To: Egan, Robert[egan.robert@epa.gov]; Siler, Sandy[siler.sandra@epa.gov]; Hill, Kevin[hill.kevin@epa.gov]; Restaino, Mark[restaino.mark@epa.gov]
From: Kamke, Sherry
Sent: Mon 4/7/2014 6:14:52 PM
Subject: FW: FY14 Tribal RSO decisions
Tribal RSO FY14 LUST C decisions.xlsx
Tribal RSO FY14 LUST P decisions.xlsx

Please see the decision that HQ made regarding our funding requests. It shows that we will get one year of DITCA money that we requested and we will get all the money that we asked for cleanup (minus the funds that we will get from WI PECFA).

I'll look at this in more detail so that we can begin next steps. I just wanted you to see this as soon as I did. Thanks for your efforts on this.

Sherry

From: Hoskinson, Carolyn
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2014 11:52 AM
To: OUST Regional Program Managers
Cc: OUST Regional Liaisons; Barolo, Mark; Worley, Ray; DePont, Lynn; Lienesch, William; Barrows, Judy; Knighton, Erin; Hagan, Lela
Subject: FY14 Tribal RSO decisions

Many thanks to everyone for your patience and for all the information you have given OUST as we worked through these difficult funding decisions. The basic dilemma is that we just don't have enough money to do everything we think is important to do. I have attached the final decisions, and below have attempted to describe the factors we used in our decision-making (in case you're interested).

Of course if, within the amount we have approved for you, you wish to make modifications to how you award these funds, you may. Please, however, let us know how you allocated your funding so that we can be better informed for next year's decision-making.

If you have any questions or comments on this year's process or decisions, or suggestions

for next year's process, please let us know.

Please pass these decisions on to others in your region who were involved with this process.

- **Carolyn**

-

Basis for EPM decisions:

We approved everything you asked for, and we have $119,000 left. I would like to explore options for whether these funds might be used to improve our Tribal data management since many of you have mentioned how helpful that would be.

- Funding provided: Region 5 $25K (SEE), Region 7 $20K (SEE) possibly an additional $10K awaiting final $ request from R7, Region 8 $90 (SEE) & $50 (IAG with IHS), Region 9 $50 (IAG with Corps) & $11 (database), Region 10 $100K (IAG with IHS) & $10 (SEE).

Basis for LUST Prevention decisions:

Unfortunately we didn't have any other LUST Prevention funding available to add to our new year funds for this, so we only had the $1,587,000 in new year funding to spread out among everyone's needs.

Reduced demand for funds as much as possible by doing the following:

- Reducing Regional requests by the amount of expected recertifications of any LUST Prevention funding (including from states and territories).

- Any region who asked for more than 1-year of grant funding, we cut it back to 1 year.

- We then compared the funding level you requested to the number of facilities supported by the tribe or consortia you proposed to give a grant to. Some tribes had very few facilities, and with our needs outstripping our supply of funds, we cut in half from your request the funding for any grantee supporting 16 or fewer facilities. For the 2 grantees supporting 17 facilities each, we cut their funding in half from your request, then gave each back $4,500 which used up the remaining available funds. In the future, I strongly suggest that you consider not giving grants at all to grantees supporting so few facilities. Rather, I encourage you to explore the possibility of

consortia to improve efficiencies.

- Next year's president's Budget request for Tribal LUST prevention funds is $1,773,000 which is slightly higher than the $1,587,000 that we received this year. However, we do not know whether we will receive as much funding as we requested. It would not be unexpected if we receive less funding than we asked for. Therefore, it would be a good idea for us to start planning now for the possibility of having less money next year than we had this year. This will be a good discussion topic for our conversations about the future directions for our Tribal compliance and leak prevention work.

Basis for LUST Cleanup funding decisions:

Increased the supply of funds as much as possible by adding together:

- new year funds = $2,400,000, plus

- funds unused in the BERS contract $44,789, plus

- carryover $17,647, plus

- transferred some extramural funds from LUST non-Tribal (put a few projects on hold) = $90,000

For a total supply of funds of $2,552,436.

Reduced demand for funds as much as possible by doing the following:

- Reducing Regional requests by the amount of expected recertifications of LUST cleanup D86 funds (did not include recerts of D87 state grant funds due to 80% rule).

- Did not approve funding for any sites identified by the requesting region as less than "high priority."

- Offset Region 5's request by an anticipated approx. $70K they hope to receive from Wisconsin for the Boivin site.

- Reduced Region 8 and 9 by anything above $1M they requested (only logic here is that we just didn't have enough money), then

- Gave all regions an additional 8% across the board cut to make the numbers balance.

For a total of approved funding = $ 2,505,931

This leaves a small cushion of $46,504.73. We will need this cushion if, for example, a workplan for one of these cleanups comes in higher than the region's estimate, or other unforeseen circumstances.