and how each measure will meet the goals of the CPRG program.	
b. (10 points) Demonstration of Funding Need. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: • Demonstrates a strong need for EPA CPRG implementation funding; • Explains if and how other funding streams have been explored, and why these sources are not sufficient; and, • Lists federal and non-federal funding sources the applicant has applied for, has secured, and/or will secure to implement the GHG reduction measures, if applicable.	
c. (15 points) Transformative Impact. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the GHG reduction measures have the potential to create transformative opportunities or impacts that can lead to significant additional GHG emissions reductions.	

Evaluation Criteria	Points
2. Impact of GHG Reduction Measures a. (20 points) Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025 through 2030. The application will be evaluated on the magnitude of cumulative GHG emission reductions and the durability of the reductions to be achieved by the proposed GHG reduction measures from 2025 through 2030, using appropriate methodologies and assumptions. Applications will be assessed on the estimated emission reductions that will directly result from EPA CPRG implementation grant funding. b. (10 points) Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025 through 2050. The application will be evaluated on the magnitude of cumulative GHG emission reductions and the durability of the reductions to be achieved by the proposed GHG reduction measures from 2025 through 2050, using appropriate methodologies and assumptions. Applications will be assessed on the estimated emission reductions that will directly result from EPA CPRG implementation grant funding. c. (15 points) Cost Effectiveness of GHG Reductions. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and the: • Cost effectiveness of the GHG reduction measures in terms of the CPRG implementation grant dollars requested divided by cumulative GHG metric ton of CO_2-equivalent emission reductions to be achieved from 2025 through 2030 for the set of measures in the application, and • Qualitative narrative explaining any factors that may affect the cost-effectiveness calculation. d. (15 points) Documentation of GHG Reduction Assumptions. The application will be evaluated on the quality, thoroughness, reasonableness, and comprehensiveness of the methodologies, assumptions, and calculations used for developing the estimated GHG emission reductions for the GHG reduction measures included in the application, including GHG reductions from 2025 through 2030; GHG reductions from 2025 through 2050; and, the estimated cost per metric ton of CO_2-equivalent GHG reductions to be achieved from 2025 through 2030 for the collection of measures in the application.	60
3. Environmental Results – Outputs, Outcomes, and Performance Measures a. (10 points) Expected Outputs and Outcomes. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it identifies expected outputs and outcomes, as defined in Section I.C for each GHG measure, including listing GHG emission reductions and listing co-pollution (CAP and HAP) emission changes as outcomes, among others.	30

Evaluation Criteria	Points
b. (10 points) Performance Measures and Plan. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and the extent to which it: • Provides a clear description of the proposed performance measures to track, measure, and report progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes for each GHG reduction measure, and • Describes the plan for effectively tracking and measuring progress in implementing each GHG reduction measure. c. (10 points) Authorities, Implementation Timeline, and Milestones. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: • Identifies the parties and their roles and responsibilities for implementing each GHG reduction measure; • For each measure, describes whether the implementing entity has current authority to carry out the measure and if they do not, articulates the plan and timing for obtaining it during the grant period; and, • Provides the detailed implementation timeline for each measure, including key milestones for specific tasks, and discusses the key actions needed to meet the project goals and objectives by the end of the grant period.	
4. Low-Income and Disadvantaged Communities a. (25 points) Community Benefits. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: • Provides a comprehensive discussion and assessment of expected benefits and/or avoided disbenefits to low-income and disadvantaged communities from the proposed GHG reduction measures; • Lists CEJST Census tract IDs or EPA's EJScreen Census block group IDs for areas that may be affected by GHG reduction measures; and, • Describes the plan to assess, quantify, and report a more thorough quantitative analysis of associated community benefits, including co-pollutant (CAP and HAP) emission reductions. b. (10 points) Community Engagement. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: • Explains how input from low-income and disadvantaged communities was incorporated into the application, and • Describes how meaningful engagement with low-income and disadvantaged communities will be continuously included in the implementation of the GHG reduction measures.	35

Evaluation Criteria	Points
5. Job Quality (5 points). The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it describes, as applicable, concrete strategies and commitments to ensure job quality, strong labor standards, and a diverse, highly skilled workforce for the implementation of the GHG reduction measures.	5
6. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance a. (10 points) Past Performance. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the applicant has past performance in successfully managing and completing the federal assistance agreements as described in Section IV.B. b. (10 points) Reporting Requirements. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: • Demonstrates that the applicant has a history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in the project narrative as described in Section IV.B, and • Describes whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements; the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements; and, if sufficient progress was not being made, whether the applicant adequately reported the reason for insufficient progress. c. (10 points) Staff Expertise. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the applicant has the requisite organizational experience, including staff expertise and qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or ability of obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. *Note: In evaluating applicants under criteria 6.a and 6.b, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If the applicant does not have any relevant or available past performance or reporting information, please indicate this in the application. The application will receive a neutral score for criteria 6.a and 6.b. A neutral score is 5 points of 10 possible points for each criterion. If the applicant does not provide any response for these items, they may receive a score of 0 for these criteria.*	30

Evaluation Criteria	Points
7. Budget and Timely Expenditure of Grant Funds a. (20 points) Budget Detail. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which the proposed budget provides a detailed breakout by funding type in the proper budget category for each activity for which the applicant is requesting funding. b. (15 points) Expenditure of Awarded Funds. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the approach, procedures, and controls described in the application will ensure that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. c. (10 points) Reasonableness of Cost. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which the proposed grant expenditures are reasonable for accomplishing the proposed goals, objectives, and measurable environmental outcomes described in the application.	45
Total	250

B. Review and Selection Process

Applications will first be evaluated against the threshold factors listed in Section III.C. of this NOFO. Only those applications that meet all of the threshold factors will be evaluated by a review panel using the evaluation criteria listed above. Each eligible application will be given a numerical score and will be rank-ordered by the review panel against other applications in the same funding tier. For this general competition, EPA will have five funding tiers as described in in Section II.B. EPA intends to make awards to top ranked applications in each tier. Preliminary funding recommendations will be provided to the EPA selection official based on the panel reviews and rankings. Final funding decisions will be made by the EPA selection official based on 1) the rankings and preliminary recommendations of the EPA evaluation team, and 2) the other factors listed in Section V.C.

EPA anticipates awarding no more than two grants to applicants at the same level of government within a single jurisdiction (e.g., a single state, municipality, tribal area, or territory). In addition, EPA will make selections to ensure diverse geographic coverage of CPRG implementation funding across the different funding tiers. However, EPA reserves the right to exceed these targets in the event that there is an inadequate number of meritorious applications from entities in other jurisdictions.

C. Other Factors

In making the final funding decisions, the EPA selection official may also consider certain programmatic priorities and the geographic diversity of awardees. Additional consideration

may be given to making awards that advance the Justice40 Initiative,[16] provide GHG reduction measures in key sectors, and/or provide greater diversity in the types of entities receiving CPRG implementation funds (e.g., state agencies and departments, municipal agencies and departments, tribal and territorial agencies and departments). Once final decisions have been made, a funding recommendation will be developed and forwarded to the EPA award official.

D. Anticipated Announcement and Federal Award Dates

EPA anticipates it will announce selection decisions by July 2024 and tentatively plans to issue awards by October 2024.

VI. Award Administration Information

Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at EPA Solicitation Clauses.

A. Award Notices

EPA anticipates notification to successful applicants will be made via electronic mail by EPA's Office of Air and Radiation (OAR). The notification will be sent to the original signer of the application or the project contact listed in the application. This notification, which informs the applicant that its application has been selected and is being recommended for award, is not an authorization to begin work. The official notification of an award will be made by applicable EPA Regional Grants Management Offices or EPA's Office of Grants and Debarment. Applicants are cautioned that only a grants officer is authorized to bind the government to the expenditure of funds; selection does not guarantee an award will be made. For example, statutory authorization, funding availability, or other issues discovered during the award process may affect the ability of EPA to make an award to an applicant. The award notice, signed by an EPA grants officer, is the authorizing document and will be provided through electronic mail. The successful applicant may need to prepare and submit additional documents and forms (e.g., revised workplan), 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.

B. Reporting Requirements

Progress Reports. Semi-annual progress reports and a detailed final report will be required for each grant awarded. Semi-annual reports summarizing technical progress, accomplishments, and milestones achieved including a description of outputs and outcomes, planned activities for the next six months, and a summary of expenditures to date are required. Grant recipients will also be expected to report on their community engagement, and, as applicable, their strategy for mitigating environmental risks, and progress on job quality (see Section IV.B.2).

One year after grant award, as part of their second semi-annual progress report, the grant recipient should provide a report that quantifies benefits to low-income and disadvantaged

[16] More information on Justice40 at EPA can be found at: https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/justice40-epa.

communities, including changes in co-pollutant emissions. The co-pollutant changes should be reported in general and in low-income and disadvantaged communities for the GHG measures implemented under the awarded grant. Since co-pollutant reductions occurring in low-income and disadvantaged communities may represent only a portion of the total benefits estimated from a given GHG emission reduction measure or suite of measures, the grant recipient should estimate the proportion of total benefits that occur in the identified communities. This report should also provide an update on ongoing and planned community engagement.

The detailed final report shall be submitted to EPA within 120 calendar days of the completion of the period of performance. The final report must include a summary of the GHG reduction measures implemented, outputs and outcomes achieved, and costs of the measures. In addition, the final report shall report the total GHG emissions and other pollutants reduced (in general and in low-income and disadvantaged communities), provide a summary of community engagement, and discuss the problems, successes, and lessons learned from the implementation of the GHG reduction measures that could help overcome structural, organizational, or technical obstacles to implementing a similar project elsewhere. Consistent with EPA's commitment to conducting business in an open and transparent manner, EPA may make portions of the progress reports or final reports publicly available on EPA's website or another public website. The schedule for submission of semi-annual reports will be established by EPA after the grants are awarded. Award recipients may be provided with additional information and guidance on reporting performance measures and project progress after award.

Performance Measures. The applicant should develop performance measures they expect to use through the proposed activities and describe them in the application. These performance measures will help gather insights and will be the mechanism to track progress concerning successful processes and output and outcome strategies and will provide the basis for developing lessons to inform potential future work. It is expected that the description of performance measures will directly relate to the project outcomes and outputs (see Section I.C), including but not limited to:

- Overseeing subrecipients, and/or contractors and vendors;
- Tracking and reporting project progress on expenditures and purchases; and,
- Tracking, measuring, and reporting accomplishments and proposed timelines/milestones.

The following are questions to consider when developing output and outcome performance measures of quantitative and qualitative results:

- What are the measurable short-term and long-term results the GHG reduction measures will achieve?
- How does the plan measure progress in achieving the expected results (including outputs and outcomes) and how will the approach use resources effectively and efficiently?

- What are the expected locations of the outputs and outcomes?

C. Prevailing Wage Requirements

As required by section 314 of the Clean Air Act, grants for construction activities will be subject to prevailing wage requirements as determined by the U.S. Department of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Related Acts (42 USC §7614) authority. EPA will provide terms and conditions on Davis-Bacon compliance requirements in agreements that fund *Construction* as that term is defined at 40 CFR 33.103.

D. Build America, Buy America Requirements

Certain projects that may be funded under this competition may be subject to domestic content sourcing requirements under the Build America, Buy America (BABA) provisions of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (P.L. 117-58, §§70911-70917). These provisions apply when a grantee uses federal funds for the purchase of goods, products, and materials on any form of construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of public infrastructure in the United States.[17] The Buy America preference requirement applies to all of the iron and steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used in an infrastructure project under an award for identified EPA financial assistance funding programs.

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 these requirements must flow down to all subawards and contracts at any tier. For legal definitions and sourcing requirements, the recipient must consult EPA's Build America, Buy America website.

CPRG implementation grants are subject to BABA, which requires applicants to comply with BABA requirements or obtain a waiver for each infrastructure project. Under BABA, the Buy America preference only applies to articles, materials, and supplies that are consumed in, incorporated into, or affixed to an infrastructure project. Note that any mobile source vehicles/engines funded by this program would not be considered "infrastructure." Projects limited to the construction or improvement of a private residence for personal use also would not constitute an infrastructure project.

---

[17] See Memorandum M-22-11 from Executive Office of the President to heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, April 22, 2022, "Initial Implementation Guidance on Application of Buy America Preference in Federal Financial Assistance Programs for Infrastructure." From page 4: "The IIJA's definition of "infrastructure" encompasses public infrastructure projects. Thus, the term "infrastructure" includes, at a minimum, the structures, facilities, and equipment for, in the United States, roads, highways, and bridges; public transportation; dams, ports, harbors, and other maritime facilities; intercity passenger and freight railroads; freight and intermodal facilities; airports; water systems, including drinking water and wastewater systems; electrical transmission facilities and systems; utilities; broadband infrastructure; and buildings and real property. Agencies should treat structures, facilities, and equipment that generate, transport, and distribute energy - including electric vehicle (EV) charging - as infrastructure."

When supported by rationale provided in IIJA §70914, the recipient may submit a waiver to EPA. The recipient should request guidance on the submission instructions of an EPA waiver request from their EPA Project Officer. 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 the "Build America, Buy America" clause in EPA Solicitation Clauses.

VII. EPA Contacts

Further information, including technical information, eligibility information, and electronic submission information, may be obtained by contacting EPA at the following email address: CPRG@epa.gov. Information regarding this NOFO obtained from sources other than this Agency contact may not be accurate.

Questions and answers will be posted until one week prior to the closing of this announcement on the CPRG website. The cut-off date for submitting questions related to this NOFO is **March 15, 2024, at 11:59 p.m. (ET)**.

Appendix A. Additional Information Regarding Contracts, Subawards, and Participant Support Costs

A. Background

The Standard Form 424A (SF-424A) includes a separate row for "contractual" costs and "other" costs. As noted in Section 6 under Section IV.B, the "other" cost category on the SF-424A should be used to cover both subawards and participant support costs. Depending on the project, these costs may be applicable to a CPRG implementation grant application. This appendix helps clarify these differences. Additional information about participant support costs is contained in RAIN-2018-G05, "EPA Guidance on Participant Support Costs."

If a recipient intends to fund the proposed project's technologies that they do not directly own, the recipient may have the option to: (1) issue a contract; (2) make a subaward to an eligible entity; or, (3) provide participant support costs to a program beneficiary. For options (2) and (3), the recipient may be able to fund technology and installation costs, but only subawards can be used to fund direct and indirect costs. If the grant recipient only intends to fund equipment and installation costs, the recipient may choose to provide participant support costs to a program beneficiary rather than a subaward.

B. Contracts

As described in 2 CFR § 200.331, a contract is for the purpose of obtaining goods and services for the recipient's own use and creates a procurement relationship with the contractor. Characteristics indicative of a procurement relationship between the recipient and a contractor are when the contractor:

- Provides the goods and services within normal business operations;
- Provides similar goods or services to many different purchasers;
- Normally operates in a competitive environment;
- Provides goods or services that are ancillary to the operation of the federal program; and,
- Is not subject to compliance requirements of the federal program as a result of the agreement, though similar requirements may apply for other reasons.

Grant recipients that enter into procurement contracts must comply with the applicable procurement provisions in 2 CFR § 200.317 through 200.327.

C. Subawards

Under 2 CFR § 200.1, subrecipient means a non-federal entity that receives a subaward from a grantee to carry out part of a federal program but does not include program beneficiaries receiving participant support costs; see section D of this appendix. Coalitions are subject to subaward requirements. Grant recipients may make subawards to subrecipients to carry out a portion of the grant project; in such case, the grant recipient is also known as a "pass-through entity." Subawards establish a financial assistance relationship under which the subrecipient's

employees and contractors implement programs and projects to accomplish the goals and objectives of the grant. It is important to bear in mind that subrecipients are subject to the same federal requirements as the pass-through entity.

Under this competition, a non-federal entity is eligible to receive a subaward even if it is not eligible to receive a grant from EPA directly. While there may be some situations in which a subaward to an individual may be appropriate, those situations are rare.

Subrecipients only receive reimbursement for their actual direct or approved indirect costs and do not "profit" from the transaction. For-profit entities participating in grant activities are typically contractors rather than subrecipients.

EPA's Award Official must approve subawards to for-profit entities and individuals on the basis of either a precise description of the subaward in the EPA approved budget and project narrative, or on a transaction-by-transaction basis.

The applicant's project narrative and budget narrative should include detailed descriptions of any proposed subawards and include cost estimates for subawards as line items under the "Other" budget category in the SF-424A; see Section 6 in Section IV.B. Should a recipient decide to make a subaward that was not described in the approved project narrative and budget, the recipient must obtain prior written approval from EPA's Award Official for the subaward.

If a recipient chooses to pass funds from its grant to other entities through subawards, the recipient must comply with applicable subaward provisions of 2 CFR Part 200, the EPA Subaward Policy, and EPA's General Term and Condition for Subawards. Note that under 2 CFR § 200.331 through 200.333, there are extensive requirements for subrecipient monitoring and management that apply to pass-through entities.

Many of the federal administrative grant regulations in 2 CFR Part 200 and 2 CFR Part 1500, as well as the grant terms and conditions in the assistance agreement, "flow down" to subrecipients receiving a subaward. Such requirements need to be identified in the written subaward agreement between the recipient and the subrecipient. Additionally, if a subrecipient intends to procure goods or services using CPRG implementation grant funds, the subrecipient must comply with the applicable federal procurement standards in 2 CFR Part 200, 2 CFR Part 1500, and 40 CFR Part 33 as these requirements also "flow down" to subrecipients.

There is no requirement for recipients to compete subawards under this NOFO; however, pass-through entities may choose to select subrecipients competitively provided this practice is consistent with applicable statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of their CPRG implementation grant.

Recipients may use the subaward template contained in Appendix D of EPA's Subaward Policy to assist them in complying with the "subaward content" requirements; however, EPA does not mandate the use of this template.

D. Participant Support Costs

Recipients may provide participant support costs (PSCs) to program beneficiaries to enable beneficiaries to participate in the recipient's program or project. PSCs include rebates, subsidies, stipends, or other payments to program beneficiaries by a grantee, subrecipient, or contractor. For example, PSCs might be used for the purchase of eligible technologies. Program beneficiaries, rather than the grant recipient, would own the new technology.

PSCs differ from subawards in that the beneficiary is participating in the grant recipient's GHG reduction measures instead of implementing their own measures. Program beneficiaries may include but are not limited to individual owner/operators, private or public fleet owners, or residents in the applicable area; however, program beneficiaries are not employees, contractors, or subrecipients of the grant recipient. For example, PSCs could include supplies, per diem, travel expenses, and/or registration fees paid to or on behalf of a participant in connection with a meeting, workshop, conference, symposium, or training project conducted under the award.

Recipients may also use PSCs to make purchases on behalf of program beneficiaries. In some situations, this approach allows grant recipients to achieve economies of scale and/or take advantage of existing purchase contracts. Competitive procurement requirements apply to the grant recipient when the recipient takes this approach.

The federal administrative grant regulations in 2 CFR Part 200 and 2 CFR Part 1500, as well as the grant terms and conditions in the recipient's grant agreement, generally do not "flow down" to program beneficiaries receiving PSCs except that costs must be reasonable and incurred within the grant period. Requirements for compliance with civil rights laws and ensuring that program beneficiaries are eligible to receive federal financial assistance are applicable as explained in "*EPA Guidance on Participant Support Costs*." In addition, program beneficiaries must abide by requirements to ensure that the funds are used only for authorized purposes.

If a grantee, subrecipient, or contractor is issuing PSCs, it must have a written agreement in place. The written agreement should not be structured as a subaward agreement and should not refer to program beneficiaries as subrecipients consistent with 2 CFR 200.1, "Subrecipient." In addition, the written agreement should not include language requiring the program beneficiary to comply with the federal grant regulations at 2 CFR Part 200, 2 CFR Part 1500, or the terms and conditions found in the award between EPA and the recipient, other than requiring that the costs must be reasonable, necessary, and allocable. The written agreement should also include the following:

- A description of the activities and amounts that will be supported by the PSCs;
- The program and/or statutory requirements that the program beneficiary must abide by in order to ensure that the funds are used only for authorized purposes;
- Specify which party will have title to the technologies (e.g., vehicles, engines, equipment

and/or appliances), if any, purchased with PSCs;
- Source documentation requirements to ensure proper accounting of the PSCs; and,
- Any reporting that must be submitted by the program beneficiary.

EPA's Award Official must approve PSCs on the basis of either a precise description of the PSCs in the EPA approved budget and workplan, or on a transaction-by-transaction basis. The applicant's workplan and budget narrative should include detailed descriptions of any proposed PSCs and include cost estimates for PSCs as line items under the "Other" budget category. Should a recipient decide to issue PSCs that were not described in the approved work plan and budget, the recipient must obtain prior written approval from EPA's Award Official. Moreover, after a grant is awarded, should a recipient decide to modify the amount approved (upwards or downwards) for PSCs, prior written approval from EPA's Award Official is also required.

When creating budgets, applicants/recipients must exclude PSCs from Modified Total Direct Costs for calculation of indirect costs as required by 2 CFR 200.1, "Modified Total Direct Costs."

Resources

- RAIN-2018-G05, "EPA Guidance on Participant Support Costs."

- Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements

- Grants Policy Issuance 16-01: EPA Subaward Policy for EPA Assistance Agreement Recipients, with attachments, includes:
    - EPA Subaward Policy
    - Appendix A: Distinctions Between Subrecipients and Contractors
    - Appendix B: National Term and Condition for Subawards
    - Appendix C: Model Programmatic Subaward Reporting Requirement
    - Appendix D: Subaward Agreement Template

Appendix B. Global Warming Potentials for GHGs

Global Warming Potential (GWP) allows for comparisons of the global warming impacts of different gases. Specifically, it is a measure of how much energy the emissions of 1 ton of a gas will absorb over a given period of time, relative to the emissions of 1 ton of carbon dioxide (CO_2). The larger the GWP, the more a given gas warms the Earth compared to CO_2 over that time period. The time period usually used for GWPs is 100 years. GWPs provide a common unit of measure, which allows analysts to add up emissions estimates of different gases (e.g., to compile a national GHG inventory) and allows policymakers to compare emissions reduction opportunities across sectors and gases.

Global Warming Potentials (GWP) for Greenhouse Gases				
Greenhouse Gas	**100-Year Global Warming Potential[a]**		**Greenhouse Gas**	**100-Year Global Warming Potential[a]**
Carbon dioxide (CO_2)	1		HFC-245fa	858
Methane (CH_4)[b]	28		HFC-365mfc	804
Nitrous oxide (N_2O)	265		CF_4	6,630
HFC-23	12,400		C_2F_6	11,100
HFC-32	677		C_3F_8	8,900
HFC-41	116		C_4F_6[c]	0.003
HFC-125	3,170		c-C_5F_8	2
HFC-134a	1,300		C_4F_{10}	9,200
HFC-143a	4,800		c-C_4F_8	9,540
HFC-152a	138		C_5F_{12}	8,550
HFC-227ea	3,350		C_6F_{14}	7,910
HFC-236fa	8,060		SF_6	23,500
HFC-43-10mee	1,650		NF_3	16,100

Footnotes

a. GWP values are calculated over a 100-year time horizon. If the 100-year GWP of a fluorinated GHG (F-GHG) is not listed in table above, see Chapter 8, Appendix 8.A, Table 8.A.1 in IPCC AR5 Fifth Assessment Report (2013).

b. The methane GWP includes the direct effects and those indirect effects due to the production of tropospheric ozone and stratospheric water vapor. The indirect effect due to the production of CO_2 is not included.

c. Calculated by EPA based on Radiative Efficiency (RE) and atmospheric lifetime provided in IPCC (2013).

Source: IPCC AR5 Fifth Assessment Report (2013)

Appendix C. Required Technical Appendix and Optional GHG Emission Reduction Calculations Spreadsheet

A. Overview

Appendix C describes requirements for applicants with respect to the technical appendix that must be submitted as an attachment to the project narrative or in the project narrative for evaluation criterion 2.d (see Section IV.B.2 and Section V.A). The technical appendix (up to 10 pages) explains the assumptions and methodologies used in developing the estimated GHG emissions reductions for each GHG reduction measure.

Applicants should "show their work" so that EPA can understand the basis for the GHG emission reductions estimated for each GHG reduction measure in the application. Applicants should provide information such as the methods, models, key assumptions, related outputs, and individual calculations supporting their GHG reduction estimates. Estimates of both annual and cumulative GHG emission reductions should be provided for each GHG reduction measure for two time periods: 2025 through 2030, and 2025 through 2050. Applicants should not double-count GHG emission reductions resulting from different GHG reduction measures.

In addition to the technical appendix, applicants may provide an optional GHG emission reduction calculations spreadsheet (no page limit) that provides the specific GHG emission reduction calculations for each GHG reduction measure in the application.

Neither the technical appendix nor GHG emission reduction calculations will count toward the 25-page limit for the workplan. Additional details are provided below.

B. Technical Appendix

Applicants must include a technical appendix that explains the methodology and assumptions for developing the estimated GHG emission reductions for each measure in the application. This maximum 10-page appendix should include the key elements listed below. Applicants should use the latest available information whenever possible and provide detailed and specific references for any models and/or tools used. Applicants should describe uncertainties associated with the estimated GHG emission reduction estimates, including those related to key assumptions, such as emission factors, activity information, economic considerations, or other data; see Section IV.B.2.

Additional important information may also include quantitative tables, graphs, charts and/or other data. EPA will not review pages in excess of the 10-page limit for the technical appendix.

Measure-Specific Documentation:

- **GHG Reduction Estimate Method**: Describe the methods used to arrive at the measure-related activity data or other outputs and the GHG emission reduction estimate (e.g., engineering estimates, modeling, existing publicly available tool or calculator).
- **Models/Tools Used**: List or describe the specific models or tools used to develop the GHG emission reduction estimate; the name of the developer/provider of the

model/tool (e.g., EPA); and, any other detailed references (e.g., specific versions of the model or tool), as appropriate.

- **Measure Implementation Assumptions:** Provide key assumptions related to the implementation of the GHG reduction measure (e.g., data supporting assumed rate of measure implementation, implementation milestones, measure lifetime, capital cost assumptions, operation and maintenance cost assumptions).
- **GHG Reduction Estimate Assumptions:** Provide key assumptions used as part of the method for estimating GHG emission reductions (e.g., emission rates; emission factors; input assumptions if modeling is used, such as cost and performance data, energy prices).
- **Reference Case Scenario (GHG Emissions or Activity Level)**: Describe the reference scenario that is used to quantify GHG emission reductions for each measure, as applicable. The type of reference scenario may differ depending upon the type of GHG reduction measure.
    - For example, an activity-level reference scenario approach might include a reference level of energy efficiency for a type of energy use equipment or GHG emission intensity under standard market practice for a type of activity, application, or equipment.
    - In contrast, a GHG emissions reference scenario approach might include documented base year GHG emissions for the application or sector where the GHG reduction measure will be implemented or projected future GHG emissions in the absence of the implemented GHG reduction measure.

  For a reference scenario based on projected "business as usual" (BAU) GHG emissions, the timeframe of the BAU projection should align with the timeframe for quantified emission reduction estimates. Provide key assumptions that apply for the reference scenario(s) used. If using a BAU projection, indicate whether the BAU projection includes the effect of non-CPRG federal incentives (e.g., grants, tax incentives) provided through programs or legislation such as IRA, BIL, and/or CHIPS.
- **Measure-Specific Activity Data**: Provide relevant activity data that is used for estimating GHG emission reductions for each measure. This may include data such as energy savings (e.g., MMBtu by fuel or MWh saved), electrical output (e.g., MWh), vehicle miles traveled, units of equipment installed, or other metrics used to track the implementation and/or effects of a GHG reduction measure. Applicants should use reasonable assumptions for measure implementation (e.g., market availability and level of use for a technology-related measure or level of participation for an activity-related measure).
- **GHG Emissions Reduced:** For each GHG reduction measure, provide measure-specific estimated annual GHG emission reductions (e.g., absolute reduction in metric tons of CO_2 equivalent [$mtCO_2e$]) and cumulative GHG emission reductions for the periods 2025 through 2030, and 2025 through 2050.

C. GHG Emission Reduction Calculations

Applicants may include, as additional documentation, the GHG emission reduction calculations that quantify the GHG emission reductions for each measure included in their application in a spreadsheet file. This spreadsheet may show the specific formulas, assumptions, and/or model inputs used to determine the estimated GHG emission reductions.

The GHG emission reduction calculations can either be included at the end of the project narrative file or as a separate file attachment. The GHG reduction calculations component has no page limit.

Appendix D. Application Submission Checklist

The application package must include all of the following materials. Applicants may use this optional checklist to ensure that all required materials have been included in the application package. This checklist does not need to be submitted with the application.

- ☐ Standard Form 424, *Application for Federal Assistance*. Please note that the organizational Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) must be included on the SF-424.
- ☐ Standard Form 424A, *Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs*
- ☐ EPA Form 4700-4, *Pre-Award Compliance Review Report*. See EPA's Applicant Tips for completing this form.
- ☐ EPA Form 5700-54, *Key Contacts Form*
- ☐ Project Narrative Attachment Form, *Project Narrative* – Prepared as described in Section IV.B.2, including the following:
    - ☐ Project narrative
        - ☐ Cover page. See example cover page provided with this NOFO on Grants.gov.
        - ☐ Workplan (up to 25 pages). See optional outline provided with this NOFO on Grants.gov.
            - ☐ Overall Project Summary and Approach
            - ☐ Impact of GHG Reduction Measures
            - ☐ Environmental Results – Outputs, Outcomes, and Performance Measures
            - ☐ Low-Income and Disadvantaged Communities
            - ☐ Job Quality
            - ☐ Programmatic Capability and Past Performance
            - ☐ Budget (with accompanying budget narrative)
        - ☐ Budget narrative
            - ☐ Descriptive budget narrative (up to 10 additional pages)
            - ☐ Optional budget spreadsheet (no page limit). See optional budget spreadsheet provided with this NOFO on Grants.gov.
        - ☐ Technical appendix (up to 10 additional pages): explains the assumptions and methodology for determining the estimated GHG emission reductions for each measure; see Appendix C
    - ☐ Optional GHG emission reduction calculations spreadsheet that provides the GHG emission reduction calculations for each measure (no page limit); see Appendix C
- ☐ Grants.gov Lobbying Form
- ☐ Standard Form LLL, *Disclosure of Lobbying Activities* (if required)
- ☐ PDF copy of the applicable PCAP(s) serving as the basis for the application (use "Other Attachments Form" to submit)
- ☐ For coalition applications: Memorandum of Agreement signed by a representative from all participating eligible applicants (use "Other Attachments Form" to submit)
- ☐ List of Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST) Census tract IDs or EPA's EJScreen Census block group IDs for each community that may be affected by a proposed measure in the application (use "Other Attachments Form" to submit).

Appendix E. Guidelines for a Memorandum of Agreement for a Coalition

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) must be included in any CPRG implementation grant funding application that is submitted by a coalition. The MOA provides documentation that the organizations have consulted with each other and are committed to fulfilling their respective roles and responsibilities to successfully implement the GHG reduction measures described in the application.

The following elements should be included in an MOA:

- List each partner agency committing to participate in the coalition.
- State the purpose of the MOA.
- Clearly describe the agreed upon roles, responsibilities, and commitments each partner will provide to ensure project success. The roles and responsibilities should align with overall project goals, objectives, and target outputs.
- Describe the proposed operating model for the coalition.
- Describe how the collaboration and partnerships associated with the coalition will benefit the project.
- Describe the resources each partner will contribute to the project. Such resources could include project management, staff time, technical analyses, in-kind contributions, training or facilitation, or other related services.
- Provide a statement that the lead applicant accepts full responsibility for the performance of the coalition and will be accountable to EPA for effectively carrying out the full scope of work and the proper financial management of the grant.
- Provide a statement that other coalition members who are grant subrecipients will be accountable to the lead applicant for proper use of EPA funding and successful project implementation.
- The MOA must be signed by all coalition partners. Signatories must be officially authorized to sign on behalf of their agency or organization, and their signature should include title and agency name.

ATTACHMENT 3

SOUTHEAST FLORIDA REGIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE COMPACT

SOUTHEAST FLORIDA TRANSFORMATIONAL GHG REDUCTION PLAN

2024 CPRG Implementation Grant Application

SOUTHEAST FLORIDA TRANSFORMATIONAL GHG REDUCTION PLAN
COVER PAGE FOR APPLICATION

APPLICANT INFORMATION
Organization: Broward County
Primary Contact Name: Dr. Jennifer Jurado
Phone Number: 954-519-1464
Email Address: JJURADO@broward.org

TYPE OF APPLICATION
Lead application for a Coalition: Broward County
Coalition members: Miami-Dade County, Monroe County, Palm Beach County

FUNDING REQUESTED: $270,639,381

APPLICATION TITLE: Southeast Florida Transformational GHG Reduction Plan

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF GHG MEASURES:
Residential Energy Efficiency Program (REEP) - This measure will cost $200,511,563 and will service 8,365 income-qualifying households in low-income and disadvantaged communities (LIDACs). The total greenhouse gas reduction is estimated to be 16,665 metric tons of CO2e between 2025-2030.

Solar Rebate Program (SRP) - This measure will cost $51,846,438 and will service 7,782 residences in LIDACs. The total greenhouse gas reduction is estimated to be 58,332 metric tons of CO2e between 2025-2030.

Electric Vehicle New Incentives for Charging Equipment Program (EV-NICE) - This measure will cost $18,281,379 and will install 650 Level 2 ports and 152 DCFC ports in LIDACs. The total greenhouse gas reduction is estimated to be 204,132 metric tons of CO2e between 2025-2030.

SECTORS:
Commercial and Residential, Electricity Generation, Transportation

EXPECTED TOTAL CUMULATIVE GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS
Estimated cumulative GHG reductions for 2025-2030 (metric tons CO2e): 279,129
Estimated cumulative GHG reductions from 2025-2050 (metric tons CO2e): 1,327,902

LOCATIONS:
Counties: Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Palm Beach Counties and the 109 municipalities and 2 tribal governments within this four-county region.
State: Florida

APPLICABLE PRIORITY CLIMATE ACTION PLAN(S) (PCAP) ON WHICH MEASURES ARE BASED:
PCAP Lead Organization(s): Miami-Dade County
PCAP Title(s): Southeast Florida Priority Climate Action Plan
PCAP Website link(s) (if applicable): https://southeastfloridaclimatecompact.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Southeast-Florida-Priority-Climate-Action-Plan_FinaL2024.pdf

LIST OF GHG REDUCTION MEASURES AND PCAP PAGE REFERENCE FOR EACH MEASURE:

1. Basic Enclosure, pages 36 – 37
2. Medium Efficiency A/C, pages 36 – 37
3. Medium Efficiency Heat Pump, pages, 36 - 37
4. Heat Pump Water Heater, pages 36 - 37
5. Induction Range, pages 36 - 37
6. Heat Pump Dryer, pages 36 - 37
7. LED Replacements, pages 36 - 37
8. Solar Photovoltaics, page 38
9. Level 2 Charger, pages 31 – 32
10. DC Fast Charger, pages 31 - 32

WORKPLAN

1 Overall Project Summary and Approach

1.1 Introduction

The Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact (Compact or Project Team), as the Coalition, respectfully submits this EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (CPRG) application that will enable Southeast Florida low-income and disadvantaged community (LIDAC) residents and local organizations to equitably and meaningfully participate in robust home energy efficiency programs, and access solar energy and electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure. Broward County, Lead Applicant, on behalf of the Compact, will collaborate with Compact partners to use the CPRG funding to create transformational greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction measures and programs that fight climate change, provide substantial financial incentives to enable broader community participation in these efforts, and help reduce energy costs for the 25% of Southeast Florida households who are highly or severely energy burdened according to the Compact's 2022 Energy Efficiency Action Plan.

Established in 2009, the Compact is a partnership between Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach counties that comprises 109 municipalities and two tribal governments and represents over 6.2 million people. With a 15-year track record of building long-term trusted relationships, the Compact has driven significant progress in reducing GHG emissions and building climate resilience across Southeast Florida. The Compact partnership has produced valuable research, innovative policy platforms, and successful strategies. In a 2015 speech, President Obama formally celebrated the Compact's bipartisan agreement to fight climate change, calling it *"a model not just for the country, but for the world."* This statement has held, as other climate resiliency partnerships in Florida, the United States, and globally have since replicated the Compact's collaborative regional approach to address climate change.

In 2012, the Compact developed its first Southeast Florida Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) and has updated it every five years with input from technical and community stakeholders. The RCAP aligns, guides, and accelerates local and regional climate action toward a low-carbon, healthy, prosperous, and equitable region. Today, RCAP 3.0 recommendations include increasing household energy efficiency, on-site renewable energy, and public EV charging infrastructure (EVCI) through equitable processes and outcomes.

Although the Compact Counties have significantly reduced GHG emissions since developing the RCAP, state and regional barriers to GHG emissions reduction programs and funding have hindered widespread expansion and investment. For example, the State rejected federal funds to administer $364M in home energy rebates and rejected $320M from the Department of Transportation for carbon reduction. These actions restrict Southeast Florida residents' ability to seize once-in-a-lifetime federal funding opportunities. In addition, utility-sponsored energy efficiency programs for LIDACs are extremely limited in Southeast Florida.

These challenges intersect with economic and health difficulties Southeast Florida communities face, which climate change impacts exacerbate. For example, in 2023, Southeast Florida experienced its warmest year on record, and its six warmest years have all occurred since 2015. Moreover, while average electricity rates in Florida may be low, Southeast Florida residents have some of the highest national energy bills per square foot due to the hot and humid climate. High household energy costs and the lack of adequate efficiency resources inequitably harm Florida's lower-income households – particularly Black and Brown communities that have been subject to historical disinvestment. Unmediated, these inequities will worsen as warming persists. Within the Compact region, scientists predict the number of days per year that the heat index exceeds 105°F will increase by at least 68 days and up to 92 days by midcentury relative to historical conditions. With these evolving conditions, living a healthy and

comfortable life in Southeast Florida without proper air conditioning is no longer possible, underscoring the urgent need for addressing these challenges through home energy retrofits and renewable energy projects proposed in this Plan.

Regarding transportation, Southeast Florida passenger vehicles account for the largest share of GHG emissions based on the 2019 regional GHG inventory in the region, with 97% of its community dependent on private automobiles for mobility. While aspirational plans for increasing transit infrastructure and public transit have been proposed, most have failed, securing private automobiles as an outsized component of Southeast Florida's transportation mix. Therefore, it is imperative to reduce vehicle GHG emissions by encouraging EV ownership. Yet, LIDACs have low or no access to home and workplace EV charging (where Electrify the South notes 80% of charging currently occurs), preventing the widespread EV adoption Southeast Florida needs to mitigate transportation GHG emissions. With this Plan, the Compact intends to expand EVCI to encourage EV ownership focusing on multifamily housing and employment centers.

1.2 Description of GHG Reduction Measures

Informed by the Compact's Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP) and community stakeholder input, the Compact submits the Southeast Florida CPRG Project (Project) consisting of three GHG reduction measures. The Residential Energy Efficiency Program (REEP) will provide home energy retrofits and the necessary and reasonable repairs needed to provide those retrofits safely and effectively within LIDACs. The Solar Rebate Program (SRP) will provide rebates to offset a portion of upfront solar array installation costs in LIDACs. Finally, the EV New Incentives for Charging Equipment program (EV-NICE Program) will provide rebates covering a portion of the upfront costs for EVCI to be installed in LIDACs. The total funding request, cumulative GHG emissions reductions between 2025-2030, cost-effectiveness of each measure, and the cumulative total of the portfolio of all three measures can be found in section 2.4.

In addition, the Project offers significant societal benefits, such as improved public health, reduced energy burdens, and enhanced economic opportunities. These outcomes align with the EPA's broader values and objectives of advancing environmental justice, sustainability, and equitable access to clean energy technologies. Table 1.1 shows an overview of the interventions included in each proposed measure and their relationship to the Compact's PCAP.

Measure	PCAP Measure Code	Category	Intervention	Durability (Years)
REEP	RC-01	Envelope	Basic Enclosure	13.0
REEP	RC-03	HVAC	Medium Efficiency A/C	14.0
REEP	RC-03	HVAC	Medium Efficiency Heat Pump	14.0
REEP	RC-04	DHW	Heat Pump Water Heater	10.0
REEP	R-01	Appliance	Induction Range	14.0
REEP	R-01	Appliance	Heat Pump Dryer	13.0
REEP	RC-05	Lighting	LED Replacements	16.3
SRP	R-02	Solar	Solar Photovoltaics	30.0
EV-NICE	T-03	EV	Level 2 Charger	24.0
EV-NICE	T-03	EV	DC Fast Charger	24.0

Table 1.1 - Summary of Proposed Measure Interventions, PCAP Alignment, and Durability

1.3 Residential Energy Efficiency Program (REEP)

To empower LIDACs, REEP will reduce GHG emissions while lowering energy expenses and improving quality of life for qualifying single-family and multifamily households by installing weatherization and energy-efficient upgrades to income-qualifying LIDAC households throughout the Compact region with annual household incomes not exceeding 140% of local area median income. Weatherization improvements include basic enclosure upgrades consisting of building envelope air sealing, duct tightening, attic insulation, and wall insulation. Other energy efficiency upgrades consist of new energy-efficient air-conditioners, heat pump water heaters, LED replacements, and appliance upgrades like induction ranges and heat pump dryers. This measure also allocates approximately 15% of requested funds for prerequisite home repairs, including, but not limited to, roof and window replacements, wiring replacements, and requisite electric service upgrades. Community advocates informed the inclusion of these repairs in this Proposal because their communities cannot be served by other energy-saving programs like the U.S. DOE's Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) due to funding restrictions for home repairs persisting even after the introduction of the Weatherization Readiness Fund.

Notably, the Project Team responded to community input in developing REEP by integrating home repairs fundamental to safe and effective energy upgrades, such as roof repair in conjunction with attic insulation where leaks and mold are present, upgrading wiring to accommodate heat pumps, and upgrading requisite electric service. Without this support, many LIDAC homes would be unable to take advantage of REEP, even though they are most in need of these energy-saving interventions. This feature underscores the commitment to include all LIDAC households for a more equitable distribution of services and to serving hard-to-reach populations.

REEP uses a comprehensive approach, targeted outreach, a streamlined application process, careful project selection, and diligent implementation. REEP also emphasizes the importance of participant education on energy efficiency benefits and includes a participation survey to gather feedback, assess benefits, and guide continuous improvement. Across the region, the Project Team targets serving an estimated 8,365 LIDAC households, generating nearly $11.7M in cumulative bill savings for participants and offsetting a cumulative 16,665 metric tons of CO2e from 2025 to 2030.

1.3.1 REEP Major Features and Tasks

- Project Development
    - Program Creation: Hire necessary staff described in the budget narrative and integrate REEP into Compact County government programs.
    - Conduct Outreach and Engagement: Build upon existing relationships with home repair contractors and affordable housing community-based organizations and establish connections with other stakeholders, community leaders, and resident groups to draw program awareness and interest to candidates and contractors. Seek resident feedback on program design and application process during community town halls.
    - Develop Contractor Pool: Develop REEP standards and criteria for contractors. Conduct procurement. To protect consumers, evaluate contractor candidates to verify legitimacy, past performance, and warranty information. Execute contracts with subcontractors and partners.
    - Develop Application Process: Develop program applications and intake requirements, create graphics that display the "menu" of energy efficiency options, and develop resident and contractor presentation materials.
- Project Application and Installation
    - Applications Open: Launch program application when candidates can apply. Evaluate applications for program eligibility and project viability.

  - Project Selection and Scope Development: Evaluate and select applicants. Review intake forms and determine building and equipment ages. Conduct initial site assessments if needed, including energy assessments. Determine whether to conduct home repairs before making energy efficiency improvements.
  - Installation: Perform home repairs and energy efficiency measures by qualified contractors to eligible applicants. Coordinate quality assurance and quality control through building code inspections.
- Project Evaluation and Participant Support
  - Conduct Surveys: Send voluntary surveys to participants to capture qualitative and quantitative data to verify intended outcomes.
  - Participant Education: Train and educate program participants on energy efficiency and conservation behaviors through in-person presentations and webinars to ensure interventions yield intended outcomes.

1.3.2 REEP Milestones (Key milestones and timeline shown in Table 3.2)

- Project Development
  - County program staff hired.
  - REEP measure launched in each County.
  - Outreach and communications materials for participants and contractors finalized.
  - Qualified contractors procured.
  - REEP applications and a menu of energy efficiency options finalized.
- Project Application and Installation
  - Program launched.
  - Energy efficiency measures in single-family households installed.
  - Energy efficiency measures in multifamily households installed.
- Project Evaluation and Participant Support
  - Voluntary surveys are sent and analyzed.
  - Energy-saving behavior training finalized.

1.4 Solar Rebate Program (SRP)

The SRP will transform solar accessibility and affordability for households in LIDACs by providing qualified LIDAC participants with rebates on the upfront cost of their solar photovoltaic installations using a streamlined application process and robust engagement. SRP will rigorously vet and select contractors to ensure participants receive high-quality service and support throughout their solar transition. Scheduled bi-annual application intakes and a clear timeline for solar installations within one year reflect operational efficiency and responsiveness to community needs. Across the region, the Project Team targets serving 7,782 households in LIDACs, generating more than $45.1M in cumulative bill savings for participants and offsetting 58,332 metric tons of CO2e from 2025 to 2030.

1.4.1 SRP Major Features and Tasks

- Project Development
  - Program Creation: Hire necessary staff to administer SRP.
  - Conduct Outreach and Engagement: Build upon existing relationships with Solar and Energy Loan Fund, Solar United Neighbors, and other stakeholders to draw program awareness and interest to candidates and contractors through community engagement and outreach. Seek resident feedback on program design and application process.

    - Develop Contractor Pool: Develop SRP standards and criteria for contractors. To protect consumers, evaluate contractor candidates to verify legitimacy, past performance, and warranty information. Select contractor pool.
    - Deliver Contractor Training: Provide required training for eligible contractors regarding the program structure and requirements for acceptance and closeout of applications.
    - Develop Application Process: Develop program applications and rebate requirements. Develop outreach materials about combining SRP with other low-cost financing and tax credits.
- Project Application and Installation
    - Applications Open: Launch program application when candidates can apply. Evaluate applications for program eligibility and project viability.
    - Project Selection: Process applications and notify participants if they qualify for a rebate upon project completion.
    - Installation: Participants will procure their own contractors from the pre-qualified list and install solar photovoltaic systems on their rooftops or property.
    - Rebates: Provide participants with rebates upon proof of a qualified installation and closeout.
    - Evaluate Program Needs to Expand Pool: Evaluate residential participation and available funds and expand the eligibility to mission-oriented non-profits and community-based organizations if warranted.
- Project Evaluation and Participant Support
    - Conduct Surveys: Send voluntary surveys to participants to capture qualitative and quantitative data to verify intended outcomes.
    - Participant Education and Network: Create and launch SRP participant network to foster the exchange of practices, lessons, and experiences and access to a staff liaison to assist with any post-project experiences.

1.4.2 SRP Milestones (Key milestones and timeline shown in Table 3.2)

- Project Development
    - County program staff hired.
    - Outreach and communications materials for participants and contractors finalized.
    - Pre-qualified contractors selected.
- Project Application and Installation
    - Program launched.
    - All rebates for solar installations provided.
- Project Evaluation and Participant Support
    - Voluntary surveys are sent and analyzed.
    - SRP participant network launched.

1.5 Electric Vehicle New Incentives for Charging Equipment (EV-NICE)

The EV-NICE measure provides rebates on the upfront costs to install publicly accessible Level 2 and DC Fast Charging infrastructure targeted at eligible entities in LIDACs. By increasing public EV charging station availability, EV-NICE will increase EV adoption and reduce GHG emissions and harmful air pollutants in LIDACs. The EV-NICE measure allows for multiple intakes throughout the year, catering to both public/private entities and local and tribal governments, with a particular focus on multifamily properties and large employers in LIDACs. Ongoing training and education on EV benefits will help to enhance community awareness and acceptance of EV technology. Across the region, the Project Team

targets deploying 802 new electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) in LIDACs, resulting in 18,937 new EV purchases and offsetting a cumulative 204,132 metric tons of CO2e from 2025 to 2030.

1.5.1 EV-NICE Major Features and Tasks

- Project Development
  - Program Creation: Hire necessary staff to administer EV-NICE.
  - Conduct Outreach and Engagement: Build upon existing relationships with Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Clean Cities Coalition, chambers of commerce, and community stakeholders to draw program awareness and interest to multifamily and large employer candidates and contractors through community engagement and outreach. Seek LIDAC participant feedback on program design and application process.
  - Develop Equipment Standards and Preferred Vendor Criteria: Develop EV-NICE equipment standards and criteria for vendors aligned with NEVI requirements as relevant. Work with nonprofit partners to identify local EV installers/operators that meet standards and criteria.
  - Develop Application Process: Develop program applications and rebate requirements. Develop outreach materials about other EVCI rebates, financing options, and incentives.
- Project Application and Installation
  - Applications Open: Launch program application when candidates can apply. Evaluate applications for program eligibility and project viability.
  - Project Selection: Process applications and notify participants if they qualify for a rebate upon project completion.
  - Installation: Participants will procure their own licensed and insured contractors and install EVCI on their property.
  - Rebates: Upon proof of a qualified installation, provide participants with rebates.
- Project Evaluation and Participant Support
  - Conduct Surveys: Send voluntary surveys to participants to capture qualitative and quantitative data to verify intended outcomes.
  - Participant Education: Train participants' residents/employees on using EVCI and EV ownership.

1.5.2 EV-NICE Milestones (Key milestones and timeline shown in Table 3.2)

- Project Development
  - County program staff hired.
  - Outreach and communications materials for participants finalized.
  - Equipment standards and preferred vendor criteria developed.
- Project Application and Installation
  - Program launched.
  - All EV rebates provided.
- Project Evaluation and Participant Support
  - Voluntary surveys sent and analyzed.
  - EVCI and ownership training finalized.

1.6 Roles & Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities among the Compact's four member counties will follow the same system for all measures proposed in this application. Broward County serves as the lead applicant and "pass-through entity" and, upon award, will subaward to Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach Counties. Each county has been integral to the Project design and will continue to be engaged in further program development, planning, and implementation decision-making. Unless otherwise noted, each

county will be responsible for implementing each GHG reduction measure from the Project within their jurisdiction. A joint committee among partner counties will coordinate closely to ensure seamless and consistent participant and contractor experience for each measure. Broward County, as the lead entity, will submit a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to EPA for this application by July 1, 2024, signed by all coalition members including Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach Counties.

1.7 Risks and Assumptions

While measure and intervention-specific assumptions are examined further in the Technical Appendix, this section will discuss risks associated with the proposed measures that could lead to delays or interruptions. For REEP, there are risks of fluctuating material and labor costs that exceed average inflation rates. Another risk is potential delays due to complex coordination with stakeholders, including homeowners, contractors, and utility companies. Technological advancements, building code changes, and equipment standard changes may also require program adjustments. In addition to specific measures detailed in this plan, the Compact will use existing agency and community partnerships to mitigate these risks equitably.

For SRP, upfront costs to install solar can limit LIDAC participation. Regulatory variability with net metering or solar credits could affect program attractiveness and financial viability. Additionally, relying on qualified contractors to install and maintain solar, balance workload demand, and ensure consistent quality can be challenging especially when implementing solar in diverse communities. To mitigate these risks, the counties will coordinate outreach efforts with funding/finance providers including nonprofit Solar and Energy Loan Fund to present financing options to interested participants. The Project Team vetted the SRP with and received support from LIDAC community advocates. SRP will require contractors to pre-qualify and meet liability and operational requirements to participate. Approximately 40 solar contractors are licensed locally, demonstrating workforce capacity and ability to provide ongoing support to LIDAC participants. Additionally, if the Project Team realizes low program participation from homeowners, mission-oriented nonprofits and community-based organizations would be encouraged to apply and utilize the SRP rebates.

For the EV-NICE measure, risks include EV adoption pace within LIDACs that can undermine the EV charging station use, affecting the program justification and support. EVCI might require electric grid upgrades for additional load, which could delay projects and increase costs. Finally, material shortages and supply chain disruptions can delay EV charging installations. The EV program will mitigate risk by lowering installation costs to allow profitability at lower utilization rates, accounting for grid enhancements in cost estimates, and coordinating with local utility providers to locate EVCI appropriately in visible, convenient, reliable, and safe areas to raise confidence in the electrification transition.

1.8 Demonstration of Funding Need

Without federal support through the EPA CPRG program, Southeast Florida LIDAC residents will struggle to take advantage of clean energy technology and continue to be burdened by high energy costs. Compact members conducted an exhaustive review of comparable measures and interventions offered through federal, state, and local government programs, as well as utility-sponsored programs, with results shown in Table 1.3. At the federal level, the Governor of Florida ultimately rejected Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) and Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) formula funding and programs, depriving Floridians of nearly $670M that could have helped pursue several of the Project's measures. Other attempts at leveraging federal funds have either been unsuccessful or applications are pending, with many pending applications facing similar and different challenges reaching the Compact Communities. For example, the WAP and related Weatherization Readiness Fund have statewide proposed allocations

of $3,472,840 and $190,708, respectively, for Fiscal Year 2024-2025, anticipated to serve approximately 450 households *statewide*. If current funding rates were applied only to the Project Teams' region, it would take more than two millennia to serve the region's 1,179,003 households in LIDACs. While extremely valuable and beneficial programs, these funding limitations prohibit scaling climate solutions to match the severity and urgency that climate change demands.

Funding Sources Explored	Amount	Type	Status
State of Florida			
U.S. DOE Home Energy Rebates Programs (HER & HEAR)	$346,326,390	Formula	Rejected
U.S. DOE Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP)	$3,472,840	Formula	Secured
U.S. DOE Weatherization Readiness Fund	$190,708	Formula	Secured
U.S. DOE Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant	$3,477,450	Formula	Rejected
U.S. DOT Carbon Reduction Program (FY2023)	$320,000,000	Formula	Rejected
U.S. DOT National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program (FY2026)	$198,000,000	Formula	Secured
U.S. EPA Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund - Solar For All	-	Competitive	Did Not Apply
Compact Counties			
2023 U.S. DOE Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) - *Palm Beach County*	$652,450	Formula	Pending
2023 U.S. DOE Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) - *Miami Dade County*	$1,134,700	Formula	Secured
2020 U.S. DOE State Energy Programs - Florida Counties Low-Income Residential Energy Efficiency Grant Program - *Miami-Dade, Broward, Orange, and Sarasota Counties*	$399,998	Competitive	Secured
U.S. DOT Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grant Program	$13,538,266	Competitive	Unsuccessful
Compact Partners			
U.S. EPA Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund - Solar For All - *a Florida application submitted by Coalition partners: Solar Energy Loan Fund; The Nature Conservancy; FL Solar United Neighbors*	$250,000,000	Competitive	Pending
Florida DACS Fiscally Constrained Energy Efficiency Program	$1,000,000	Competitive	Did Not Apply
Local Utility Programs			
Florida Power and Light (FPL) Ways to Save Energy Savings Program - *Broward, Miami-Dade, Palm Beach Counties, Direct to Resident (e.g., $150 for AC replacement)*	Partial Rebates for Limited Measures	Rebate	N/A
Florida Keys Electric Cooperative - *Monroe County, Direct-to-Resident (e.g., up to $500 for AC Replacement)*	Partial Rebates for Limited Measures	Rebate	N/A
Key Energy Services - *Monroe County, Direct-to-Resident (e.g., up to $250 for AC Replacement)*	Partial Rebates for Limited Measures	Rebate	N/A

Table 1.3 - Summary of Funding Sources Reviewed for Proposed GHG Measures

1.9 Transformative Impact of Measures

Implementing the Project measures holds transformative potential for LIDACs, each addressing the unique facets of energy and transportation equity, increasing the probability of additional GHG emission reductions. By making energy efficiency upgrades and solar installations more accessible, participants may share their experience and benefits with friends and family, even outside the region, spurring more retrofits and installations outside of these funds. Similarly, increasing access to EVCI and rising consumer confidence in EV practicality may result in participants encouraging the people they speak with, perhaps outside of the region, to explore an EV for their next vehicle, removing additional internal combustion engine vehicles from the road. REEP will equip local housing departments with resources to grow staff and contractor networks and refine protocols for robust program implementation which may attract additional funding resources to continue beyond this grant.

Ultimately, integrating Project measures embodies a holistic approach to addressing energy inequity. By leveraging these programs in concert, communities can accelerate their transition towards sustainability, ensuring the benefits of clean energy and transportation are shared by all, especially those historically marginalized. These measures make climate and energy solutions more accessible, reducing long-term financial burdens on households through lower utility bills and fostering a shift towards cleaner, renewable energy sources. By mitigating upfront costs, these initiatives increase access to technologies for LIDACs, advancing environmental justice and inclusion in the energy transition.

2 Impact of GHG Reduction Measures

2.1 Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025-2030

REEP Measure Evaluation - Total	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2025-2030	2025-2050
Households Served:	836	2,509	2,509	1,673	836	8,365	8,365
Annual Bill Savings ($):	$ 376,635	$ 1,129,904	$ 1,129,904	$ 753,270	$ 376,635	$ 11,675,679	$ 87,002,642
Annual Emissions Reduction (tons CO2e):	550	1,602	1,602	1,076	550	16,665	124,257

Table 2.1 - REEP Measure Evaluation

The Project Team built and designed REEP interventions using data, calculations, and assumptions aligned with publicly available information and industry standards (Technical Appendix). The REEP measure consists of seven distinct interventions with a combined average expected useful life of 13.5 years (Table 1.1). For the 2025-2050 calculations, it is assumed that interventions will be replaced at the end of life by an intervention with an efficiency rating greater than or equal to the expiring system.

SRP Measure Evaluation - Total	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2025-2030	2025-2050
Households Served:	778	2,334	2,334	1,556	778	7,782	7,782
Annual Bill Savings ($):	$ 1,456,049	$ 4,368,146	$ 4,368,146	$ 2,912,097	$ 1,456,049	$ 45,137,504	$ 336,347,206
Annual Emissions Reduction (tons CO2e):	1,882	5,645	5,645	3,763	1,882	58,332	434,670

Table 2.2 - SRP Measure Evaluation

Table 2.2 shows emissions reductions for the SRP measure designed using data, calculations, and assumptions aligned with publicly available information and industry standards (Technical Appendix). 10 kW is assumed to be the average size of installed systems based on input from local solar installers and Florida Solar United Neighbors. All systems installed during the performance period would be operational throughout the 2025-2050 period.

EV-NICE Measure Evaluation - Total	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2025-2030	2025-2050
New EVSEs Installed:	80	241	241	160	80	802	802
New Vehicles Attributed to Program:	0	1,846	6,076	5,452	3,632	18,937	18,937
Annual Emissions Reduction (tons CO2e):	6,671	28,815	48,162	58,868	61,616	204,132	768,975

Table 2.3 - EV-NICE Measure Evaluation

The Project Team designed EV-NICE measure interventions and supporting models using data, calculations, and assumptions aligned with publicly available information and industry standards (Technical Appendix). Emissions reductions were modeled from an International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT) whitepaper that assumes a 1% increase in EVSEs leads to a 3% incremental increase in EV sales in the region.

2.2 Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025-2050

Please see Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 for a summary of GHG reductions from 2025-2050.

2.3 Cost-Effectiveness of GHG Reductions

Cost-Effectiveness Summary	REEP	SRP	EV-NICE	Portfolio
Requested CPRG Funding ($):	$ 200,511,563	$ 51,846,438	$ 18,281,379	$ 270,639,380
Cumulative GHG Emissions Reduction, 2025-2030 (tons CO2e):	16,665	58,332	204,132	279,129
Cost-Effectiveness of GHG Reductions ($/ton CO2e):	$ 12,032	$ 889	$ 90	$ 970

Table 2.4 - Cost-Effectiveness Summary of GHG Emissions Reducing Measures Proposed by the Compact

Table 1.1 summarizes cost-effectiveness for both individual measures and across the portfolio of proposals. The REEP measure has a notably higher cost per ton of CO2 abated than the SRP and EV-NICE measures, warranting a closer look into the contributing factors. The Compact heard an overwhelming demand from community advocates for a residential energy efficiency program to holistically address energy poverty, health disparities, and unequal access to clean energy. Community advocates noted the overall barrier of upfront costs to traditional energy efficiency improvements. Also, they advised the Compact to address necessary home repairs needed before energy-saving measures could be safely and effectively installed.

These home repairs may not directly contribute to GHG emission reductions; however, they unlock the potential for households to receive GHG emission reduction interventions. The project budget allows approximately 15% of funds to address necessary and reasonable home repairs, leveraging existing rehabilitation services within each county.

To overcome the cost barrier to residential retrofits facing energy-burdened community members, the REEP measure will provide fully subsidized energy retrofits to qualifying households, unlike the partial rebates offered for SRP and EV-NICE measures. In addition to the emissions reduction differences among measure interventions, the partial rebate produces a disproportionate ratio of GHG emission reductions per dollar spent, compared to the fully subsidized REEP measure.

2.4 Documentation of GHG Reduction Assumptions

Please see Appendix B - Technical Appendix for documentation of GHG reduction assumptions.

3 Environmental Results

Evaluating Project performance requires comprehensive measures that assess both direct outputs and broader outcomes for participants and the community. These measures are crucial for ensuring that the Project achieves its objectives to reduce GHG emissions and that benefits are accessible to all community segments. The following sections describe output and outcome performance measures and plans, reflecting the Project's commitment to effectiveness and equity.

3.1 Expected Outputs and Outcomes

The Project aligns with the EPA's mission "To Protect Human Health and the Environment" and is shaped by the guiding principles of "Follow the Science, Follow the Law, Be Transparent, and Advance Justice and Equity."

Table 3.1 provides an in-depth review of Project outputs and performance measures for each GHG reduction measure. The Project outputs are the quantity of each measure installed or completed. The Project outcomes include GHG emissions reductions and other environmental and socio-economic outcomes, making a compelling case for further support and expansion.

	MEASURE		
OUTPUTS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES	**REEP**	**SRP**	**EV-NICE**
Quantity of Homes Retrofitted - Number of applications/month - Number of proposals received/month - Number of work orders issued/month - Number of rebate submissions processed/month	X		
Quantity of Solar Arrays Installed - Number of applications/month - Number of proposals received/month - Number of work orders issued/month - Number of rebate submissions processed/month		X	
Quantity of EVSEs Installed - Number of applications/month - Number of proposals received/month - Number of work orders issued/month - Number of rebate submissions processed/month			X
OUTCOMES	**REEP**	**SRP**	**EV-NICE**
GHG Emissions Reductions -Provide a direct measure of the environmental benefits of these programs, specifically between 2025-2030 and between 2025-2050.	X	X	X

Enhanced Community Engagement -Vulnerable and underserved populations can become active participants in energy transition efforts, empowering a more equitable access to the benefits for measures addressing historical disparities	X	X	X
Reduced Energy Costs -A range of critical issues from economic hardship to environmental and energy justice can be evaluated in the REEP and Solar measures	X	X	
Improved Health Outcomes -Significant reductions in respiratory diseases, enhanced mental well-being, and lowered healthcare costs are often associated with residential energy efficiency programs	X		
Reduced Exposure to Air Pollution -Air pollution is a key indicator of public health, environmental quality, and social equality. Monitoring the impact publicly available EVSEs have on air pollution will share valuable insights into the intersectionality of the benefits of this measure. The Project is also expected to reduce criteria air pollutants (CAPs).	X	X	X

Table 3.1 - Summary of Outputs, Outcomes, and Performance Measures by Measure

3.2 Performance Measures and Plan

3.2.1 Summary

The Project team will monitor and evaluate performance measures listed below to comprehensively understand the program's effectiveness, equitable distribution, and areas for improvement, ensuring that the Project benefits extend to LIDACs, especially those historically underserved.

The Project will use a cloud-based software platform to enable coordinated management and consistent processes by providing user licenses for the Project Team. This platform will substantially aid project tracking and reporting under each subgrant with uniform data collection, including intake of applications by measure, streamlined management, and automated rollup of program activity for consolidated reporting by the project lead, Broward County. Each Compact county will be responsible for capturing information to evaluate the output performance measures of each measure and for monthly reporting to Broward County. Broward County will compile county reports every two months to identify and report themes and outliers. Using the county reports, Broward County will adjust targets, make recommendations, and share resources.

3.2.2 REEP Performance Measurement Plan

1. **Reduced GHG Emissions** calculated through a combination of quantifying the number of individual interventions installed and applying intervention-specific data points with engineered calculations to generate energy savings projections, then multiplying energy savings by appropriate emissions factors for Southeast Florida's electric grid.
2. **Energy Savings** calculated through a combination of quantifying the number of individual interventions installed and applying intervention-specific data points with engineered calculations to generate energy savings projections and verify those savings by capturing energy consumption data pre- and post-retrofits through voluntary annual surveys.
3. **Cost Savings** calculated by multiplying energy savings by appropriate energy rates for Southeast Florida's utilities and through voluntary annual surveys.
4. **Health and Safety Outcomes** such as reduced respiratory problems, allergies, or inadequate cooling incidents. The Project measure could reduce Criteria Air Pollutants (CAPs), including Carbon Monoxide, Sulfur Dioxide, Nitrogen Dioxide, and Particulate Matter if a participating

home has an existing combustion appliance. The Project will capture this data through voluntary surveys conducted 6 to 12 months after Project installation to realize health and safety benefits fully.

5. **Program Participation Metrics**, including households served, demographics, and geographic distribution captured upon application intake and evaluated periodically by the Project team.
6. **Participant Satisfaction** with the application process, work quality, and satisfaction captured through the referenced survey and encouraging participants to refer others to the Project.

3.2.3 SRP Performance Measurement Plan

1. **Reduced GHG Emissions** calculated by applying a Southeast Florida GHG emissions indicator to energy savings.
2. **Solar Capacity Installed** captured through County rebate submissions.
3. **Energy Savings** captured by estimating energy production using system size inputs with NREL's PVWatts platform and through voluntary annual surveys.
4. **Cost Savings** calculated by multiplying energy savings by appropriate energy rates for Southeast Florida's utilities and through voluntary annual surveys.
5. **Program Participation** including households served, demographics, and geographic distribution captured upon application intake and evaluated periodically by the Project team.
6. **Participant Satisfaction** on application process, work quality, and satisfaction captured through the voluntary surveys conducted 2 to 4 months after solar installation and encouraging participants to refer others to the Project.

3.2.5 EV-NICE Performance Measurement Plan

1. **Reduced GHG Emissions** calculated by applying actual EV adoption increases to Greenlink's emissions reductions model created for the EV-NICE program.
2. **Rebate Utilization Rates** that track the number of rebates claimed relative to the number available to assess the program's uptake and accessibility. This metric can indicate how well the program is being marketed and whether the rebates are sufficient to incentivize participation.
3. **Geographic Distribution of Installed EVSEs** to identify geographic disparities in EV charging access, ensure LIDACs are adequately served, and quantify Project impact on local "charging deserts."
4. **EVSE Utilization Rates** to help indicate profitability and ensure individual chargers are maintained and used.
5. **Increase in EV Adoption Rates** within participating communities to determine how increased EVCI availability correlates with higher rates of EV ownership, which can indicate the program's success in removing barriers to EV adoption.
6. **Impact on Local Air Quality** from increased EV adoption facilitated by the program, which can demonstrate the program's contribution to reducing vehicle emissions and improving health outcomes in targeted communities.
7. **Participant Satisfaction** on the application process, rebate amount, and satisfaction captured through the voluntary surveys conducted 2 to 4 months after EVSE installation.

3.3 Authorities, Implementation Timeline, and Milestones

Broward County's Resilient Environment Department will be the lead applicant for administering funds to their subawards - Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach Counties. Each county will manage its own budget to implement projects for each measure. Recognizing that each county has its own procurement process requirements, each county will develop its own solicitation to select and execute contracts with qualified contractors in their respective counties, noting that only the REEP measure will require contracted services for implementation. County Housing Programs will manage the procurement, where

similar services are already part of program operations and agency expertise. The contractors will conduct outreach, install upgrades and equipment, conduct quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC), and educate consumers on the benefits across LIDAC communities. Each county will provide project and administrative oversight to their respective subawards and each county has authority to administer the Project.

Each of the Compact counties brings decades of housing repair and community engagement expertise to the Project, an experience that provides a strong foundation for Project success to implement broad energy efficiency housing retrofits through powerful community collaborations and strong vendor relations. For example:

- **Broward County** Housing Finance Division (HFD) administers over 150 contracts on an ongoing basis. Funding sources include federal HOME/CDBG/ESD grants and the state State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) program. The total annual grant resources is $37.4M. The strategies that are represented include home repair, purchase assistance, special needs home improvements, small capital projects and infill new construction. The home repair proportion is generally 30% of the overall funding.
- **Monroe County** Housing Authority and the Housing Authority of the City of Key West administer over $40M each year to assist in solutions to the affordable housing crisis, including SHIP and housing rehabilitation projects. The Monroe County Social Services Department administers the Weatherization and LIHEAP programs.
- **Miami Dade County** Community Action and Human Services Department stewards an annual budget of approximately $3.5M to enhance housing and rehabilitation endeavors. The Energy Facilities and Transportation Division orchestrates home repair initiatives, thoughtfully funded by an array of Federal, State, and local government programs. The home assistance caters to a spectrum of needs, including rectifying code violations, addressing health and safety concerns, furnishing energy-efficient appliances and cutting-edge HVAC systems, undertaking plumbing and electrical refurbishments, accommodating accessibility requirements, and implementing innovative modifications for heightened hurricane resilience. The multifamily energy efficiency measures will be performed in partnership with the Public Housing and Community Development Department who manages multiple grant and county funded projects and services including over $20M in multifamily housing rehabilitation and preservation alone.
- **Palm Beach County** Department of Housing & Economic Development administers approximately $8.5M yearly for housing rehabilitation projects. The home repair program addresses code violations, life, health and safety repair needs, public utility connections, accessibility needs, and hurricane hardening.

The County housing departments will administer REEP, issue procurement opportunities for contractors, hire staff, and conduct LIDAC resident outreach and intake procedures. The Compact housing departments recognize the great need to reduce homeowner energy bills and improve quality of life through REEP, were active contributors to the Project proposal, and look forward to expanding housing programs to address these critical issues with CPRG support. Table 3.2 provides a comprehensive overview of Project implementation timelines and milestones.

Table 3.2 Abbreviated Schedule of Tasks and Milestones

Tasks	Milestone	TASK OWNER	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4				YEAR 5			
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Program Management	Staff mobilization/hiring program staff	Counties																				
Application Process Development	Develop program application criteria and requirements for each measure	Counties																				
County Procurement	Execute contracts by county, contractor trainings	Counties																				
Website/Project management tracking and reporting platform	*Plan, **beta version, x functional version, xx improvements, xxx sustainability	Browad County	*, **	x			xx		xx		xxx		xxx		xxx		xxx		xxx			
Semi-Annual Reporting	Submission of semi-annual reporting to EPA	Broward County																				
Residential Energy Efficiency & Electrification Program (REEP)			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Outreach and Engagement	Outreach and engagement in all counties	Counties, Partners																				
Application Process	Intake applications from LIDACs in all counties (single-family)	Counties via the regional web-based platform																				
Application Process	Intake applications from LIDACs in all counties (multifamily)	Counties via the regional web-based platform																				
Project Selection	Single-family households	Contractors per county																				
Project Selection	Multifamily projects	Contractors per county																				
Installation	Installations of EE upgrades (single-family & multifamily)	Contractors per county																				
Evaluation and Participant Support	Training and education of EE benefits to participants (single-family & multifamily), participation survey	Contractors, Counties																				
Solar Rebate Program (SRP)			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Outreach and Engagement	Outreach and engagement in all counties	Counties, Partners, Contractors																				
Contractor Pre-Qualification Process	Develop pre-qualification process for all counties	Counties																				
Contractor Selection and Training	Develop contractor list for all counties, training for eligible contractors on requirements	Counties																				
Application Process	Intake applications from LIDACs in all counties	Counties via the regional web-based platform			*rolling application period*				*rolling application period*				*rolling application period*				*rolling application period*					
Application Selection	Single-family households	Contractors																				
Installation and Rebate	Installation of solar arrays (1 year period), provide Contractors with rebates post-installation	Contractors, Counties																				
Evaluation and Participant Support	Conduct training and education of solar benefits to participants, participation survey	Contractors, Counties																				
Electric Vehicle New Incentives for Charging Equipment (EV-NICE)			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Outreach and Engagement	Outreach and engagement in all counties	Counties and Partners																				
Develop Equipment Standards	Develop equipment standards	Counties																				
Develop Preferred Vendor Criteria	Develop preferred vendor criteria	Counties																				
Application Process	Intake applications from LIDAC public/private entities (multifamily, large employers)	Counties via the regional web-based platform			*rolling application period*				*rolling application period*				*rolling application period*				*rolling application period*					
Application Process	Intake applications from LIDAC local and tribal governments	Counties via the regional web-based platform																				
Application Selection	Public/Private entities (multifamily, large employers)	Contractors																				
Application Selection	Local and tribal governments	Contractors																				
Installation and Rebate	Installation of EV chargers (1 year period), provide Contractors with rebates post-installation	Contractors																				
Evaluation and Participant Support	Training and education of EV benefits to participants, participation survey	Contractors, Counties																				

4 Low-Income and Disadvantaged Communities

4.1 Community Benefits

The Project focuses on regional LIDACs and will reduce GHG emissions while providing direct and indirect benefits for LIDACs. The Project prepares for potential LIDAC negative consequences with strategies to monitor and mitigate potential burdens. These are outlined below for all Project measures.

4.1.1 REEP Direct Benefits

1. **GHG and Other Pollutant Reductions**, which combat climate change and contribute to cleaner air and a healthier environment. This particularly benefits LIDACs historically burdened by environmental pollution. REEP will reduce the average participating household's carbon footprint by 0.658 metric tons of CO2e each year, cutting their carbon emissions by about 10% annually.
2. **Reduced Energy Bills** for homeowners and renters by installing energy-efficient appliances, better insulation, and more efficient heating and cooling systems that require less energy to operate. REEP will reduce the average participating household's energy expenses by $450 per year, nearly one-third of their bill.

4.1.2 REEP Indirect Benefits

1. **Improved Health Outcomes** through increased access to cooling, which will reduce heat-related illnesses, and improved indoor air quality, by reducing outdoor pollutant infiltration and minimizing indoor pollutants, such as mold and mildew. These actions can significantly improve respiratory health and reduce the incidence of asthma and other respiratory conditions. These outcomes are significant in LIDACs, where health disparities are often more pronounced and energy burdens are disproportionately high.
2. **Improved Year-Round Home Comfort** by maintaining more consistent indoor temperatures by reducing drafts, enhancing thermal barriers, and introducing high-efficiency air conditioning systems to protect families from Southeast Florida's excessive heat and humidity. As comfort improves, daily activities like sleep for occupants improve, establishing a positive feedback loop with enhanced health and youth learning outcomes.
3. **Improved Energy Security** by reducing overall power grid demand, which can reduce power outages, reduce new power plant needs, and lower community energy costs. LIDACs are often more vulnerable to power outages and energy price fluctuations.
4. **Job Creation** in energy efficiency needs assessments, energy-efficient technology installation, and energy-efficiency maintenance opportunities.
5. **Enhanced Community Resilience** to climate change and extreme weather events by ensuring homes are better insulated and more liveable during heat waves or power outages.
6. **Increased Social Equity** by prioritizing LIDACs and bridging the gap in energy access and affordability, which increases equitable resource distribution and social cohesion.

4.1.3 REEP Potential Negative Impacts

1. **Gentrification** from increased property values that attract higher-income residents.
2. **Perceived Costs and Complexity Accessibility** if participants incorrectly assume that REEP will require upfront costs, which could deter them from applying. In addition, LIDACs with limited time, resources, and program knowledge might find the application process too complex. However, this has not been the experience to date, and demands for similar but severely limited funds have well-exceeded funds availability, with fewer than 10% of approved applications failing to advance.
3. **Split Incentives** where renters might not directly benefit from REEP unless they directly pay for their energy bills or landlords pass along the savings.

4. **Insufficient Work Quality** from low-quality or inappropriate retrofitting work can result in ineffective improvements, potential damage to homes, or even health risks, such as inadequate ventilation and poor indoor air quality.

4.1.4 REEP Negative Impact Mitigation Strategies

1. **Enact Anti-Displacement Policies** for owners and renters. For owner-occupied households, limit participation to homestead properties and implement a 10-year lien that requires repayment in the event of a title transfer to protect against "flipping." For rental properties, include stipulations that tenant rents remain affordable following home upgrades through 30-year deed restrictions.
2. **Conduct Community Engagement** so that LIDACs participate in REEP planning and implementation to tailor solutions to community needs and preferences. Provide technical assistance to participants on energy efficiency benefits and energy-saving behaviors to increase REEP uptake and ensure sustained benefits.
3. **Conduct Workforce Education and Hire Local** to support local economic development and benefits. Deliver training to support contractor participation as effective partners.
4. **Create Quality Assurance and Consumer Protection Protocols** with strict work quality standards, contractor certification, and training requirements. Use existing County consumer protection frameworks to address contractor issues.
5. **Monitor and Evaluate** to assess ongoing REEP impacts (both positive and negative), and adjust REEP if needed in response to findings.

4.1.5 SRP Direct Benefits

1. **GHG Reductions** where average Solar participants can reduce their carbon footprint by nearly 2.4 tons of CO2e each year, offsetting about 30% of the average emissions of non-participants.
2. **Reduced Energy Bills** are critical for low-income families who experience the highest energy burdens in Southeast Florida. Average Solar participants can reduce their energy bills by about $1,871 annually.

4.1.6 SRP Indirect Benefits

1. **Protection Against Rising Energy Costs** from predictable energy costs and less exposure to fluctuating utility prices.
2. **Enhanced Home Value** from solar installations, potentially increasing equity and wealth.
3. **Improved Energy Security** by reducing overall power grid demand, which can reduce power outages, reduce new power plant needs, and lower community energy costs.
4. **Job Creation** in local solar installation, maintenance, and manufacturing opportunities.
5. **Improved Public Health** by reducing GHG emissions and reducing health impacts, including respiratory ailments and heart conditions.

4.1.7 SRP Potential Negative Impacts

1. **Gentrification** from increased property values that attract higher-income residents.
2. **Split Incentives** where renters might not directly benefit from REEP unless they directly pay for their energy bills or landlords pass along the savings.
3. **Insufficient Work Quality** from improper installation or inadequate maintenance that leads to underperforming systems, safety hazards, or additional costs.

4.1.8 SRP Negative Impact Mitigation Strategies

1. **Encourage Anti-Displacement Policies** in broader affordable housing and community planning efforts.

2. **Conduct Community Engagement** so that LIDACs participate in SRP planning and implementation to tailor solutions to community needs and preferences. Provide plain language information on solar incentives, financing options, and benefits. Streamline the application process.
3. **Create Quality Assurance and Consumer Protection Protocols** establishing minimum performance standards (e.g., insolation) and require modeled performance by the solar contractor for each project. Establish strict eligibility requirements for participating solar contractors and verification of work quality standards in the closeout process.
4. **Monitor and Evaluate** to assess ongoing SRP impacts and performance (both positive and negative) and adjust SRP if needed.

4.1.9 EV-NICE Direct Benefits

1. **GHG Reductions** from replacing gas-powered cars with EVs through increased adoption. Public EV charging access in LIDACs makes EV ownership more practical for those least likely to be able to access home and workplace charging and more appealing to residents who might be hesitant to transition from combustion vehicles.
2. **Lowered Transportation Costs** because EVs have lower ownership and maintenance costs than gas-powered cars, even when considering the higher cost of public charging stations relative to at-home charging.

4.1.10 EV-NICE Indirect Benefits

1. **Improved Public Health** because EVs emit no tailpipe pollutants and help reduce GHG emissions. Reduced pollutants can mitigate adverse health impacts, including respiratory ailments and heart conditions. As Southeast Florida's electric grid transitions to renewable resources in Florida Power & Light's (FP&L) plan to be REAL Zero by 2045, public health will continue to benefit more from fewer primary fuel emissions.
2. **Increased Social Equity** by prioritizing EVCI in LIDACs, which addresses historical inequities in clean transportation technology access where LIDACs are often excluded.
3. **Rideshare Electrification** for rideshare drivers, who often reside in LIDACs, have limited access to EV charging stations, and account for the highest Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Public EVCI in LIDACs will increase rideshare driver EV accessibility and substantially reduce GHGs.
4. **Stimulate Local Economies** by attracting new businesses and tourists who use EVs to the area.

4.1.11 EV-NICE Potential Negative Impacts

1. **Increased Electric Stress** from significantly increased electricity demand, compromising grid reliability and offsetting GHG reductions if FP&L fails to meet its REAL Zero milestones.
2. **Inadequate Maintenance** of charging stations can lead to operational failures, diminishing their utility and frustrating potential EV adopters.
3. **Limited Utilization Rates** initially as EV adoption is currently lower in LIDACs due to lack of infrastructure and high purchase prices for EVs.

4.1.12 EV-NICE Negative Impact Mitigation Strategies

1. **Coordinate with Local Utilities** FP&L and Florida Keys Electric Cooperative to site projects with existing grid capacity.
2. **Plan for Maintenance** by working with contractors aligned with NEVI standards during the rebate application process to ensure charging stations remain functional and accessible.

3. **Conduct Community Engagement** so that LIDAC residents are informed of planned new EVCI and EV ownership benefits. Use data-driven planning, including results from active EVCI planning projects, to place EV charging stations in appropriate areas.

4.2 Community Engagement

4.2.1 Project Planning

The Project Team has incorporated LIDAC input into this application through the outreach and engagement process undertaken to support the Southeast Florida Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP). During the PCAP development, the team conducted a survey and distributed it through the CLEO Institute, four counties, including local and tribal governments, and partner organizations. Additionally, the team conducted a targeted panel survey on the phone and online. This survey targeted zip codes that overlapped with LIDACs on the CEJST and EJScreen tools. Over 1,300 surveys were completed.

Four stakeholder engagement webinars were organized following the surveys for people to receive updates and provide feedback on the process. All promotional materials were developed in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole to make them more accessible and inclusive. Over 125 individuals participated in these discussions.

Through intentional engagement with the community, the LIDAC priorities identified through these surveys and webinar informed the measures proposed in the Compact's PCAP and ultimately advanced the Project measures proposed. The top community requests included:

- Financial incentives to improve housing conditions
- Financial incentives to support upgrading appliances, electronics, lighting
- Financial incentives to upgrade air conditioning unit to a more efficient model
- Financial incentives to install rooftop solar panels
- Financial incentives for EV
- Reduce air pollution from commercial/industrial activities/facilities near residential communities

In developing the Project, the team spoke with "Community Connectors," who are community leaders who understand local needs and priorities. The team presented the draft Project components and anticipated approach. The Community Connectors provided a positive endorsement of the Project, but most importantly, provided critical feedback on existing LIDAC communication challenges and common predatory practices that the Project will address as part of community engagement to build clarity around the Project opportunities. This input also inspired an additional community component to be undertaken for the SRP: establishing an SRP participant network to foster the exchange of practices, lessons, and experiences and access to a staff liaison to assist with any post-project experiences.

4.2.2 Project Implementation

Each county will have community development specialists and partner with non-profit organizations and Community Connectors to support LIDAC outreach, engagement, and feedback processes throughout each Project stage as follows:

- Before the Application Open: Counties will connect and build upon community partnerships to spread outreach materials and awareness of programs to potential program participants and contractors. The team will host community town halls in LIDACs to help individuals understand what resources are available and what information will be required to apply to the Project. The team will ask for feedback on program design, application process, and addressing application barriers.

- During Application Period: Community development specialists will support individuals in LIDACs with completing their applications and collecting materials. Applicants can provide feedback on their application experience to improve the Project process.
- During Installation: Successful applicants will provide feedback on their experiences with the counties and contractors, including their overall experience and how the implemented measure has led to positive, neutral, or negative outcomes.
- Post-Project: Voluntary surveys will be sent to participants to capture program successes and areas for improvement.
- Ongoing Participant Education: The Project Team will hold in-person presentations and webinars to train and educate program participants on energy efficiency behaviors to increase household energy efficiency outcomes further.
- Ongoing Community Engagements: The Project Team will produce outreach materials in Spanish, Haitian Creole, and English, informing all residents about opportunities to participate in all available programs and installing low- and no-cost energy upgrades in their own homes.

The Compact will build upon its trusted relationships with local stakeholders to successfully deliver the Project, including local and tribal governments in the region. Additionally, partners include the Minority Builders Association of South Florida, Habitat for Humanity of Broward, Urban League of Broward, Lebolo Construction Management, and municipal housing programs who all have demonstrated their support for this proposal through letters of support attached. Partners are engaged and ready, crossing the full spectrum required for successful programs of this scale and nature, ranging from local contractors to community-based organizations that support resident engagement, such as Community Partners of South Florida.

For SRP, Solar United Neighbors and Solar and Energy Loan Fund, with letters of support attached, will be instrumental in sharing program information with cooperative participants. For EV-NICE, the Project Team expects to continue its existing partnerships with Southern Alliance for Clean Energy and the U.S. DOE Clean Cities Coalition, letter of support attached, will be critical partners for sharing program information with the EV industry. Southeast Florida has well-organized chambers of commerce that will be vital for sharing EV program information with multifamily developers and large employers.

Additionally, the Compact will explore opportunities to utilize and leverage the American Climate Corps to support the successful implementation of all measures. This opportunity may attract talent and ideas from an emerging generation of change-makers to help accelerate the deployment of clean energy solutions and advance environmental justice.

5 Job Quality

The Compact has a strong history of supporting high-quality jobs internally and encouraging "high road" labor practices among partners providing services through county and region-wide programs. Because Compact partners will have more direct influence with contractors participating in REEP, the Compact has employed and will continue to seek opportunities to employ the following strategies to ensure the implementation of GHG reduction measures generate high-quality jobs with a diverse, highly skilled workforce:

- Require all solicitations for REEP projects to meet the standard set in the Davis-Bacon Act, ensuring all workers are compensated at the prevailing wage.
- Encourage the inclusion of registered apprenticeship programs, particularly those reaching underserved communities.

- Promote diversity and inclusion among contractors and service providers by intentionally encouraging small, diverse, and women-owned businesses to participate, to the extent permissible by state law.
- Support worker certifications and credentialing by adopting NREL's Standard Work Specifications as the installation standards for interventions provided through REEP. These standards may encourage contractors to invest in training for their workers aligned with Building Performance Institute standards. Subsequently, work with local partners to overcome barriers to workforce training.

In addition to REEP, Compact partners are committed to advancing the quality of jobs supported and generated through SRP and EV-NICE. A common thread among the industries behind this Project is the promise of long-term career development and workforce training.

For example, the Compact will continue collaborating with partners like Minority Builders Association of South Florida and SELF, both strong supporters of this Project providing two of the attached letters of support, to connect participants of their solar jobs training program, funded through the American Rescue Plan Act, to contractors participating in SRP. Similarly, the Compact will work with Sheridan Technical College, a local provider of EV-specialized technical training, to connect students with participating vendors of EV-NICE.

This Project will create a positive feedback loop, propelling these industries in return. Providing a collective area of focus, these and other local labor partners, in collaboration with the Compact, will be more equipped to pursue additional workforce development grant opportunities, perpetuating the growth and development of high-quality jobs beyond the period of performance of this Project.

6 Programmatic Capability and Past Performance

6.1 Past Performance

Broward County, as the lead applicant, and the County's Resilient Environment Department (RED), the County's implementing agency, have demonstrated programmatic experience and capability to manage projects, programs, and budgets comparable to this proposed Project. The RED manages each project identified below, with the most relevant being the Housing and Home Programs managed by the Housing Finance Division (HFD). HFD has decades of experience managing 150 contracts at any given time with nearly $40M annually in HOME/CDBG/ESD grants and the state SHIP grant. The RED is experienced in managing large-scale contracts and projects reliant on federal reimbursement for shore protection projects valued at $50M+ each. The RED also has experience delivering residential energy efficiency rebates under historic EECBG funding and water conservation rebates as part of an active 15-year program implemented in conjunction with tribal governments and local municipalities on a countywide basis. While not internal to the Department, the County's Human Services Division has successfully managed a $100M Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP). The Program proposes utilizing the same project management platform (Neighborly) supporting ERAP, providing efficient roll-out and project management benefitting from internal experience and expertise. Details for several current projects receiving federal assistance and managed within the RED are provided below:

Project I: Housing and Community Development Act (PL 930383) - Community Development Block Grant

Assistance agreement number: B-23-UC-12-001
Assistance listing number: CFDA# 14.218
Description: Projects and activities to promote, create, and preserve affordable housing, provide new or increased public services, build or improve public infrastructure and facilities, and barrier-free projects.

Contact: Nora E. Casal Cintron, HUD Miami Field Office
Management: Funds are formula-based and awarded after successful completion and submission of the Annual Action Plan (AAP) to U.S. HUD. The Broward County HFD implements and oversees approximately 25 to 30 subrecipient agreements (projects/activities) a year, not including housing projects /activities implemented by the Division, and has for over 35 years.

Project II: HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
Assistance agreement number: Assistance/Agreement Number: M23DC120201
Assistance listing number: CFDA# 14.239
Description: Provides funds for affordable housing projects, including permanent housing, acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction, and provides assistance through loans, loan guarantees, equity investments, interest subsidies, and other forms of investment approved by HUD.
Contact: Nora E. Casal Cintron, HUD Miami Field Office
Management: The County allocates funds to subrecipients and manages larger funded projects; support towards affordable housing projects includes collaboration with the County's Housing Finance Authority (HFA) bond program, tax credit projects, gap financing, etc.

Project III: American Rescue Plan Direct Award - Ambient Air Monitoring
Assistance agreement number: 0P-02D26122
Listing number: CFDA 66.034 Surveys-Studies-Investigations-Demonstrations and Special Purposes Activities relating to the Clean Air Act.
Description: Provide monitoring of Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5) or other National Ambient Air Quality Standards pollutants in and near communities with environmental justice concerns facing disproportionate exposure to these pollutants and health risks, also associated with increased vulnerability to COVID-19. Funds were used to purchase new ozone and nitrogen dioxide monitoring equipment and to establish a new PM2.5 monitoring site in an Environmental Justice (EJ) community.
Contact: Maya Odeh-Adimah, Grants & Audit Management Section - EPA Regional Office, Atlanta, GA
Management: Broward County Air Quality Program staff works closely with the EPA Region 4 office. The project is 50% complete. New ozone and nitrogen dioxide instruments were purchased and staff was recently notified that the EJ site selected was approved by EPA, meeting siting requirements. Staff is working on securing electrical to the site and purchasing a PM2.5 monitor with an enclosed shelter.

Project IV: Inflation Reduction Act - Ambient Air Monitoring
Assistance agreement number*: 5A-02D50923-0*
Listing number*:* CFDA 66.034 Surveys-Studies-Investigations-Demonstrations and Special Purposes Activities relating to the Clean Air Act.
Description: Enhance monitoring of black carbon concentrations under the IRA of the Clean Air Act (CAA) Section 103. Purchase instrumentation to monitor black carbon concentrations at Broward County Ambient Air Monitoring site 12-011-8002, located at the Dr. Von D. Mizel-Eula Johnson State Park in Dania Beach, Florida.
Contact: Maya Odeh-Adimah, Grants & Audit Management Section - EPA Regional Office, Atlanta, GA
Management: Broward County Air Quality Program staff works closely with the EPA Region 4 office to manage listed agreements. Broward County Air Program staff are in the procurement process for the Magee Scientific AE33 black carbon monitor.

Project V: Child Care Licensing and Enforcement
Assistance agreement number: Department of Children and Families (DCF) Contract JC206

Listing number: CFDA 93.575 Child Care and Development Block Grant, CFDA 93.667 Social Services Block Grant, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Description: The Florida Department of Children and Families (DCF) is engaging Broward County to conduct licensing activities for child care facilities and family child care homes in Broward County, and school readiness provider monitoring.
Contact: Colleen Kelly-Statler, FCCM, Contract Manager Specialist Southeast Region, DCF
Management: The Child Care Licensing and Enforcement section of Broward County successfully complies with the above agreement by providing expenditure reports and quarterly performance measure reports to DCF to demonstrate licensing activities and deliverables outlined in the agreement. Acceptance of these reports by DCF has resulted in payment of the full grant amount to Broward County.

6.2 Reporting Requirements

Project I. Housing and Community Development Act - Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
Reporting is undertaken through HUD-established reporting tools as the project progresses and at each project/activity close-out. The HFD also prepares a year-end Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). The CAPER summarizes County progress in carrying out its strategic plan/Annual Action Plan outlined in the Consolidated Plan. This progress includes accomplishments, resources, leveraging, persons assisted (demographics), income data, etc. The HFD has submitted the CAPER on time every year. HUD has always approved the CAPER, and the County has consistently shown progress in achieving its proposed goals and outcomes.

Project II. HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
Reporting is undertaken through HUD-established reporting tools as the project progresses and at each project/activity close-out. The HFD also prepares a year-end CAPER, which summarizes the progress made by the County in carrying out its strategic plan/Annual Action Plan outlined in the Consolidated Plan. This includes accomplishments, resources, leveraging, persons assisted (demographics), income data, etc. The HFD has submitted the CAPER on time every year. HUD has always approved the CAPER, and the County has consistently shown progress in achieving its proposed goals and outcomes.

Project III. American Rescue Plan Direct Award - Ambient Air Monitoring
Under this grant agreement, Broward County must submit quarterly reports 30 days after the quarterly reporting period ends and a final report 120 calendar days after the period of performance. Broward County has submitted seven (7) quarterly reports on time and in accordance with the requirements of the grant agreement. A Federal Financial Report (FFR) will be required 90 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance.

Project IV. Inflation Reduction Act - Ambient Air Monitoring
Broward County is required to submit semi-annual performance reports within 30 days after the reporting periods end. Reporting periods are April 1 – September 30 and October 1 – March 31. The final performance report must be submitted no later than 120 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance. The first semi-annual report is due April 2024. An FFR and minority/women based-enterprise reports will be required 90 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance.

Project V. Child Care Licensing and Enforcement
All required annual and quarterly reports were submitted timely by Broward County. Each quarterly report submitted met the required targets per the DCF agreement.

6.3 Staff Expertise

Compact counties have staff who are leading experts in climate resilience and mitigation. Staff have served in leadership roles with relevant professional organizations, regularly serve as invited speakers and panelists nationally and abroad, have contributed to various federal initiatives on climate and resilience, have supported various federal resilience initiatives, including convenings hosted by the National Academy of Sciences, and have provided testimony before various congressional committees. Notable qualifications of key staff are as follows:

6.3.1 Broward

Dr. Jennifer Jurado, Chief Resilience Officer, Deputy Director, Resilient Environment Department

- Knowledge: climate policy and planning, climate science, environmental resource management
- Expertise: agency, community-wide, and regional resilience initiatives, multi-jurisdictional projects, collaborative processes and partnerships, program development
- Qualifications: Ph.D. in Marine Biology and Fisheries, 21 years with Broward County leading climate and environmental efforts county-wide
- Resources: Directs Resilience Unit with 10 existing staff, department resources include Housing Finance, Sustainability Program, and Innovation Unit

Dr. Gregory Mount, Assistant Chief Resilience Officer

- Knowledge: skilled trades, contracting, assessment and performance monitoring
- Expertise: geoscience, environmental and cultural resources management, grant management, operations and logistics
- Qualifications: Ph.D. in Hydrogeophysics, 15 years in academia and local government

Ralph Stone, Director Housing Finance Division/Executive Director Housing Finance Authority

- Knowledge: urban planning, redevelopment, affordable housing including home repair, purchase assistance, new construction
- Expertise: urban planning, economic development, redevelopment, affordable housing/finance, tax credit bond financing, city management
- Qualifications: Masters Degree in Urban Planning; 40 years as a City Manager, Assistant City Manager, Downtown Development Authority Executive Director, Planning Director, Consultant
- Resources: All affordable housing-related strategies

6.3.2 Miami-Dade

Dr. Patricia Gomez, Interim Chief Resilience Officer and Director of Energy

- Knowledge: energy management, contracting, personnel management, climate policy, facilitating multi-disciplinary conversations, breaking silos and aligning resources
- Expertise: engineering, Certified Energy Manager (CEM) by AEE, Professional Engineer in the State of Florida, and other multiple certifications, project management for solar installations and EV charging stations
- Qualifications: Ph.D. in Industrial Engineering, 25 years in local government, private industry and academia
- Resources: Manages Office of Resilience with 27 staff members, and coordinates across departments in a large county government

Adrian Frazier, Director, Energy Facilities and Maintenance Division, Community Action and Human Services Department (CAHSD)

- Knowledge: Project and contract management from planning and procurement through construction and closeouts

- Expertise: Oversees weatherization and housing rehabilitation programs, contract negotiations, conflict resolution, project oversight, manages 45 staff, over 20 years with Miami-Dade County.
- Qualifications: BA Urban Design; AA Architecture
- Resources: Ability to hire and oversee grant-funded staff, procurement of contractors, provide office space, training and resources

Kimberly Brown, Director of Resilience Planning and Implementation

- Knowledge: resilience policy and planning
- Expertise: policy, planning, grant management, public outreach, geographic information systems
- Qualifications: M.A. Urban and Regional Planning, 15 years in public sector planning and policy, American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) certification

6.3.3 Monroe

Rhonda Haag, Chief Resilience Officer, Monroe County

- Knowledge: resilience policy and planning, environmental resource restoration
- Expertise: environmental restoration, resilience and adaptation, project management, outreach
- Qualifications: MBA, 15 years in environmental and resilience project management, 20 years in procurement and contract management with State and County governments
- Resources: Sustainability Director, ability to coordinate staff resources across departments

Alicia Betancourt, University of Florida, IFAS Extension Director

- Knowledge: energy efficiency program planning, GHG accounting
- Expertise: community energy program development, GHG emissions accounting, facilitation and program evaluation
- Qualifications: M.A. Public Administration, 17 years of community-centered program implementation, evaluation and outreach
- Resources: University of Florida, IFAS support and coordination of technical experts

6.3.4 Palm Beach

Megan Houston, Chief Resilience Officer

- Knowledge: Design, environmental law, sustainable development
- Expertise: Climate mitigation, climate adaptation, and sustainable development strategies; energy efficiency program implementation; grant development and management
- Qualifications: J.D., Florida and New York Bar memberships
- Resources: Resilience Director, ability to coordinate staff resources across County departments

Natalie Frendberg, Environmental Program Supervisor

- Knowledge: Environmental science, climate science education, cultural anthropology
- Expertise: Grant management, project management, program evaluation, community outreach
- Qualifications: LEED Green Associate, Lean Sigma Six-Green Belt

Jonathan Brown, Director, Palm Beach County Housing & Economic Development (HED)

- Knowledge: affordable and workforce housing, economic development, and banking/lending
- Expertise: Business, community, and affordable and workforce housing programs
- Qualifications: BBA; Certified Redevelopment Professional; Certified Economic Development Finance Professional; Certified Green Belt; Certified Homeownership Counselor
- Resources: Ability to hire grant-funded staff and provide office space, training, and resources

7 Budget

Please see Appendix A - Budget Narrative for Project budget information.

APPENDIX A - BUDGET NARRATIVE

The following budget narrative is intended to provide a detailed description of the budget found in the SF-424A for the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact's (Compact or Project Team) proposed measures for U.S. EPA's Climate Pollution Reduction Grant Implementation Grant application (Project). This narrative includes a discussion of the Compact's approach to ensuring proper management of grant funds, and contextualizes the budget proposed for the measures detailed in this Project including the ResidentialEnergy Efficiency Program (REEP), the Solar Rebate Program (SRP), and the Electric Vehicle New Incentives for Charging Equipment (EV-NICE). This technical appendix is intended to supplement the Compact's Workplan and Budget Spreadsheet.

1 Budget Detail

1.1 Personnel

Personnel [Total: $5,625,109]

1.1.1 REEP Personnel

- **[$500,000]** One 100% full-time employee (FTE) construction project manager to manage REEP measure projects at $100,000/year for 5 years = $500,000
- **[$1,500,000]** Four 100% FTE community development specialists to manage client relationships and application process at $75,000/year for 5 years = $1,500,000
- **[$140,642]** One 33% FTE internal contract grant administrator (senior) to coordinate and oversee all grant deliverables in accordance with grant requirements on behalf of regional partners. Ensure timely and complete reporting to the granting agency, administrative coordination with project partners, and program coordination with the funding agency. Provide budget management. This individual's salary is $84,385/year at 0.33FTE = $28,128 for 5 years = $140,0642.
- **[$133,333]** One 33% FTE Accountant (senior) to support the Contract Grant Administrator Senior. Provide detailed accounting of all program expenditures, partner invoicing, and payment processing, maintaining all records and backup materials. This individual's salary is $80,000/year for 5 years = $133,333
- **[$140,642]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator (senior) to support program coordination across the four counties and projects implemented within Broward. Lead communications efforts and community engagement. Coordinate with public communications to address public inquiries and manage web content and social media. Distribute communications materials to partner counties. Serve as program liaison with regional service providers relevant to grant activities (e.g., EV companies, Solar installers, energy efficiency contractors). This individual's salary is $84,385/year at 0.33FTE = $28,128 for 5 years = $140,0642.
- **[$113,208]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator to support Project Coordinator Senior with program marketing, public inquiries, partner support, and other duties as required. This individual's salary is $67,925/year for 5 years = $113,208
- **[$150,000]** One 40% FTE community development specialist/monitoring to support program monitoring, administration, and oversight. This individual's salary is $75,000/year at 0.4 FTE = $30,000 for 5 years = $150,000.
- **[$25,200]** One 2.8% FTE Director to provide oversight of the program. This individual's salary is $180,000/year at 0.028 FTE = $5,040 for 5 years = $25,200.
- **[$50,400]** One 9.6% FTE section manager for home repair and purchase assistance to support program monitoring, administration, and oversight. This individual's salary is $105,000/year at 0.096 FTE = $10,080 for 5 years = $50,400.

- **[$150,000]** One 40% FTE accountant to support program accounting, monitoring, administration, and oversight. This individual's salary is $75,000/year at 0.4 FTE = $30,000 for 5 years = $150,000.

1.1.2 SRP Personnel

- **[$500,000]** One 100% FTE project manager to manage SRP measure at $100,000/year for 5 years = $500,000
- **[$187,500]** One 50% FTE resilience specialist for EV-NICE and SRP measures at $75,000/year for 5 years = $187,500
- **[$140,642]** One 33% FTE contract grant administrator (senior) to coordinate and oversee all grant deliverables in accordance with grant requirements on behalf of regional partners. Ensure timely and complete reporting to the granting agency, administrative coordination with project partners, and program coordination with the funding agency. Provide budget management. This individual's salary is $84,385/year at 0.33FTE = $28,128 for 5 years = $140,0642.
- **[$133,333]** One 33% FTE Accountant (senior) to support the Contract Grant Administrator Senior. Provide detailed accounting of all program expenditures, partner invoicing, and processing of payments, maintaining all records and backup materials. This individual's salary is $80,000/year for 5 years = $133,333.
- **[$140,642]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator (senior) to support program coordination across the four counties and projects implemented within Broward. Lead communications efforts and community engagement. Coordinate with public communications to address public inquiries and manage web content and social media. Distribute communications materials to partner counties. Serve as program liaison with regional service providers relevant to grant activities (e.g., EV companies, Solar installers, energy efficiency contractors). This individual's salary is $84,385/year at 0.33FTE = $28,128 for 5 years = $140,0642.
- **[$113,208]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator to support Project Coordinator Senior with program marketing, public inquiries, partner support, and other duties as required. This individual's salary is $67,925/year for 5 years = $113,208

1.1.3 EV-NICE Personnel

- **[$500,000]** One 100% FTE project manager to manage the EV-NICE measure at $100,000/year for 5 years = $500,000
- **[$187,500]** One 50% FTE resilience specialist for the EV-NICE measure and SRP at $75,000/year for 5 years = $187,500
- **[$171,995]** One 20% FTE assistant chief resilience officer to oversee the EV-NICE measure at $82.6/hour for 5 years = $171,995
- **[$119,038]** One energy & sustainability specialist to support the EV-NICE measure. This individual's salary is $119,038/year, at 0.20 FTE for 5 years = $119,038
- **[$140,642]** One 33% FTE contract grant administrator (senior) to coordinate and oversee all grant deliverables in accordance with grant requirements on behalf of regional partners. Ensure timely and complete reporting to the granting agency, administrative coordination with project partners, and program coordination with the funding agency. Provide budget management. This individual's salary is $84,385/year at 0.33FTE = $28,128 for 5 years = $140,0642.
- **[$133,333]** One 33% FTE Accountant (senior) to support the Contract Grant Administrator Senior. Provide detailed accounting of all program expenditures, partner invoicing, and processing of payments, maintaining all records and backup materials. This individual's salary is $80,000/year for 5 years = $133,333

- **[$140,642]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator (senior) to support program coordination across the four counties and projects implemented within Broward. Lead communications efforts and community engagement. Coordinate with public communications to address public inquiries and manage web content and social media. Distribute communications materials to partner counties. Serve as program liaison with regional service providers relevant to grant activities (e.g., EV companies, Solar installers, energy efficiency contractors). This individual's salary is $84,385/year at 0.33FTE = $28,128 for 5 years = $140,0642.
- **[$113,208]** One 33% program project coordinator to support Project Coordinator Senior with program marketing, public inquiries, partner support, and other duties as required. This individual's salary is $67,925/year for 5 years = $113,208

1.2 Fringe Benefits [Total: $2,250,043] *1.2.1 REEP Fringe Benefits*

- **[$200,000]** One 100% full-time employee (FTE) Construction project manager at $100,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $200,000
- **[$600,000]** Four 100% FTE community development specialists at $75,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $600,000
- **[$56,257]** One 33% FTE contract grant administrator (senior) at $84,385/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $56,257
- **[$53,333]** One 33% FTE accountant (senior) at $80,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $53,333
- **[$56,257]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator (senior) at $84,385/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $56,257
- **[$45,283]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator at $75,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $45,283
- **[$60,000]** One 40% FTE community development specialist/monitoring at $75,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $60,000
- **[$10,080]** One 2.8% FTE director at $180,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $10,080
- **[$20,160]** One 9.6% FTE section manager for home repair and purchase assistance at 40% fringe for 5 years = $20,160
- **[$60,000]** One 40% FTE accountant at $75,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $60,000.

1.2.2 SRP Fringe Benefits

- **[$200,000]** One 100% FTE project manager to manage the SRP measure at $100,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $200,000
- **[$75,000]** One 50% FTE resilience specialist for EV-NICE and SRP measure at $75,000/year for 5 years at 40% fringe = $75,000
- **[$56,257]** One 33% FTE contract grant administrator (senior) at $84,385/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $56,257
- **[$53,333]** One 33% FTE accountant (senior) at $80,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $53,333
- **[$56,257]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator (senior) at $84,385/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $56,257
- **[$45,283]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator at $75,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $45,283

1.2.1 EV-NICE Fringe Benefits

- **[$200,000]** One 100% FTE project manager to manage the EV-NICE measure at $100,000/year at

40% fringe for 5 years = $200,000

- **[$75,000]** One 50% FTE resilience specialist for the EV-NICE measure and SRP measure at $75,000/year for 5 years at 40% fringe = $75,000
- **[$68,798]** One 20% FTE Assistant Chief Resilience Officer at 40% fringe for 5 years = $68,798
- **[$47,615]** One 20% FTE Energy & Sustainability Specialist at $119,038 yearly salary, at 40% fringe for 5 years = $47,615
- **[$56,257]** One 33% FTE contract grant administrator (senior) at $84,385/year at 30% fringe for 5 years = $56,257
- **[$53,333]** One 33% FTE accountant (senior) at $80,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $53,333
- **[$56,257]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator (senior) at $84,385/year at 30% fringe for 5 years = $56,257
- **[$45,283]** One 33% FTE program project coordinator at $75,000/year at 40% fringe for 5 years = $45,283

1.3 Travel [Total: $39,865]

1.3.1 REEP Travel

- **[$25,628]** This measure requires travel for nine full time employees at 17 trips per year for five years at Federal mileage rate of 67 cents per mile for 50 miles for community meetings

1.3.2 SRP Travel

- **[$2,848]** This measure requires travel for one full time employee at 17 trips per year for five years at the Federal mileage rate of 67 cents per mile for 50 miles for community meetings.

1.3.2 EV-NICE Travel

- **[$11,390]** This measure requires travel for four full time employees at 17 trips per year for five years at the Federal mileage rate of 67 cents per mile for 50 miles for community meetings.

1.4 Equipment [Total: $0]

None

1.5 Supplies [Total: $87,000]

- **[$36,000]** Across all measures, new staff will need laptops and computer software at a rate of $3,000 per staff member. There are a total of 12 FTE which makes the laptop and computer budget = $3,000 x 12 = $36,000
- **[$12,000]** Across all measures, new staff will need a phone budget at a rate of $1,000 per staff member. There are a total of 12 FTE employees which makes the phone budget = $1,000 x 12 = $12,000.
- **[$30,000]** Across all measures, new staff will need furniture and office supplies at a rate of $2,500 per FTE and a miscellaneous budget for shirts and field gear at a rate of $750 per FTE. There are a total of 12 FTE employees, which makes the furniture and office supplies budget = $2,500 x 12 = $30,000.
- **[$9,000]** Across all measures, new staff will need miscellaneous field gear such as shirts and field gear at a rate of $750 per staff member. There are a total of 12 FTE employees, which makes the miscellaneous budget = $750 x 12 = $9,000.

1.6 Contractual [Total: $53,892,800]

1.6.1 REEP Contractual

- **[$50,000,000]** This measure requires a general contractor to implement the energy efficiency and weatherization work for applicants. This work is anticipated to cost $50,000,000 to service

an estimated 2,324 LIDAC homes in Broward County, leading to a cumulative emissions reduction of 4,632 metric tons of CO2e between 2025 and 2030. The contractor has yet to be determined.

- **[$3,392,800]** This measure requires software management for all four countries in this application for the purposes of tracking progress and reporting. The budget for this contract is $3,392,800. It is anticipated that this work will be contracted with Neighborly as an amendment to an existing service agreement with Broward County supporting the County's Emergency Rental Assistance Program.

- **[$166,667]** This measure requires outreach for LIDAC feedback and engagement. The budget for this contract is $166,667, and it is anticipated that these contracts will be awarded to local non-profit organizations.

1.6.2 SRP Contractual

- **[$166,667]** This measure requires outreach for LIDAC feedback and engagement. The budget for this contract is $166,667, and it is anticipated that these contracts will be awarded to local non-profit organizations.

1.6.3 EV-NICE Contractual

- **[$166,667]** This measure requires outreach for LIDAC feedback and engagement. The budget for this contract is $166,667, and it is anticipated that these contracts will be awarded to local non-profit organizations.

1.7 Other [Total: $208,120,852]

1.7.1 REEP Other

- **[$54,299,135]** Sub-award to Miami-Dade County to implement the REEP measure in Miami-Dade County. This sub-award includes $50,000,000 for implementation to service 2,324 homes. $4,299,135 is to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs.
- **[$33,930,135]** Sub-award to Monroe County to implement the REEP measure in Monroe County. This sub-award includes $30,000,000 for implementation to service 1,394 homes. $3,930,135 is to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs.
- **[$54,212,390]** Sub-award to Palm Beach County to implement the REEP measure in Palm Beach County. This sub-award includes $50,000,000 for implementation to service 2,324 homes. $4,212,390 is to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs.
- **[$36,000]** This measure will require all staff to get trained, certified, if needed, and go to relevant conferences.

1.7.2 SRP Other

- **[$12,474,000]** Direct rebates to residents of $12,474,000 for the SRP measure serving 2,146 households in Broward County.
- **[$14,036,542]** Sub-award to Miami-Dade County to implement the SRP measure in Miami-Dade County. This sub-award includes $12,474,000 for direct rebates and $1,562,541 to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs. This measure will serve 2,101 households.
- **[$9,286,875]** Sub-award to Monroe County to implement the SRP measure in Monroe County. This sub-award includes $7,501,500 for direct rebates and $1,785,3752 to support LIDAC

engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs. This measure will serve 1,263 households.

- **[$14,030,015]** Sub-award to Palm Beach County to implement the SRP measure in Palm Beach County. This sub-award includes $12,474,000 for direct rebates and $1,556,015 to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs. This measure will serve 2,272 households.
- **[$4,000]** This measure will require all staff to get trained, certified, if needed, and go to relevant conferences.

1.7.3 EV-NICE Other

- **[$3,057,700]** Direct rebates to public and private entities of $3,057,700 for the EV-NICE measure. This will lead to the installation of 200 level 2 and 40 DCFC ports.
- **[$4,536,285]** Sub-award to Miami-Dade County to implement the EV-NICE measure in Miami-Dade County. This sub-award includes $3,057,700 for direct rebates and $1,478,585 to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs. This will lead to the installation of 200 level 2 and 40 DCFC ports.
- **[$3,597,060]** Sub-award to Monroe County to implement the EV-NICE measure in Monroe County. This sub-award includes $1,805,685 for direct rebates, and $1,791,375 is to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs. This will lead to the installation of 50 level 2 and 32 DCFC ports.
- **[$4,616,715]** Sub-award to Palm Beach County to implement the EV-NICE measure in Palm Beach County. This sub-award includes $3,057,700 for direct rebates and $1,559,015 to support LIDAC engagement contracts and county-level staff time, fringe benefits, and indirect costs. This will lead to the installation of 200 level 2 and 40 DCFC ports.
- **[$4,000]** This measure will require all staff to get trained, certified, if needed, and go to relevant conferences.

1.8 Indirect Charges [Total: $623,712]

Across all measures, a 7.7% indirect cost rate will be applied to personnel and fringe only. Additionally, the first $25,000 of each sub-award to Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach counties is also captured.

2 Total Budget Summary

Program Year	Anticipated Production (% of Total)	Description	Estimated Budget
Year 1 - 2025	10% of total production	Ramp-up year	$30,618,306
Year 2 - 2026	30% of total production	Peak performance year	$77,855,942
Year 3 - 2027	30% o f total production	Peak performance year	$77,855,942
Year 4 - 2028	20% of total production	Post-peak throttle-down year	$54,065.11
Year 5 - 2029	10% of total production	Ramp-down and closeout year	$30,243,481
		TOTAL:	**$270,639,381**

Table 2.1 - Measure Implementation Budget Schedule

2.1 Expenditure of Awarded Funds

Broward County will provide senior program administration and oversight within the Resilient Environment Department. The Department will coordinate with the County's Office of Management and Budget - Grants Administration Section and the Accounting Division to ensure adherence with all

administrative procedures and protocols (Broward County and EPAs). The Department will hire an additional four full-time employees to support the proper expenditure of these funds, providing coordination across all four counties. Monthly, the grant administration and programmatic team will meet to review expenditures to ensure that they are in alignment with the negotiated budget for this grant. Additionally, Broward County's CPRG project administration team will work in partnership with each of the three county sub-awardees, whose project staff each includes a grants administrator as a single point of contract, to ensure all processes are in alignment with EPA's policies and procedures and grant expenditures are in accordance with the outlined timeline. The County's proposed utilization of Neighborly as a shared cloud-based project management tool will allow for shared access and uniform processes across the four counties, with collective viewing of all program data and progress, facilitating data management and reporting across projects, partners, and years.

2.2 Reasonableness of Costs

The costs outlined above are critical to the implementation and administration of this program. Each position (personnel and fringe), their equipment and supplies are critical to ensuring the programs are adequately staffed to this scale of work. Contractual agreements for LIDAC engagement are critical to ensuring LIDACs can access these programs and provide their feedback as participants of the programs. Contractual work for REEP is vital for ensuring licensed and insured professionals are undertaking and completing authorized projects in residents' homes. Finally, indirect costs across these programs are necessary to ensure utility expenses are paid, staff have office space and internal support services (accounting, legal, purchasing, information technology) needed to deliver quality governmental services across all aspects of the proposed services, along with the necessities to ensure government buildings are accessible to those who work within and visit them.

2.2.1 REEP Reasonableness of Costs

It is expected the REEP measure will reduce CO2e by 16,665 metric tons and will lead to $11,675,679 in cumulative bill savings over 5 years. The funds allocated to this program are based on project cost estimates for the select high-priority measures modeled for the region. The counties took into account historic program operations and demand, workflow and capabilities, demand for similar services, and project term to arrive at reasonable estimates of what can effectively be deployed through the coordinated efforts of the collective partners in this program.

2.2.2 SRP Reasonableness of Costs

It is expected the SRP measure will reduce CO2e by 58,332 metric tons and will lead to $45,137,504 in cumulative bill savings over 5 years. The funds allocated to this program are based on research of estimated rebate amounts necessary to incentivize solar project installations (combined with tax incentives), typical installation costs for roof types in our region, and an average/maximum installation size based on conversations with industry and non-profits in the region. With these estimates, county partners considered management abilities and historic demands for similar programs to establish a program scale. We are confident in our ability to successfully deploy the funds proposed within the 5-year program based on detailed assumptions.

2.2.3 EV-NICE Reasonableness of Costs

It is expected the EV-NICE measure will install 802 ports, will reduce CO2e by 204,132 metric tons and will lead to an additional 18,937 electric vehicles attributed to the program. The funds allocated to this program are based on project cost estimates for the select high-priority measures modeled for the region. The four counties accounted for the demand expressed by community partners and residents and existing capacity within our agency operations to estimate the reasonableness of project scale,

workflow, and capabilities, and demand for services to arrive at reasonable estimates of what can effectively be deployed through the coordinated efforts of the collective partners in this program.

Consolidated Budget Table

BUDGET BY YEAR							
COST-TYPE	**CATEGORY**	**YEAR 1**	**YEAR 2**	**YEAR 3**	**YEAR 4**	**YEAR 5**	**TOTAL**
Direct Costs	TOTAL PERSONNEL	*$1,125,022*	*$1,125,022*	*$1,125,022*	*$1,125,022*	*$1,125,022*	*$5,625,109*
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	*$450,009*	*$450,009*	*$450,009*	*$450,009*	*$450,009*	*$2,250,043*
	TOTAL TRAVEL	*$7,973*	*$7,973*	*$7,973*	*$7,973*	*$7,973*	*$39,865*
	TOTAL EQUIPMENT	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*
	TOTAL SUPPLIES	*$87,000*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$87,000*
	TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	*$5,809,360*	*$15,808,360*	*$15,808,360*	*$10,758,360*	*$5,708,360*	*$53,892,800*
	TOTAL OTHER	*$23,000,340*	*$60,343,301*	*$60,343,301*	*$41,603,070*	*$22,830,840*	*$208,120,852*
	TOTAL DIRECT	*$30,479,703*	*$77,734,664*	*$77,734,664*	*$53,944,433*	*$30,122,203*	*$270,015,669*
	TOTAL INDIRECT	$138,602	$121,277	$121,277	$121,277	$121,277	$623,712
TOTAL FUNDING		**$30,618,306**	**$77,855,942**	**$77,855,942**	**$54,065,711**	**$30,243,481**	**$270,639,381**

BUDGET BY PROJECT			
Project Number	**Project Name**	**Total Cost**	**% of Total**
1	*Measure 1 REEP*	*$200,511,563*	*74%*
2	*Measure 2 SRP*	*$51,846,438*	*19%*
3	*Measure 3 EV-NICE*	*$18,281,379*	*7%*
Total		*$270,639,381*	*93%*

Measure 1: REEP- Detailed Budget Table

BUDGET BY YEAR							
COST-TYPE	CATEGORY	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	TOTAL
Direct	**Personnel**						
	Construction Project Manager @$100,000/yearly salary, one 100% FTE	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$500,000*
	Community Development Specialist @$75,000/yearly salary four 100% FTE	*$300,000*	*$300,000*	*$300,000*	*$300,000*	*$300,000*	*$1,500,000*
	Contract Grant Administrator Senior @$84,385 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$140,642*
	Accountant Senior @$80,000 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$133,333*
	Program Project Coordinator Senior @$84,385 yearly salary one 33% FTE	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$140,642*
	Program Project Coordinator @$67,925 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$113,208*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Community Development Specialist/Monitoring @$75,000 yearly salary, one 40% FTE	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$150,000*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Director @ $180,000 yearly salary, one 2.8% FTE	*$5,040*	*$5,040*	*$5,040*	*$5,040*	*$5,040*	*$25,200*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Section Manager for Home Repair and Purchase Assistance @$105,000 yearly salary, one 9.6% FTE	*$10,080*	*$10,080*	*$10,080*	*$10,080*	*$10,080*	*$50,400*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Accountant @$75,000 yearly salary, one 40% FTE	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$30,000*	*$150,000*
	TOTAL PERSONNEL	*$580,685*	*$580,685*	*$580,685*	*$580,685*	*$580,685*	*$2,903,425*
	Fringe Benefits						
	Construction Project Manager, one 100% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$200,000*
	Community Development Specialist, four 100% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$120,000*	*$120,000*	*$120,000*	*$120,000*	*$120,000*	*$600,000*
	Contract Grant Administrator Senior, one 33% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$56,257*
	Accountant Senior, one 33% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$53,333*
	Program Project Coordinator Senior, one 33% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$56,257*
	Program Project Coordinator, one 33% @ 40% of salary	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$45,283*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Community Development Specialist/Monitoring @$75,000 yearly salary, one 40% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$60,000*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Director @ $180,000 yearly salary, one 2.8% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$2,016*	*$2,016*	*$2,016*	*$2,016*	*$2,016*	*$10,080*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Section Manager for Home Repair and Purchase Assistance @$105,000 yearly salary, one 9.6% FTE @ 40% of	*$4,032*	*$4,032*	*$4,032*	*$4,032*	*$4,032*	*$20,160*
	Broward County Housing Finance Authority Accountant @$75,000 yearly salary, one 40% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$60,000*
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	*$232,274*	*$232,274*	*$232,274*	*$232,274*	*$232,274*	*$1,161,370*
	Travel						
	17 trips per year for five years for 9 FTE at Federal mileage rate of 67 cents per mile for 50 miles for community meetings	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$25,628*
							$0
	TOTAL TRAVEL	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$5,126*	*$25,628*
	Equipment						*$0*
	TOTAL EQUIPMENT	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*
	Supplies						
	Laptop Computer and software, $3,000 for 9 FTE	*$27,000*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$27,000*
	Phone budget, $1000 for nine FTE	*$9,000*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$9,000*
	Furniture and office supplies, $2,500 for nine FTE	*$22,500*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$22,500*
	Miscellaneous (shirts, field gear), $750 for nine FTE	*$6,750*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$6,750*
	TOTAL SUPPLIES	*$65,250*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$65,250*
	Contractual						
	General contractor to fulfill EE/weatherization scopes (TBD)	*$5,000,000*	*$15,000,000*	*$15,000,000*	*$10,000,000*	*$5,000,000*	*$50,000,000*
	Software management for all four counties for reporting access - Includes hosting fee, administrative users,data as a service, smarty streets, maintenance	*$759,360*	*$658,360*	*$658,360*	*$658,360*	*$658,360*	*$3,392,800*
	Outreach for LIDAC engagement	*$16,667*	*$50,000*	*$50,000*	*$33,333*	*$16,667*	*$166,667*
	TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	*$5,776,027*	*$15,708,360*	*$15,708,360*	*$10,691,693*	*$5,675,027*	*$53,559,467*
	OTHER						
	Subaward to Miami-Dade County for residential EE/Weatherization program	*$5,879,560*	*$15,869,394*	*$15,869,394*	*$10,852,727*	*$5,828,060*	*$54,299,135*
	Subaward to Monroe County for residential EE/Weatherization program	*$3,770,760*	*$9,804,094*	*$9,804,094*	*$6,787,427*	*$3,763,760*	*$33,930,135*
	Subaward to Palm Beach County for residential EE/Weatherization program	*$5,860,611*	*$15,850,445*	*$15,850,445*	*$10,833,778*	*$5,817,111*	*$54,212,390*
	Training, certifications, and conference registration ($1,000 per year for four years for all FTE)	*$9,000*	*$9,000*	*$9,000*	*$9,000*	*$0*	*$36,000*
	TOTAL OTHER	*$15,519,931*	*$41,532,933*	*$41,532,933*	*$28,482,932*	*$15,408,931*	*$142,477,660*
	TOTAL DIRECT	*$22,179,292*	*$58,059,378*	*$58,059,378*	*$39,992,710*	*$21,902,042*	*$200,192,799*
Indirect	**Indirect Costs**						
	7.7 % indirect cost rate - applied across fringe, personnel	*$62,598*	*$62,598*	*$62,598*	*$62,598*	*$62,598*	*$312,989*
	First $25,000 of each subaward (3 total)	*$5,775*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$5,775*
	TOTAL INDIRECT	*$68,373*	*$62,598*	*$62,598*	*$62,598*	*$62,598*	*$318,764*
TOTAL		*$22,247,665*	*$58,121,975*	*$58,121,975*	*$40,055,308*	*$21,964,640*	*$200,511,563*

Measure 2: SRP- Detailed Budget Table

BUDGET BY YEAR							
COST-TYPE	**CATEGORY**	**YEAR 1**	**YEAR 2**	**YEAR 3**	**YEAR 4**	**YEAR 5**	**TOTAL**
Direct Costs	**Personnel**						
	Project manager @$100,000/year salary, one 100% FTE	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$500,000*
	Resilience Specialist for EVSE + Solar PV program @$75,000/year, one 50% FTE	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$187,500*
	Contract Grant Administrator Senior @$84,385 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$140,642*
	Accountant Senior @$80,000 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$133,333*
	Program Project Coordinator Senior @$84,385 yearly salary one 33% FTE	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$140,642*
	Program Project Coordinator @$67,925 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$113,208*
	TOTAL PERSONNEL	*$243,065*	*$243,065*	*$243,065*	*$243,065*	*$243,065*	*$1,215,325*
	Fringe Benefits						
	Project Manager 1 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$200,000*
	Resilience Specialist for EVSE + Solar PV program 0.5 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$75,000*
	Contract Grant Administrator Senior 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$56,257*
	Accountant Senior 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$53,333*
	Program Project Coordinator Senior 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$56,257*
	Program Project Coordinator 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$45,283*
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	*$97,226*	*$97,226*	*$97,226*	*$97,226*	*$97,226*	*$486,130*
	Travel						
	17 trips per year for five years for 1 FTE at Federal mileage rate of 67 cents per mile for	*$570*	*$570*	*$570*	*$570*	*$570*	*$2,848*
	TOTAL TRAVEL	*$570*	*$570*	*$570*	*$570*	*$570*	*$2,848*
	Equipment						*$0*
	TOTAL EQUIPMENT						*$0*
	Supplies						
	Laptop Computer and software, $3,000 for one FTE	*$3,000*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$3,000*
	Phone budget, $1000 for one FTE	*$1,000*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$1,000*
	Furniture and office supplies for one FTE	*2500*					*$2,500*
	Miscellaneous (shirts, field gear), $750 for one FTE	*$750*					*$750*
	TOTAL SUPPLIES	*$7,250*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$7,250*
	Contractual						
	Outreach for LIDAC engagement	*$16,667*	*$50,000*	*$50,000*	*$33,333*	*$16,667*	*$166,667*
	TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	*$16,667*	*$50,000*	*$50,000*	*$33,333*	*$16,667*	*$166,667*
	OTHER						
	Participant support costs - residential solar rebate	*$1,247,400*	*$3,742,200*	*$3,742,200*	*$2,494,800*	*$1,247,400*	*$12,474,000*
	Subaward to Miami-Dade County for residential and community-based organizations solar rebate program	*$1,549,842*	*$4,069,975*	*$4,069,975*	*$2,805,908*	*$1,540,842*	*$14,036,542*
	Subaward to Monroe County for residential and community-based organizations solar rebate program	*$1,090,758*	*$2,624,392*	*$2,624,392*	*$1,857,575*	*$1,089,758*	*$9,286,875*
	Subaward to Palm Beach County for residential and community-based organizations	*$1,551,136*	*$4,067,770*	*$4,067,770*	*$2,803,703*	*$1,539,636*	*$14,030,015*
	Training, certifications, and conference registration ($1,000 per year for four years for all	*$1,000*	*$1,000*	*$1,000*	*$1,000*	*$0*	*$4,000*
	TOTAL OTHER	*$5,440,136*	*$14,505,337*	*$14,505,337*	*$9,962,986*	*$5,417,636*	*$49,831,432*
	TOTAL DIRECT	*$5,804,913*	*$14,896,198*	*$14,896,198*	*$10,337,180*	*$5,775,163*	*$51,709,651*
Indirect	**Indirect Costs**						
	7.7 % indirect cost rate - applied across fringe, personnel	*26202.407*	*26202.407*	*26202.407*	*26202.407*	*26202.407*	*$131,012*
	First $25,000 of each subaward (3 total)	*$5,775*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$5,775*
	TOTAL INDIRECT	*$31,977*	*$26,202*	*$26,202*	*$26,202*	*$26,202*	*$136,787*
TOTAL		***$5,836,891***	***$14,922,400***	***$14,922,400***	***$10,363,382***	***$5,801,366***	***$51,846,438***

Measure 3: EV-NICE- Detailed Budget Table

BUDGET BY YEAR							
COST-TYPE	**CATEGORY**	**YEAR 1**	**YEAR 2**	**YEAR 3**	**YEAR 4**	**YEAR 5**	**TOTAL**
Direct Costs	**Personnel**						
	Project manager @100,000/year salary, one 100% FTE	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$500,000*
	Resilience Specialist for EVSE + Solar PV program @75,000/year, one 50% FTE	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$37,500*	*$187,500*
	Assistant Chief Resilience Officer @$171,995 yearly salary, one 20% FTE	*$34,399*	*$34,399*	*$34,399*	*$34,399*	*$34,399*	*$171,995*
	Energy & Sustainability Specialist @119,038 yearly salary, one 20% FTE	*$23,808*	*$23,808*	*$23,808*	*$23,808*	*$23,808*	*$119,038*
	Contract Grant Administrator Senior @$84,385 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$140,642*
	Accountant Senior @$80,000 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$26,667*	*$133,333*
	Program Project Coordinator Senior @$84,385 yearly salary one 33% FTE	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$28,128*	*$140,642*
	Program Project Coordinator @$67,925 yearly salary, one 33% FTE	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$22,642*	*$113,208*
	TOTAL PERSONNEL	*$301,272*	*$301,272*	*$301,272*	*$301,272*	*$301,272*	*$1,506,359*
	Fringe Benefits						
	Project Manager 1 FTE @ @ 40% of salary	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$40,000*	*$200,000*
	Resilience Specialist for EVSE + Solar PV program 0.5 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$75,000*
	Assistant Chief Resilience Officer 20% FTE, @ 40% of salary	*$13,760*	*$13,760*	*$13,760*	*$13,760*	*$13,760*	*$68,798*
	Energy & Sustainability Specialist 20% FTE @ 40% of salary	*$9,523*	*$9,523*	*$9,523*	*$9,523*	*$9,523*	*$47,615*
	Contract Grant Administrator Senior 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$56,257*
	Accountant Senior 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$10,667*	*$53,333*
	Program Project Coordinator Senior 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$11,251*	*$56,257*
	Program Project Coordinator 0.33 FTE @ 40% of salary	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$9,057*	*$45,283*
	TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	*$120,509*	*$120,509*	*$120,509*	*$120,509*	*$120,509*	*$602,543*
	Travel						
	17 trips per year for five years for 4 FTE at Federal mileage rate of 67 cents per	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$11,390*
	TOTAL TRAVEL	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$2,278*	*$11,390*
	Equipment						*$0*
	TOTAL EQUIPMENT						*$0*
	Supplies						
	Laptop Computer and software, $3,000 for two FTE	*$6,000*					*$6,000*
	Phone budget, $1000 for two FTE	*2000*					*$2,000*
	Furniture and office supplies for two FTE	*5000*					*$5,000*
	Miscellaneous (shirts, field gear), $750 for two FTE	*$1,500*					*$1,500*
	TOTAL SUPPLIES	*$14,500*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$14,500*
	Contractual						
	Outreach for LIDAC engagement	*$16,667*	*$50,000*	*$50,000*	*$33,333*	*$16,667*	*$166,667*
	TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	*$16,667*	*$50,000*	*$50,000*	*$33,333*	*$16,667*	*$166,667*
	OTHER						
	Direct rebates to public and private entities of 50%	*$305,770*	*$917,310*	*$917,310*	*$611,540*	*$305,770*	*$3,057,700*
	Subaward to Miami-Dade County for EVSE rebate program	*$596,820*	*$1,227,194*	*$1,227,194*	*$904,757*	*$580,320*	*$4,536,285*
	Subaward to Monroe County for EVSE rebate program	*$524,177*	*$916,647*	*$916,647*	*$719,412*	*$520,177*	*$3,597,060*
	Subaward to Palm Beach County for EVSE rebate program	*$612,506*	*$1,242,880*	*$1,242,880*	*$920,443*	*$598,006*	*$4,616,715*
	Training, certifications, and conference registration ($1,000 per year for four yea	*$1,000*	*$1,000*	*$1,000*	*$1,000*	*$0*	*$4,000*
	TOTAL OTHER	*$2,040,273*	*$4,305,031*	*$4,305,031*	*$3,157,152*	*$2,004,273*	*$15,811,760*
	TOTAL DIRECT	*$2,495,498*	*$4,779,089*	*$4,779,089*	*$3,614,544*	*$2,444,998*	*$18,113,219*
Indirect Costs	*7.7 % indirect cost rate - applied across fringe, personnel*	*$32,477*	*$32,477*	*$32,477*	*$32,477*	*$32,477*	*$162,385*
	First $25,000 of each subaward (3 total)	*$5,775*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$5,775*
	TOTAL INDIRECT	*$38,252*	*$32,477*	*$32,477*	*$32,477*	*$32,477*	*$168,160*
TOTAL		***$2,533,750***	***$4,811,566***	***$4,811,566***	***$3,647,021***	***$2,477,475***	***$18,281,379***

APPENDIX B - TECHNICAL APPENDIX

1 GHG Reduction Estimate Method & Tools Used

The following sections are intended to provide insight into the assumptions and modeling used to generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction estimates for the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact's (Compact or Project Team) proposed measures for U.S. EPA's Climate Pollution Reduction Grant Implementation Grant application (Project). The measures proposed in this Project include Residential Energy Efficiency Program (REEP), Solar Rebate Program (SRP), and Electric Vehicle New Incentives for Charging Equipment (EV-NICE). This technical appendix is intended to supplement the Compact's Workplan.

1.1 REEP & SRP - GHG Reduction Estimate Method & Tools Used

The methods used for REEP and SRP measure-related outputs and GHG emission reduction estimates included publicly available tools and datasets. Rewiring America was contracted to develop REEP and SRP measure estimates. These estimates were built upon Rewiring America's Personal Electrification Planner[1], and follows the methodology outlined on their website[2]. To summarize, the GHG reduction estimates were generated, first, using the ResStock[3] tool from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), to determine residential building characteristics specific to homes in Florida in 2021 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) climate zone 1A, as well as energy saving estimates under a variety of upgrade scenarios, or interventions. To convert energy savings estimates into GHG reduction estimates, we use two sets of emissions factors. For fossil fuel site emissions - including propane, natural gas, or fuel oil - we use the appropriate emissions factors from the U.S. EPA's AP-42: Compilation of Air Emissions Factors from Stationary Sources[4]. For estimating the emissions from electric loads, NREL's energy analysis data sets on Cambium[5] were used to forecast long-run marginal emissions rates.

Solar production for SRP was modeled using NREL's PVWatts tool[6]. The modeled system size was 10 kW based on community input received from local solar installers and Solar United Neighbors, a solar advocacy organization.

One exception to this methodology is estimates from the lighting upgrade (LED replacements) intervention incorporated into the REEP measure. The Personal Electrification Planner was not equipped to estimate savings from lighting upgrade interventions, so engineering estimates were used instead. The calculations and assumptions were based on Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships (NEEP) produced Maryland/Mid-Atlantic Technical Reference Manual (TRM), version 10[7], to produce electric consumption savings (kWh), which was then used to determine GHG emission reductions and participant cost savings based on Southeast Florida-specific grid emission factors and energy prices.

1.2 EV-NICE - GHG Reduction Estimate Method & Tools Used

Emissions reductions for the EV-NICE program were modeled using the amount of vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) associated with an increase in electric vehicle (EV) sales brought on by the measures' increased availability of public EV charging infrastructure. The amount of VMTs that become electrified is compared to the emissions that would have come from combustion vehicles to arrive at an annual emissions reduction figure. The extra emissions from electricity usage are calculated using an average EV

[1] https://homes.rewiringamerica.org/
[2] https://homes.rewiringamerica.org/data-methodology
[3] https://www.nrel.gov/buildings/resstock.html
[4] https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-factors-and-quantification/ap-42-compilation-air-emissions-factors-stationary-sources
[5] https://www.nrel.gov/analysis/cambium.html
[6] https://pvwatts.nrel.gov/
[7] https://neep.org/mid-atlantic-technical-reference-manual-trm-v10

battery efficiency and forecasted grid emission factors, which are then subtracted to find the total annual emissions impact from the program overall.

Greenlink Analytics was contracted to create the model for emissions reductions, which was then tested and revised for local conditions of the Compact partners. Greenlink used their proprietary model, ATHENIA[8], to model Florida Power & Lights (FPL) grid emission intensities to determine emission factors through 2050. The model used input data from publicly available resources.

Source data were derived from a combination of federal government agencies, research institutes, a regional transportation planning council, and industry-related websites. The following list provides a detailed overview of the publicly available information used for the analysis by source:

- The International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT)
    - Expanding the Electric Vehicle Market in U.S. Cities (2017) by Peter Slowik[9]
        - Elasticity of Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSEs) to EV sales
    - Evaluating Electric Vehicle Market Growth Across U.S. Cities (2021) by Anh Bui[10]
        - Continued support of above
- U.S. DOE's Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Projection (EVI-Pro) Lite tool[11]
    - Charging infrastructure needs projections
- NREL: The 2023 National Charging Network[12]
    - EV adoption projections (12% in 2030)
- U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2023[13]
    - Average ICE car emissions
- Southeast Florida Regional Transportation Plan 2045 (adopted 2020)[14]
    - Growth in population vs VMTs in the future
- Kelley Blue Book[15]
    - Average FL VMTs per year
- Car and Driver[16], Electrek[17], Driving Electric[18] websites
    - Average EV battery efficiency and average EV lifetime

2 Measure Implementation Assumptions

2.1 Assumed Rate of Measure Implementation

Assumed rates of measure implementation for all measures were determined by Compact partners' internal evaluations synthesizing factors including internal capacity, past performance, community demand, and existing workforce to ultimately approximate how many rebates each partner could process over a five-year period. From there, a distribution model was developed to reflect the following annual anticipated performance of the Project:

[8] https://www.greenlinkanalytics.org/our-expertise
[9] https://theicct.org/publication/expanding-the-electric-vehicle-market-in-u-s-cities/
[10] https://theicct.org/publication/evaluating-electric-vehicle-market-growth-across-u-s-cities/
[11] https://afdc.energy.gov/evi-x-toolbox#/evi-pro-ports
[12] https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy23osti/85654.pdf
[13] https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/
[14] https://www.seftc.org/2045rtp
[15] https://www.kbb.com
[16] https://www.caranddriver.com/
[17] https://electrek.co/
[18] https://www.drivingelectric.com/

Program Year	Anticipated Production (% of Total)	Description
Year 1 - 2025	10% of total production	Ramp-up year
Year 2 - 2026	30% of total production	Peak performance year
Year 3 - 2027	30% o f total production	Peak performance year
Year 4 - 2028	20% of total production	Post-peak throttle-down year
Year 5 - 2029	10% of total production	Ramp-down and closeout year

Table 2.1 - Assumed Rate of Measure Implementation

2.2 Measure Lifetimes

Measure	PCAP Measure Code	Category	Intervention	Durability (Years)
REEP	RC-01	Envelope	Basic Enclosure	13.0
REEP	RC-03	HVAC	Medium Efficiency A/C	14.0
REEP	RC-03	HVAC	Medium Efficiency Heat Pump	14.0
REEP	RC-04	DHW	Heat Pump Water Heater	10.0
REEP	R-01	Appliance	Induction Range	14.0
REEP	R-01	Appliance	Heat Pump Dryer	13.0
REEP	RC-05	Lighting	LED Replacements	16.3
SRP	R-02	Solar	Solar Photovoltaics	30.0
EV-NICE	T-03	EV	Level 2 Charger	24.0
EV-NICE	T-03	EV	DC Fast Charger	24.0

Table 2.2 - Summary of Measure Intervention Lifetimes

REEP intervention-level durability was determined based on GHG reduction estimate methodology used. For interventions modeled by Rewiring America, measure durability was derived from InterNACHI's Standard Estimated Life Expectancy Chart for Homes[19]. For lighting upgrade interventions, measure durability was derived from the TRM. REEP intervention lifetimes range from 10.0 years for heat pump water heaters to 16.3 years for LED replacements.

Solar panel durability was determined based on information published by U.S. DOE's Solar Energy Technologies Office on End-of-Life Management for Solar Photovoltaics[20].

Because EV chargers do not inherently generate GHG reductions, but incentivize the purchase of GHG reducing EVs, the durability listed for both types of EV chargers are more accurately represented by the durability of the EVs they are incentivizing. The durability of the additional EVs the measure incentivizes, which will impact future emissions, is calculated to be a total of 24 years. This figure was calculated using an average 12-year expected lifespan for light-duty vehicles[21] and applying a linear decay model. This modeling method assumes for all vehicles placed into service in year 1, exactly half of the vehicles are off the road at year 12, and the remaining vehicles are off the road by year 24.

[19] https://www.nachi.org/life-expectancy.htm
[20] https://www.energy.gov/eere/solar/end-life-management-solar-photovoltaics
[21] https://www.spglobal.com/mobility/en/research-analysis/average-age-of-vehicles-in-the-us-increases-to-122-years.html

2.3 Capital Cost Assumptions

2.3.1 REEP & SRP Capital Cost Assumptions

Capital costs for both REEP and SRP measures follow the methodology on Rewiring America's website[2]. This methodology includes the upfront costs of electrification upgrades like heat pumps, heat pump water heaters, solar panels, insulation, stoves, and dryers which are estimated using datasets from programs and research such as the Massachusetts Residential Air-Source Heat Pump Program, TECH Clean California, and reports from Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). Solar costs, specifically, were derived from datasets published in LBNL's "Tracking the Sun" report[22]. Additionally, weatherization costs were adapted from the U.S. DOE Office of Scientific and Technical Information's "The Cost of Decarbonizing and Energy Upgrade Retrofits for US Homes" report[23]. These costs were then adjusted for factors like square footage, climate zone, and efficiency. Costs are further adjusted for inflation using a Construction Price Index and for location using RS Means materials and labor cost factors, representing total installed costs. For induction ranges and heat pump dryers, costs are estimated using online prices, providing a lower bound on potential expenditure.

Additionally, all costs for interventions are designed for current regulatory conditions involving refrigerants. The refrigerant regulatory changes expected in 2025 to reduce hydrofluorocarbon-based refrigerants in exchange for those with lower global warming potential could not be modeled in due to unknown market implications as of the submission of this application.

One deviation from Rewiring America's methodology is that upfront costs for LED replacements were estimated based on an existing low-income energy efficiency rebate program. Rebates offered in 2024 for lighting upgrades in the program were used and then adjusted for inflation over the proposed period of performance. These methodologies ensure a comprehensive and adjustable approach to predicting upfront costs for various electrification upgrades.

2.3.2 EV-NICE Capital Cost Assumptions

Capital costs were based on estimates provided to Miami-Dade County by local contractors in early 2023 to install Level 2 and DCFC infrastructure for their county fleet. Capital costs are to be assumed by the applicant with a 50% rebate (capped at $100,000 for Level 2 installations and $500,000 for DCFC installations) to be provided by the EV-NICE measure. These costs include project planning, site improvements, installation, operation, maintenance, and project administration. The EV-NICE program leverages public and private sector financing to ensure maximum benefit from the grant funding.

2.4 Operation and Maintenance Cost Assumptions

2.4.1 REEP & SRP Operation and Maintenance Cost Assumptions

All operation and maintenance costs are to be assumed by the participant. However, because LIDAC households are often characterized by poor-quality, less energy efficient buildings with existing deferred maintenance, the installation of new, high-quality, more energy-efficient interventions through REEP are assumed to lower operating costs, supported by energy savings calculations, and alleviate maintenance needs for participants[24]. Similarly, the installation of on-site electricity production solar photovoltaic panels through SRP is assumed to lower operating costs, supported by energy generation calculations. Maintenance costs for solar photovoltaic systems vary so community education and engagement will be an essential component for qualifying households to decide if SRP is appropriate for their individual considerations.

---

[22] https://emp.lbl.gov/tracking-the-sun
[23] https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1834578/
[24] https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy23osti/83173.pdf

2.4.2 EV-NICE Operation and Maintenance Cost Assumptions

Operation and maintenance costs are to be assumed by the applicant.

3 GHG Reduction Estimate Assumptions

While most GHG reduction estimate assumptions are driven by the methodology used in the analysis, one assumption applies to REEP, SRP, and EV-NICE calculations. FPL serves the majority of the region, with Florida Keys Electric Cooperative (FKEC) and Key Energy Services (KES) both serving portions of Monroe County, comprising the Florida Keys. The assumption was made that the GHG grid emissions factors identified for FPL would be appropriate to apply for FKEC and KES.

3.1 REEP & SRP GHG Reduction Estimate Assumptions

For REEP and SRP, when utilizing Cambium to forecast grid emissions, we used the Cambium grid decarbonization scenario assuming 95% of the grid is decarbonized by 2050, starting in 2025. This is intended to be a more conservative estimate than the predominant electric utility serving the region, FPL's Real Zero goal to completely eliminate carbon emissions in Florida no later than 2045.

Additionally, the emissions projected for REEP and SRP were levelized over 15 years (2025-2040) because Rewiring America's models are designed to quantify emissions impacts over the lifetime of an appliance, typically averaging about 15 years. This suggests a higher probability of an overestimation of emissions savings between 2025-2030 and an underestimation of emissions savings between 2025-2030.

As stated in the Workplan, as REEP measure interventions expire approximately 10-16 years after installation, this analysis assumes they will be replaced by interventions with greater than or equal to efficiency ratings of interventions installed by this Project over the period of performance. This assumption is informed by regular trends in updates to energy efficiency codes and equipment standards, as well as technological advancements.

For REEP interventions replacing HVAC equipment, efficiency of existing heat pumps of A/C units have a lower SEER (10-15 SEER) than the retrofit equipment (16+ SEER). Additionally, the assumption was made that medium efficiency straight air-conditioners and heat pumps would be most appropriate for REEP participants all residing within climate zone 1A. The incremental cost increase for higher efficiency heat pumps, for instance, was determined to not be a prudent investment due to the unique 1:100 ratio of heating degree days to cooling degree days for the region, and medium efficiency systems would better support increased dehumidification for healthier indoor air quality.

Similar to cost assumptions, all GHG reduction estimates for REEP interventions are designed for current regulatory conditions involving refrigerants. The refrigerant regulatory changes expected in 2025 to reduce hydrofluorocarbon-based refrigerants in exchange for those with lower global warming potential could not be modeled in due to unknown impacts on equipment performance and subsequent energy consumption, as of the submission of this application.

As stated in the Workplan, local solar installers and Florida Solar United Neighbors recommended using 10 kW for the modeled average system size. All solar arrays installed in the period of performance are also assumed to be operational throughout the 2025-2050 period for the analysis.

IECC climate zone 1A includes Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe Counties. While Palm Beach County falls in climate zone 2A, for purposes of modeling REEP and SRP for this application, we assumed all participants were located in climate zone 1A.

High income households defined as having annual incomes exceeding 150% of local area median income, mobile homes, and vacant homes were excluded from the baseline case scenario modeling.

3.2 EV-NICE GHG Reduction Estimate Assumptions

Based on the U.S. DOE's Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Projection (EVI-Pro) Lite tool, 1.3% of light-duty vehicles (LDVs) are EVs in 2022, which will grow to 12% by 2030, based on NREL projections. The NREL projections for EV counts by year in Florida were localized by average daily vehicle miles traveled (DVMTs) from Florida Department of Transportation to arrive at a number of EVs in just the four-county area. Then the EVI-Pro Lite tool was used to determine the necessary amount of public EVSEs on a yearly basis.

The EV-NICE measure build out schedule was then used to determine the amount of incremental additional EVSEs to be installed during each of the 5 years of the program. The amount of EVSEs was converted to a percentage of additional EVSEs, which informed the amount of new EV registrations per year attributed to the program. These additional EV registrations were based on the assumption that each additional 1% of public EVSEs installed leads to 3% more EV registrations in the following year[9].

These excess EVs are assumed to be replacing internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles and the number of EVs is multiplied by the expected emissions reductions per VMT from the electric transition. Florida VMT averages are taken from Kelley Blue Book and are assumed to grow at 1/2 the expected population growth rate based on the Southeast Florida Regional Transportation Plan 2045 (adopted 2020), due to plans for density and expanded public transportation. Average emissions from ICE vehicles are taken from the U.S. EIA's Annual Energy Outlook 2023 and assumed to decrease over time as fuel efficiency increases. Average emissions from EVs are created by assuming the average battery efficiency of 4.1 miles/kWh, backed up by efficiency numbers from top selling EVs according to Car and Driver, Electrek, and Driving Electric. Electric grid related emissions from the increased EV usage is calculated using FPL's grid emission factors, also assumed to be greening over time in accordance with plans for increased renewables in the generation portfolio.

Overall VMTs converted to EVs and the associated emissions savings on a yearly basis are then subject to an assumed 12-year average lifespan, again backed up by Car and Driver, Electrek, and Driving Electric. This lifespan is converted to a linear decay and allows the gathering of yearly emissions reduction estimates out to the year 2050.

4 Reference Case Scenario (GHG Emissions or Activity Level)

4.1 REEP & SRP Reference Case Scenarios

The reference case used for REEP and SRP modeling largely follows the same methodology outlined in 1.1, using a baseline housing stock modeled by NREL's ResStock for residential building stock in Florida, climate zone 1A, for household incomes not exceeding 150% of the local area median income [25].

"Business as usual" (BAU) projections do not include the effect of non-CPRG federal incentives because the Governor of Florida rejected formula funds through the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) and Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL). Formula funds Florida has received for programs like the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) will have limited reach among regional LIDACs. Additionally, considering the target market segment are low-income and disadvantaged communities (LIDACs), we do not expect participants to carry the tax liability needed to leverage other tax credit and rebate programs.

4.2 EV-NICE Reference Case Scenario

The EV-NICE measure baseline scenario includes average combustion vehicle emissions from the AEO 2023 as well as grid emissions data from Greenlink's FPL projections, as they are the utility provider for the vast majority of consumers throughout the region.

---

[25] https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/nrel.buildingstock/viz/shared/K9N5GPJT3

This emissions data is coupled with baseline population and driving data from the Southeast Florida Regional Transportation Plan 2045, which was adopted in August of 2020.

The final baseline assumptions come from the Department of Energy's Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Projection (EVI-Pro) Lite tool for needed charging infrastructure based on expected EV adoption, which is taken from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory 2030 projections.

5 Measure-Specific Activity Data

5.1 REEP Measure-Specific Activity Data

The activity data used for estimating GHG reductions for REEP includes:

- Quantity of basic enclosure upgrades installed
- Quantity of medium efficiency A/C installed
- Quantity of medium efficiency heat pumps installed
- Quantity of heat pump water heaters installed
- Quantity of induction ranges installed
- Quantity of heat pump dryers installed
- Quantity of LED replacements

5.2 SRP Measure-Specific Activity Data

The activity data used for estimating GHG reductions for SRP includes:

- Quantity of solar arrays installed
- Size of solar arrays installed (kW)
- Energy production of solar arrays (kWh)

5.3 EV-NICE Measure-Specific Activity Data

The activity data used for estimating GHG reductions for EV-NICE includes:

- Quantity of EVSEs installed
- Quantity of excess EV registrations
- Quantity of increased electric VMTs
- Calculation of increased grid emissions (metric tons CO2e)
- Calculation of reduced tailpipe emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6 GHG Emissions Reduced

REEP Measure Evaluation - Total	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2025-2030	2025-2050
Households Served:	836	2,509	2,509	1,673	836	8,365	8,365
Annual Bill Savings ($):	$ 376,635	$ 1,129,904	$ 1,129,904	$ 753,270	$ 376,635	$ 11,675,679	$ 87,002,642
Annual Emissions Reduction (tons CO2e):	550	1,602	1,602	1,076	550	16,665	124,257

Table 6.1 - GHG Emissions Reduced - REEP

SRP Measure Evaluation - Total	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2025-2030	2025-2050
Households Served:	778	2,334	2,334	1,556	778	7,782	7,782
Annual Bill Savings ($):	$ 1,456,049	$ 4,368,146	$ 4,368,146	$ 2,912,097	$ 1,456,049	$ 45,137,504	$ 336,347,206
Annual Emissions Reduction (tons CO2e):	1,882	5,645	5,645	3,763	1,882	58,332	434,670

Table 6.2 - GHG Emissions Reduced - SRP

EV-NICE Measure Evaluation - Total	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2025-2030	2025-2050
New EVSEs Installed:	80	241	241	160	80	802	802
New Vehicles Attributed to Program:	0	1,846	6,076	5,452	3,632	18,937	18,937
Annual Emissions Reduction (tons CO2):	6,671	28,815	48,162	58,868	61,616	204,132	768,975

Table 6.3 - GHG Emissions Reduced - EV-NICE