Factors that may be considered include: Reasonableness of the budget both in income and expenses; strength of commitment and amount of the proposer’s cost share, if any; effectiveness of management plans for control of budget; appropriateness of matching contributions; and plans for maintaining the program after the cooperative agreement has expired.

§ 291.3 Environmental tools and techniques projects.
(a) Eligibility criteria. Eligible applicants for these projects include all nonprofit organizations including universities, community colleges, state governments, state technology programs and independent nonprofit organizations. Organizations may submit multiple proposals under this category in each solicitation for unique projects.
(b) Project objective. The purpose of these projects is to support the initial development and implementation of tools or techniques which will aide manufacturing extension organizations in providing environmentally-related services to smaller manufacturers and which may also be of direct use by the smaller manufacturers themselves. Specific industry sectors to be addressed and sub-categories of tools and techniques may be specified in solicitations. These sectors or sub-categories will be specified in the solicitation announcement. Examples of tools and techniques include, but are not limited to, manufacturing assessment tools, environmental benchmarking tools, training delivery programs, electronically accessible environmental information resources, environmental demonstration facilities, software tools, etc. Projects must be completed within the scope of the effort proposed and should not require on-going federal support.
(c) Award period. Projects initiated under this category may be carried out over up to three years. Proposals selected for award will receive all funding from currently available funds. If an application is selected for funding, DOC has no obligation to provide any additional future funding in connection with that award. Renewal of an award to increase funding or extend the period of performance is at the total discretion of DOC.
(d) Matching requirements. No matching funds are required for these proposals. However, the presence of matching funds (cash and in-kind) will be considered in the evaluation under the Financial Plan criteria.
(e) Environmental tools and techniques projects evaluation criteria. Proposals from applicants will be evaluated and rated on the basis of the following criteria listed in descending order of importance:
(1) Demonstrated understanding of the environmentally-related technical assistance needs of manufacturers and technical assistance providers in the target population. Target population must be clearly defined. The proposal must demonstrate that it understands the population’s environmentally related tool or technique needs. The proposal should show that the efforts being proposed meet the needs identified. Factors that may be considered include: A clear definition of the target population, size and demographic distribution; demonstrated understanding of the target population’s environmental tools or techniques needs; and appropriateness of the size of the target population and the anticipated impact for the proposed expenditure.
(2) Technology and information sources. The proposal must delineate the sources of technology and/or information which will be used to create the tool or resource. Sources may include those internal to the center (including staff expertise) or from other organizations. Factors that may be considered include: Strength of core competency in the proposed area of activity; and demonstrated access to relevant technical or information sources external to the organization.
(3) Degree of integration with the manufacturing extension partnership. The proposal must demonstrate that the tool or resource will be integrated into and be of service to the NIST Manufacturing Extension Centers. Factors that may be considered include: Ability to access the tool or resource especially for MEP extension centers; methodology for disseminating or promoting use of the tool or technique especially within the MEP system; and
demonstrated interest in using the tool or technique especially by MEP extension centers.

(4) **Coordination with other relevant organizations.** Wherever possible the project should be coordinated with and leverage other organizations which are developing or have expertise on similar tools or techniques. If no such organizations exist, the proposal should show that this is the case. Applicants will need to describe how they will coordinate to allow for increased economies of scale and to avoid duplication. Factors that may be considered include: Demonstrated understanding of existing organizations and resources relevant to the proposed project; Adequate linkages and partnerships with existing organizations and clear definition of those organizations’ roles in the proposed activities; and that the proposed activity does not duplicate existing services or resources.

(5) **Program evaluation.** The applicant should specify plans for evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed tool or technique and for ensuring continuous improvement of the tool. Factors that may be considered include: Thoroughness of evaluation plans, including internal evaluation for management control, external evaluation for assessing outcomes of the activity, and “customer satisfaction” measures of performance.

(6) **Management experience and plans.** Applicants should specify plans for proper organization, staffing, and management of the implementation process. Factors that may be considered include: Appropriateness and authority of the governing or managing organization to conduct the proposed activities; qualifications of the project team and its leadership to conduct the proposed activity; soundness of any staffing plans, including recruitment, selection, training, and continuing professional development; and appropriateness of the organizational approach for carrying out the proposed activity.

(7) **Financial plan:** Applicants should show the relevance and cost effectiveness of the financial plan for meeting the objectives of the project; the firmness and level of the applicant’s total financial support for the project; and a plan to maintain the program after the cooperative agreement has expired. Factors that may be considerable include: Reasonableness of the budget, both in income and expenses; strength of commitment and amount of the proposer’s cost share, if any; effectiveness of management plans for control of budget appropriateness of matching contributions; and plan for maintaining the program after the cooperative agreement has expired.

§ 291.4 National industry-specific pollution prevention and environmental compliance resource centers.

(a) **Eligibility criteria.** Eligible applicants for these projects include all nonprofit organizations including universities, community colleges, state governments, state technology programs and independent nonprofit organizations. Only one proposal per organization is permitted in this category.

(b) **Project objective.** These centers will provide easy access to relevant, current, reliable and comprehensive information on pollution prevention opportunities, regulatory compliance and technologies and techniques for reducing pollution in the most competitive manner for a specific industry sector or industrial process. The sector or industrial process to be addressed will be specified in the solicitation. The center will enhance the ability of small businesses to implement risk based pollution prevention alternatives to increase competitiveness and reduce adverse environmental impacts. The center should use existing resources, information and expertise and will avoid duplication of existing efforts. The information provided by the center will create links between relevant EPA Pollution Prevention programs, EPA and other technical information, NIST manufacturing extension efforts, EPA regulation and guidance, and state requirements. The center will emphasize pollution prevention methods as the principal means to both comply with government regulations and enhance competitiveness.

(c) **Project goal.** To improve the environmental and competitive performance of smaller manufacturers by:

1. Enhancing the national capability to provide pollution prevention and