

Compendium of Federal Funding Sources for State and Tribal Wetlands Programs

Volume I: National Sources

Released October 10, 2008

Compiled by
Glenn Barnes, UNC Environmental Finance Center
Katherine Antos, Environmental Protection Agency

Table of Contents

Federal Funding Matrix 4
Wetlands Program Development Grants..... 5
Clean Water State Revolving Fund Programs 7
Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program 10
Clean Water Act Section 319 Grants 14
Clean Water Act Section 106 Grants 17
National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grants 19
North American Wetlands Conservation Act U.S. Standard Grants Programs..... 22
North American Wetlands Conservation Act Small Grants Programs 26
Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program 29
Community-based Habitat Restoration Program Grant 31
Coastal Zone Management Program Administrative Grants..... 36
Coastal Zone Enhancement Program 39
Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program..... 42
Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program 45
Legacy Resource Management Program 47
Wetlands Reserve Program..... 50
Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program 52
Healthy Forests Reserve Program..... 54
Other Useful Resources 56

Federal Funding Matrix

Program	State Governments		Tribal Governments		Core Elements of State Wetlands Programs							Supporting Processes				
	Y/N	Y/N	Enforcement	Permitting	Regulation	Monitoring and Assessment			Restoration & Acquisition				Public-Private Partnerships	Coordination among State, Federal Agencies	Outreach and Education	Administration/O&M
						Policy Development	Monitoring/Assessment	Mapping	Land Acquisition	Other	Water Quality Standards					
Wetland Program Development Grants	Y	Y				***	***	***				***	***	**	**	
Clean Water State Revolving Fund	Y	Y					*	**	**			**	*	*	*	
Drinking Water State Revolving Fund	Y	Y						**	**			**				*
Clean Water Act Section 319 Grants	Y	Y	*				**							*	*	*
Clean Water Act Section 106 Grants	Y	Y	**	**		**	**	*	*			*	*	**	**	**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service																
National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program	Y	N - but can apply as cooperator with state agency							***	***		***	***			*
North American Wetlands Conservation Act - U.S. Standard Grants	Y	Y							***	***		***	***			
North American Wetlands Conservation Act - Small Grants	Y	Y							***	***		***	***			
Partners for Fish & Wildlife	N	Y														
NOAA																
Community-Based Habitat Restoration Program Grants	Y	Y				**	**	*	***	***		***	*	***	***	***
Coastal Zone Management Program	Y	N - but can apply for pass-through grants if coastal management programs hold competition	***	***		***	***	**	***	***	**	**	***	***	***	***
Coastal Zone Enhancement Program	Y	N - but can apply for pass-through grants if coastal management programs hold competition	**	**		***	***	**	***	***	**	**	***	***	***	***
Coastal Zone Nonpoint Pollution Program	Y	N - but can apply for pass-through grants if coastal management programs hold competition					*					*	***	***	***	***
Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program	Y	?						***	***		***	*	*	*	*	*
U.S. Department of Defense																
Legacy Resource Management Program	Y	Y							**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
U.S. Department of Agriculture																
Wetlands Reserve Program	N	Y							***	***		***	***			
Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	N	Y							**	**		**	**			
Healthy Forest Reserve Program	N	Y							**	**		**	**			
*** - Primary purpose of the grant. ** - Not primary purpose of the grant, but eligible activity that could be funded. * - Technically an eligible activity, but very rarely is funded. ** - Ineligible activity or use of grant funds.																

Wetlands Program Development Grants

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds, Wetlands Strategies and State Programs

Branch

Contact: Myra Price, 202-566-1225, price.myra@epa.gov

Website: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/grantguidelines/>

Overview

EPA Regions and Headquarters hold separate competitions to provide grants to state, tribal, and local governments, interstate associations, intertribal consortia, and nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations to develop or enhance programs that regulate, restore, protect, monitor and assess, and/or map wetland resources.

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: Exact deadlines vary by year and EPA Region. Regions and Headquarters release the Request for Proposals (RFP) between January and June, and applications are due 45 days later. Applicants should check with their Region or EPA Headquarters for the exact deadline.

Eligibility

State, tribal, and local governments can only apply for Wetland Program Development Grants (WPDGs) from EPA Regions. Nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations can only apply for WPDGs issued by EPA Headquarters. Interstate commissions and intertribal consortia are eligible for both types of WPDGs. Projects submitted to EPA Headquarters must be broad in scope and involve and/or otherwise benefit two or more states and/or tribes or be nationwide in scope. State wetlands programs are the most common recipient of Regional WPDGs.

Eligible projects include conducting or promoting: research coordination or acceleration; investigations; experiments; trainings; surveys; demonstrations; and studies of the causes, effects, extent, reduction, or elimination of water pollution. Demonstration projects must involve the use of a new or experimental technology or method, and the results must be disseminated. WPDGs cannot fund implementation projects such as conducting an existing task with traditional methods. WPDGS also cannot finance the purchase of land or easements, mapping for the sole purpose of locating wetlands, or implementation of individual mitigation projects, mitigation banks, or in-lieu-fee mitigation programs.

Match

Requirement: 25 percent of total project costs.

Type: Non-federal cash or in-kind contributions.

Application Format: Hard copy or electronically through www.grants.gov

Awards (Based on FY2003 – FY 2006 Data)

Total: 14.8 million to \$16.8 million per year; the last two years fund levels at \$16.8 million each year

Number: 66-128 projects funded a year; averaging 93 projects per year for all Regions and Headquarters

Range: \$4,000 to \$800,000 per project for all Regions and Headquarters (varies greatly by region)

Average: \$136,600

Median: \$102,770

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: From FY2003 – 2007, approximately 44% of applicants received Wetland Program Development Grants. This can vary greatly by region. The Wetland Program Development Grant program is one of the federal finance programs with the strongest link to state or tribal wetlands programs. The following table summarizes the average percentage of applicants that received funding and the percentage of requested funds that grant recipients received over the last five years.

Strategies: For each grant cycle, EPA often sets National and Regional funding priorities. For example, applicants in FY2007 received higher scores if their projects improved the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation, increased protection of vulnerable wetland types, or enhanced monitoring, assessment, and mapping efforts. Applicants should refer to the RFP and consult their Regions or Headquarters to determine current priorities.

Although Regions and Headquarters hold separate grant competitions, applications are subject to similar scoring criteria. In order of importance, the FY 2007 scoring criteria were:

- Extent and quality that project will yield and report environmental results;
- Quality of the work plan;
- Consistency with priorities. If applicable, this criteria is split evenly among national and Regional priorities;
- Technical qualifications and performance on previous federal grants if applicable; and
- Extent that project leverages partnerships and additional funding.

In addition, the likelihood of receiving a WPDG from EPA Headquarters increases as the scope and project area expand. Applicants should review the Regional or Headquarters RFP for more information on scoring criteria.

Clean Water State Revolving Fund Programs¹

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: Office of Wastewater Management, State Revolving Fund Branch

Contact: Stephanie Von Feck, 202-564-0609, vonfeck.stephanie@epa.gov

Website: <http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/index.htm>

Overview

EPA capitalizes financial assistance programs to improve water quality through publicly-owned wastewater and stormwater infrastructure and public or privately owned nonpoint source and estuary management projects, including wetland restoration, protection, and construction.

Timing

Frequency: Designated programs in states and Puerto Rico receive federal capitalization grants annually. Frequency of loans or grants from state varies by state.

Deadlines: Deadlines for submitting project applications to individual states and Puerto Rico vary by program.

Eligibility

All 50 states and Puerto Rico receive federal grants to capitalize revolving loan funds; the money is allocated by formula. Through Agency leads that are typically environmental, natural resource, or financial state agencies,² states offer zero to low-interest loans and credit enhancements to fund water quality improvement projects. Across the nation, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) loan interest rate averages 2.1 percent, compared to the average market rate of 4.3 percent.³ The guaranteed revenue stream to repay the loan can be separate from the financed project.

Projects must be eligible for CWSRF support under Clean Water Act Section 212, which applies to publicly-owned wastewater collection and treatment, stormwater, or municipal landfill projects; Section 319, which applies to publicly- or privately-owned projects that implement nonpoint source management programs and exceed permitted requirements; or Section 320, which applies more broadly to privately owned and regulated projects within National Estuary watersheds that are consistent with Comprehensive Conservation Management Plans.⁴ Historically these funds have supported upgrades at publicly-owned

¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Wastewater Management, Clean Water State Revolving Fund Branch (draft – unpublished), *The Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program: Tapping its Untapped Potential*. Prepared by Jordan Dorfman and Stephanie Von Feck. October 15, 2007 draft; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program: Tapping Its Untapped Potential*. Presented December 11 in Washington, D.C.; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water (1997), *Protecting Wetlands with the Clean Water State Revolving Fund*, EPA 832-F97-017, September; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Clean Water State Revolving Fund*, Accessed at <<http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/index.htm>>; and Von Feck, Stephanie, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007). Personal communication with Katherine Antos. December 19.

² See <http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/agency.pdf> for a complete list of contacts.

³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Clean Water State Revolving Fund*, Accessed at <<http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/index.htm>>.

⁴ The 28 National Estuary Programs each must develop a Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan that prioritizes activities, research, and funding for the estuary. It is a blueprint for future decisions that is based on a

treatment works (POTWs), but watershed protection and stormwater management, both of which can include wetlands restoration or protection, are also eligible under Sections 212, 319 and 320.⁵ Only capital costs are eligible, but they can include planting vegetation, cleanups, planning, the initial development and delivery of education programs, and monitoring during a start-up period not to exceed three years as long as these efforts are connected to capital projects. Only the portions of projects that remediate, mitigate, or prevent pollution are eligible.

Each year, 1.5 percent of federal CWSRF dollars are allocated to tribes for wastewater treatment. This money can fund wastewater treatment wetlands, but it is generally used for wastewater treatment plants. Tribal wetland programs are eligible to apply to states and Puerto Rico for additional assistance through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for wetland restoration, protection, or enhancement efforts. However, instances of such loans are uncommon. States that have issued loans to tribes include Arizona and Washington.

Match

Requirement: States and Puerto Rico must provide a 20 percent match to all federal grants they receive to establish and capitalize revolving loan funds. CWSRF does not require a match from individual projects.

Type: State matches to federal funds must be in cash.

Application Format

Varies by state

Awards

Total: From 1988 to 2007, CWSRF programs in 50 states and Puerto Rico have provided \$63 billion in assistance and issued 20,700 loans.⁶ Federal grants have steadily declined over the last five years from \$1.35 billion in FY 2003 to \$1.08 billion in FY 2007. In FY 2007, grants to individual states ranged from \$5.3 million (Wyoming) to \$118 million (New York), and averaged \$20.9 million.⁷

Number: Varies by state

Range: Varies by state

Median: Varies by state

Hints for Success

Probability of Success

States and Puerto Rico decide which projects receive loans based on their water quality priorities and credit risk standards. Consequently, the likelihood that particular types of applicants, including wetlands programs, receive financial support varies by state. The percentage of applicants that receive funding and the portion of requested funds that are awarded also vary significantly among programs.

Some notable examples of states that have used their CWSRF to support wetland restoration or protection include:

scientific characterization of the estuary and is developed and approved by a broad-based coalition of stakeholders. For more information on the National Estuary Programs, visit <http://www.epa.gov/nep/>.

⁵ Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment are eligible under Section 212 of the Clean Water Act if applicants can demonstrate that they are integral to the treatment process.

⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program: Tapping Its Untapped Potential*. Presented December 11 in Washington, D.C.

⁷ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *FY 2007 Clean Water State Revolving Fund Final Title VI Allotments*, 7 pp, April 4, Accessed at <<http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrfallots.pdf>>.

- New York - protection of watershed providing drinking water to New York City; repaid with city drinking water fees;
- Maryland - enhancement of existing wetlands to treat stormwater; repaid through stormwater utility;
- Ohio - low impact development to protect wetlands funded by private developer; wetland restoration to control nonpoint source pollution sponsored by wastewater treatment plants;
- California - The Nature Conservancy acquired land for watershed protection and restoration; repaid through TNC membership fees and donations; and
- Washington - county loan program for agricultural best management practices, including riparian restoration; repaid with municipal fees.

Strategies

Because states decide how they distribute their CWSRF loans, a wetlands program should first look at whether the particular state has financed wetland projects in the past. It should then approach the agency administering the SRF to determine how wetland projects fit among program priorities. If wetlands protection and restoration are not explicitly CWSRF priorities, wetlands program can discuss how such projects could help achieve water quality goals. The following strategies further increase the likelihood that wetland projects receive funding if they are consistent with CWSRF priorities.

In recent years, CWSRF has made an effort to report and increase the environmental benefits resulting from funded projects. It is actively conducting outreach to states and other EPA programs to make them aware of the full range of projects that are eligible for CWSRF loans in order to increase the program's environmental outcomes. Consequently, the likelihood that applicants receive financial assistance increases if they can clearly estimate their projects' environmental benefits and as the estimated benefits. Applications for wetlands protection and restoration will also be stronger if they directly manage stormwater (eg, green infrastructure), protect source water areas, or are located in a wellhead protection or surface water drainage areas.

CWSRF can support water quality trading programs that potentially provide another link to wetland programs. Specifically, states and tribes can fund projects that generate pollution abatement credits such as wetland restoration, and any revenue collected from these credits belongs to the project and can be used for loan repayments.

Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program⁸

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, Drinking Water Protection Division, Infrastructure Branch

Contact: Peter Shanaghan, 202-564-3848, shanaghan.peter@epa.gov; Howard Rubin, 202-564-2051, rubin.howarde@epa.gov

Website: <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/index.html>

Overview

Capitalizes state zero- or low-interest loan programs that protect drinking water by financing installation of water treatment and distribution systems, infrastructure improvements, and source water protection. Provides grants and loans for supporting state and facility knowledge infrastructure in the form of capacity development, operator certification, technical assistance, and source water protection.

Timing

Frequency: Designated programs in states and Puerto Rico are allocated federal capitalization grants annually.

Deadlines: State have up to 2 years to apply for grants dollars. Deadlines for submitting individual project applications vary by state program.

Eligibility

All 50 states and Puerto Rico receive federal grants to capitalize revolving loan funds. The money is allocated based on the states' and Puerto Rico's, proportional share of the most recent Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey, but with each recipient receiving at least one percent of funds available for allocation.⁹ In addition, the federal DWSRF program makes direct grants to territories, the District of Columbia, and tribes to protect drinking water supplies. A maximum of 1.5 percent of the total DWSRF appropriation is set aside as grants for tribes. This set-aside is distributed to EPA Regions based on the portion of tribal drinking water system needs reported in the Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and the annual Indian Health Service's Sanitation Deficiency System. Funded projects may be administered by either a tribe or the Indian Health Service.¹⁰

Through designated leads that are typically environmental, natural resource, or public health agencies,¹¹ states and Puerto Rico offer zero to market-rate loans or in some cases grants to public or privately-owned community water systems or nonprofit, non-community water systems to fund drinking water protection. Across the nation, the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) loan interest rate averaged 2.1

⁸ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Drinking Water State Revolving Fund*, accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/index.html>; and

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2000), *Fact Sheet: Using DWSRF Set-Aside Funds for Source Water Protection*, EPA 816-F-00-013, accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/index.html>.

⁹ EPA conducts the Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey every four years to determine and report to Congress the anticipated costs for local water utilities to maintain, upgrade, or install infrastructure to ensure the delivery of safe drinking water. Current allocations are based on the 2003 Needs Survey; the next Survey is in 2007 and will most likely released in 2009. For more information on the Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey, see <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/needssurvey/index.html>.

¹⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *DWSRF Tribal Set-Aside Program*, accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/allotments/tribes/index.html#background>;

¹¹ See <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/nims/dwagency2.pdf> for a complete list of contacts.

percent in 2006, compared to the average market rate by state of 4.2 percent.¹² The guaranteed revenue stream to repay the loan can be separate from the financed project.

State can set-aside up to 31% of their grant allocation for non-infrastructure efforts, such as capacity development, source water or wellhead protection, and even administration of the fund

Catagories of set-aside assistance look like this

Set-aside Category	% of Grant available	State Match required	Can authority be reserved?
Fund Administration and Technical Assistance	4%	No	Yes
Small System Technical Assistance	2%	No	Yes
State Program Management - Administer PWSS Program - Administer or Provide Technical Assistance - Develop and Implement State Capacity Development Strategy - Develop and Implement State Operator Certification Program	10%	1:1 Match	Yes
Local Assistance - Loan to acquire land for source water protection - loans for voluntary, incentive based source water protection - PWS Capacity Development - Assistance to Establish and Implement Wellhead protection programs	15% (with no more than 10% going to any single sub-category)	No	No

Match

¹² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Drinking Water SRF Program Information: National Summary*, p. 22, accessed at <<http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/nims/dwus06.pdf>>.

Requirement: Yes – states and Puerto Rico must provide a 20 percent match to the total federal grants they receive to establish and capitalize revolving loan funds. Additionally, a 1:1 match is required for State program management funds. DWSRF does not require a match from individual projects.

Type: Cash for loan fund. Cash, credit from PWSs grant overmatch from 1993 grant, or in-kind services for State Program Management funds (at least 50% of this State match must be cash)

Application Format

Application for loans varies by state

Awards (*Based on analysis of FY 2003 – FY 2007 grants*)

Total: \$837.5 - \$845.0 million appropriated per year. Individual capitalization grants have ranged from the minimum of one percent of allocated funds, or \$8.2 million in FY 2006 and 2007 (received by 22 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia in both years), to \$85.0 million in FY 2004 (California), and averaged \$15.5 million. The median grant was \$9.0 million. In addition to the state grants, between \$12.6 and \$12.7 million (or 1.5 percent of total funds, the maximum portion allowable under the Safe Drinking Water Act) has been set aside for tribes annually from FY 2003 – FY 2007.¹³

Number: Varies by state

Range: Varies by state

Median: Varies by state

Hints for Success

Probability of Success

States and Puerto Rico decide which projects receive loans based on their drinking water protection priorities. According to the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 which authorize DWSRF, ranking should depend on whether projects:

- Address the most serious human health risk;
- Are necessary to comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act; and
- Assist systems most in need on a per-household basis, according to state-determined affordability criteria.

15% of all loans are designated to go to systems with populations under 10,000.

Consequently, the likelihood that particular types of applicants, receive financial support varies by state. The percentage of applicants that receive funding and the portion of requested funds that are awarded also vary significantly among programs.

As mentioned above, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 limits the portion of allotments that states can spend on source water protection. Consequently, DWSRF primarily funds drinking water infrastructure, and opportunities to finance wetlands projects are limited. Any wetlands projects that are funded would have to be within source water or wellhead protection areas. States that have used their DWSRF funds to finance source water protection efforts include:

- Maine – made loans to local water utilities to purchase land for source water protection rather than install costly treatment facilities;
- Maryland and Virginia – established loan programs for voluntary source water protection measures. Helped municipalities develop local source water protection ordinances;

¹³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *DWSRF Annual Allotments by Fiscal Year*, accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/allotments/funding_dwsrf_allotments-2007.html>.

- North Carolina – financed wellhead protection education campaign and helped communities implement wellhead protection plans; and
- Pennsylvania – hired planner to administer source water protection grants; issued grants to local groups to develop and implement source water protection education programs.

Strategies

The purpose of DWSRF funds is to further the public health objectives of the Safe Drinking Water Act. Wetlands protection is one potential means to meeting those objectives, where appropriate. To utilize these funds, states and tribes will need to show a clear connection between preserving wetlands and protecting drinking water, the most obvious being source water and wellhead protection. These projects should work within, and ideally be a part of, existing source water protection and wellhead protection plans and should be a cost effective approach to improve drinking water treatment and quality. Because states decide the distribution of their DWSRF loans, a wetlands program should first approach the state agency administering the set-aside for source water protection, typically the public health agency, to determine how wetland projects fit among program priorities.¹⁴ Most likely, that agency, and not the wetlands program, will apply for the loans.

DWSRF cannot be used for routine operations and maintenance activities, so monitoring, assessment, and administering a regulatory program would be ineligible for funding.

¹⁴ See <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/nims/dwagency2.pdf> for a complete list of contacts.

Clean Water Act Section 319 Grants¹⁵

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds, Non-Point Source Control Branch

Contact: Andrea Matzke, 202-566-1150, matzke.andrea@epa.gov

Website: <http://www.epa.gov/OWOW/NPS/cwact.html>

Overview

Provides grants to states, territories, and tribes for technical and financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, demonstration projects, and monitoring to control nonpoint source water pollution.

Timing

Frequency: Distributed to states, territories, and tribes once per year

Deadlines: EPA typically announces its funding targets for the upcoming fiscal year in the spring. Deadlines for sub-grantees vary significantly by state, territory, or tribe. Applicants should check with their designated state nonpoint source coordinators for exact deadlines (see <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/stateNPScoord.pdf> for coordinator information).

Eligibility

Designated agencies of states, territories, and tribes with nonpoint source management programs approved by EPA Headquarters and Regions can receive Section 319 grants to implement their programs.^{16, 17} The programs identify and prioritize best management practices to control nonpoint source pollution in surface or ground water and the specific regulatory or nonregulatory methods (enforcement, technical or financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, demonstration projects, or monitoring specific nonpoint source projects) to implement these BMPs. States, tribes, and territories may then award subgrants or contracts to entities if the work plan is consistent with their nonpoint source management program.

To be eligible for Section 319 grants, EPA Regions must agree that projects are consistent with the appropriate nonpoint source management program and are not already required under NPDES permits. Only 10 percent of Section 319 grants can go toward administrative costs (ie, salaries, overhead, or indirect costs); however, the costs of implementing enforcement and regulatory activities, education, training, technical assistance, demonstration projects, and technology transfer are not subject to this limitation. Finally, states, territories, and tribes are ineligible for grants if they failed to make satisfactory progress on Section 319 projects in the previous year.

Match

Requirement: Yes - non-federal sources must cover 40 percent of total project costs in a particular state, territory, or tribal territory. Ground water quality projects require a 50 percent match, and Section 319 funds for ground water projects in a particular state cannot exceed \$150,000 in one year. Agencies typically require a 40 percent match from individual projects, but this project-level match may be negotiable in some states, territories, or tribes. Tribes that can prove financial hardship can get their match requirement lowered to 10 percent. Finally, tribes that combine their Section 319 funds into a

¹⁵ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Nonpoint Source Management Program – Clean Water Section 319*. Accessed at <<http://www.epa.gov/OWOW/NPS/cwact.html>>.

¹⁶ Tribes must meet the requirements for Treatment as a State to be eligible for Section 319 funds.

¹⁷ See <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/stateNPScoord.pdf> for a complete list of contacts.

Performance Partnership Grant, or PPG, can further reduce their match requirement to 5 percent of project costs.

Type: Cash or in-kind contributions

Application Format

Varies by state.

Awards

Total: EPA provides funding to eligible states, territories, and tribes on an annual basis. Fifty-six states and territories receive grants, but the number of tribal recipients varies by year.¹⁸ A formula developed by EPA and states determines federal fund allocation. After consistently increasing since its inception in 1987, Section 319 grants to all recipients totaled \$238.5 million in FY 2003, \$237 million in FY 2004, dropped 13 percent to \$207.3 million in FY 2005, and continued to decline to \$204.3 million in FY 2006 and \$199.3 million in FY 2007.¹⁹ During this five-year period, annual grants to individual states ranged from \$1.3 million to \$12.4 million. The average annual grant to a state was \$4.1 million, and the median grant was \$3.7 million.

In addition to the distributions to states and territories, tribes with Section 319 eligibility that have submitted approved work plans receive annual base funding of either \$30,000 or \$50,000, depending on their land area. Funds remaining after base allocation are eligible to tribes on a competitive basis. Tribes can request up to \$150,000 of federal funding plus match requirements.²⁰

Number: Number of individual projects varies by state, territory, and tribe.

Range: Amount of subgrant varies by state, territory, and tribe.

Median: Amount of subgrant varies by state, territory, and tribe.

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: Percentage of individual projects that receive funding and the percentage of their requests that are awarded vary by state, territory, or tribe. The likelihood that projects to protect, restore, monitor, or regulate wetlands also varies, depending on the priorities of a particular nonpoint source management program.

Strategies: States, territories, and tribes decide what projects to fund with their 319 grants as long as EPA Regions deem that these projects are eligible. Therefore, wetland programs interested in receiving 319 funds should first contact the agency administering the program. An EPA Region can act as a liaison if necessary. In general, however, EPA Regions typically defer to state priorities as long as the activities are eligible and are identified in the state's nonpoint source management program.

One goal of the Section 319 Grant Program is to improve water quality so that water bodies can be removed from the 303(d) list of impaired waters. Since it is generally easier to make measurable water quality improvements in water bodies with smaller drainage areas, the 319 Program tends to favor coordinated projects targeted to a specific watershed with an impaired water body. Therefore, interested wetland programs will likely be most successful if they can demonstrate that their projects will improve water quality in impaired waters. The ability to model water quality improvements resulting from

¹⁸ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Catalog of Federal Funding Sources for Watershed Protection*, accessed at < http://cfpub.epa.gov/fedfund/program.cfm?prog_num=44>.

¹⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Clean Water Act Section 319(h) Grant Funds History*, accessed at < <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/319hhistory.html>>.

²⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2008), *Section 319 Funds*, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds; Personal communication with Andrea Matzke, Nonpoint Source Control Branch, and Robert Brown, Policy, Communications, and Resource Management Staff, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, February 2008.

wetland activities can strengthen this demonstration. Wetlands projects are also more likely to receive funding if they are consistent with watershed plans that states or tribes have developed for waters on the 303(d) list.

Tribes that are eligible to receive Section 319 base grants are also eligible to receive 319 competitive funding. Competitive funding proposals must include implementation activities that are related to categories of NPS pollution that have been identified in the tribe's nonpoint source management program. If a tribe has identified wetland activities in their management program, they are encouraged to submit a workplan to implement wetland BMPs. The more thorough an applicant addresses the evaluation factors, the more likely the proposal will receive funding.²¹ Although 319 base funding may also be used to implement nonpoint source BMPs, including wetland BMPs, this allocation of funds is much less.

²¹ Personal communication with Andrea Matzke, Nonpoint Source Control Branch, and Robert Brown, Policy, Communications, and Resource Management Staff, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, February 2008.

Clean Water Act Section 106 Grants²²

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: Office of Water, Office of Wastewater Management, Planning, Information & Resource Management Staff

Contact: Office of Wastewater Management: Section 106 – Robyn Delehanty, 202-564-3880, delehanty.robyn@epa.gov; Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds: Monitoring Initiative - Joan Warren, 202-566-1215, warren.joan@epa.gov

Website: <http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/pollutioncontrol.htm>

Overview

Provides grants to states, territories, the District of Columbia, interstate agencies and tribes to establish and implement water pollution control programs. Grants can fund permitting, enforcement, monitoring, protection, training, and outreach efforts. In 2006, EPA revised the allocation process to allow additional funds to be allocated for priority needs.

Timing

Frequency: Annual or Bi-annual

Deadlines: State grants are generally awarded at the start of the state fiscal year. Tribal grants are awarded at the start of each federal fiscal year.

Eligibility

States, territories, the District of Columbia, interstate agencies and tribes and intertribal consortia that meet the requirements for Treatment as a State are eligible for grants. The primary purpose of Section 106 grants is to assist in administering programs for the prevention, reduction and elimination of water pollution. With EPA approval, states, interstate agencies and tribes decide how to utilize grant funds among activities that can include permitting, standard development, water quality monitoring, enforcement, compliance, advice and assistance to local agencies, and training.

EPA distributes Section 106 funds to state, territories, and interstate agencies based on a formula that includes the extent of pollution problems. EPA Regions receive regional tribal funding and then distribute Section 106 grants to eligible tribes.²³ Beginning in FY 2006, Congress appropriated an additional \$18.2 million of Section 106 funds annually for monitoring. Of this, \$9.8 million is for states and tribes to enhance state and tribal monitoring programs consistent with their monitoring strategies. Each state receives \$169,900, territories and the District of Columbia receive \$85,000 each, \$240,400 for interstate agencies and \$528,500 for tribes.²⁴

²² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Water Pollution Control Program Grants*, accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/pollutioncontrol.htm>; (note this is the webpage for the 106 grant program) The Guidelines for the Award of Section 106 Monitoring Initiative Grants *Federal Register* 73 (138) 41069-41076 can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/106-guidelines-monitor.htm>; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Clean Water Act Section 106 Tribal Water Pollution Control Grant Program*, accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/indian/cwa106.htm>.

²³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), *Final CWA Section 106 Tribal Grant Guidance: FY 2007 and Beyond*, accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/106tgg07-faq.htm>. See <http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/indian/106coord.htm> for a list of EPA Regional contacts.

²⁴ *Federal Register* 71(60): 15719-15720.

The remaining \$8.3 million is used for participation in statistically-valid surveys of water conditions (in rivers, streams, lakes, coastal waters and wetlands) at national and regional scales. States and tribes in the contiguous U.S. receive a set amount for each monitoring site within their jurisdiction. If designated agencies can conduct monitoring for less, the remaining funds must be used to implement monitoring programs. The national survey for wetlands is scheduled for 2011, and will be funded with FY 2010 Section 106 monitoring initiative funds.

Match

Requirement: States must match their FY 1971 state funding level. Tribes and intertribal consortia must provide 5 percent match.

Type: Non-federal cash or in-kind contributions.

Awards

All 50 states, 6 interstate agencies, 6 territories, and the District of Columbia 249 tribes, and 0 intertribal consortia receive Section 106 grants annually.

Probability of Success

The Section 106 Grant Program is not competitive among states; every state receives funds for water pollution control programs and to develop and implement monitoring programs. In addition, any state or tribe that provides a suitable work plan receives funds to monitor sites in their jurisdiction that are part of national water quality surveys.

Section 106 grants are not for wetlands exclusively; rather, states, tribes, or interstate agencies can fund pollution control and monitoring in coastal waters, lakes, streams, and rivers. State, tribes and interstate organizations may use Section 106 grant funds to administer and manage their clean water programs, including monitoring, developing standards, permitting, enforcement, training, and outreach. Some states are using these funds for wetlands activities including monitoring, developing NPS assessments and NPS management plans and demonstration projects. Wetlands programs should work with their state's Section 106 grant program to include wetlands in planning for the use of these funds.

Strategies

EPA is urging states to report environmental results from projects funded by Section 106 grants. The Agency also expects states and tribes to enter monitoring data into its data systems so that it can track progress under the Clean Water Act.

In working with states to develop annual Section 106 work plans, EPA Guidance encourages Regions to emphasize the following National Water Program priorities:

- Monitoring –States and tribes establish and maintain their water quality monitoring programs. Note that \$18.3 million in additional funding has been appropriated for a monitoring initiative;
- Water Quality Standards – EPA expects states to improve the timeliness and quality of its triennial reviews for water quality standards;
- Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) – EPA encourages states to assess waters and develop TMDLs within 8 – 13 years of identifying impairments;
- Permits, Enforcement, and Compliance – states should implement actions to effectively manage permit programs; and
- Source and Ground Water – EPA encourages states to use Section 106 grants to ensure water quality standards are in place and attained for each water body being used as a public water supply.

National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grants²⁵

Contact Information

Agency: Department of Interior

Office: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Contact: Chris Darnell, Division of Fish and Wildlife Management and Habitat Restoration, 703-358-2236, Chris_Darnell@fws.gov; Christy Kuczak, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program, 703-358-1748, Christy_Kuczak@fws.gov

Website: http://ecos.fws.gov/coastal_grants/viewContent.do?viewPage=home

Overview

Provides funds for acquisition, restoration, and enhancement of coastal wetlands in coastal States, territories, and Commonwealths in order to ensure the long-term conservation of coastal wetland ecosystems.

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: RFP is typically announced in February the year before award, and applications are due to the Regional Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Offices at the end of June. The Service typically announces awards in December or January.

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are State agencies designated by Governors of coastal States, territories, and Commonwealths that border the Atlantic Ocean, Pacific Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, or Great Lakes, with the exception of Louisiana, which has its own program under the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act of 1990. Eligible applicants are typically natural resource or fish and wildlife agencies. Tribal governments are not eligible applicants. However, eligible State agencies may choose to subgrant funds to tribes, NGOs, and/or other organizations.

Projects must directly fund the acquisition, restoration, or enhancement of coastal wetlands for long-term conservation of coastal wetland ecosystems. Eligible costs can include real estate appraisals of wetland property, but costs related to the administration of wetland restoration and protection programs or the development of tools to identify potential sites are ineligible. NCWCG also does not fund monitoring; research; planning as a primary focus; operations and maintenance; enforcement, except where necessary to support approved actions; construction or maintenance of recreational infrastructure; mitigation; construction of wetlands where they did not historically exist; projects in upper portions of watersheds without significant or direct benefits to coastal wetlands; or projects with less than 20 years of conservation benefits.

Match

Requirement: Yes – States and Puerto Rico must supply 50% non-Federal match unless the State has a dedicated fund for acquisition of coastal wetlands and open space, at which point match requirement decreases to 25% (most States have such a fund). This contribution must match the total Federal contribution, not just NCWCG contribution (e.g., if NCWCG contributes \$1 million and other Federal sources contribute \$3 million, non-Federal match is \$2 million for

²⁵ Sources: http://ecos.fws.gov/coastal_grants/viewContent.do?viewPage=home and links from this page; 50 CFR 84; and Darnell, Chris, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2007). Personal communication with Katherine Antos, November 9.

States without a land acquisition fund and \$1 million for States with a land acquisition fund). Territories and Commonwealths other than Puerto Rico have no match requirement.

Type: Non-Federal match may be cash or in-kind contributions. Cash may be from non-State agency sources, and the National Review Panel must deem in-kind contributions to be “reasonable and necessary for achieving overall project objectives.” However, to receive ranking points for “reduced federal share,” any match over the minimum must be cash.

Application Format

Hard copy sent to the Regional Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Office or electronic submission in pdf via Grants.gov.

Awards (*Based on analysis of FY 2003 – FY 2007 grants*)

Total: \$13-19 million awarded per year, depending on revenue from excise tax on fishing equipment and motorboat and small engine fuel. Has increased in recent years and is considered a reliable funding source.

Number: 16-25 projects funded per year

Range: \$75,000 (no specified minimum) - \$1 million (maximum grant amount)

Median: \$928,000

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: The National Review Committee ranks applications based on the ranking criteria in 50 CFR 84. They forward the list of recommended applications to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service to make the final determination for award. The highest ranked proposals tend to get funded with more certainty than those that are ranked lower. Since 2003, FWS has funded approximately 75 – 95% of proposals, depending on the number of proposals and availability of funds. The percent has increased in recent years due to greater excise tax revenue.

Strategies: FWS awards grants based on scoring criteria contained in 50 CFR 84, and the highest priority (most points) goes to projects that are:

- Consistent with the National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan;²⁶
- Beneficial to federally listed species and other Service trust species; and
- Located in maritime forests on coastal barrier islands.

FWS also gives points to projects that promote partnerships; prevent or reduce contamination; exceed the mandatory non-Federal match; support coastal watershed plans and conservation and recovery programs; and increase awareness of coastal wetlands. Certain criteria are considered tie-breakers in the event of identical scores, although tie-breakers are only necessary for projects on the cusp of being funded because all higher scoring projects are fully funded regardless of their final rank. Tie-breakers typically relate to the project’s urgency (i.e., protects wetlands from degradation caused by pending sale; represents unique and significant biodiversity) or cost-effectiveness. For a more detailed description of ranking criteria, see page 8 of <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr49264.pdf> and page 10 of http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/coastal_grants/web/pdf/1141.pdf/. This Rule is currently under revision, so ranking criteria and other program elements may change. FWS expects to complete this revision before issuing the FY 2011 RFP in February, 2010.

²⁶ The National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan, developed under Section 301 of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3921) and published in 1991, categorizes wetland types into declining, stable, and increasing. Projects featuring wetland types that are declining nationally must receive priority in the NCWCG scoring (CFR Part 84, p. 49265).

Under the current rule, the program primarily focuses on “on the ground” projects such as acquiring an interest in real property (fee title or easement) or the restoration, enhancement, or management of existing coastal wetlands. Restoration activities can include restoring wetlands hydrology, planting native vegetation, or removing exotic species. The program measures success in acres protected and/or restored.

Potential applicants should contact their FWS field or Regional office.

Other Notes

This grant program was established by the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act of 1990. It is funded by through excise taxes on fishing equipment and motorboat and small engine fuels. Coastal states receiving grants vary based on their priorities and their ability to fulfill match requirements.

North American Wetlands Conservation Act U.S. Standard Grants Programs²⁷

Contact Information

Agency: Department of Interior

Office: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Contact: David Buie, Division of Bird Habitat Conservation, 301-497-5870, david_buie@fws.gov; Bonnie Gaukler, Division of Bird Habitat Conservation, 703-358-2017, bonnie_j_gaukler@fws.gov

Website: <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/US/index.shtm>

Overview

Since 1990, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) Standard Grants Program has awarded grants to organizations for the long-term protection, restoration, enhancement and/or establishment of wetlands and associated uplands in the United States, Canada, and Mexico for the benefit of wetlands-associated migratory birds and wildlife.

Timing

Frequency: Twice per year

Deadlines: The annual submission dates are the first Friday in March and the last Friday in July. The North American Wetlands Conservation Council will review and recommend proposals for funding during their July and December meetings. The Migratory Bird Conservation Commission will make its final funding decision at its September and March meeting. In short, final approvals are typically made 6 – 9 months after the proposal deadline. Proposals that are not selected may be reviewed during the next grant cycle.

Eligibility²⁸

Any organization or individual is eligible to receive NAWCA grants, including state and tribal wetlands programs. The majority of tribal governments that receive funding are located in the Great Lakes and Pacific Northwest regions.

Eligible activities include the acquisition of land title, conservation easements and/or long-term leases and the associated acquisition costs, restoration or enhancement of wetlands and surrounding buffers that are migratory bird habitat and establishment of wetland habitat.

Grants may fund personnel, administrative costs, travel, supplies, and equipment directly related to the project. Stewardship, monitoring for compliance with easement and management requirements, evaluation, and planning costs are ineligible for NAWCA funds, although monitoring and evaluation costs can count as match if they directly contribute toward improved conservation practices. Any activities that are mitigation for permitted activities are also ineligible. The performance period for NAWCA Grants is two years.

Match

²⁷ Sources: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2008), *Division of Bird Habitat Conservation: U.S. Standard Grants*, Accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/US/index.shtm>>; Buie, David, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2008), personal communication with Katherine Antos, June 19.

²⁸ Source: North American Wetlands Conservation Council (2007), *North American Wetlands Conservation Act United States Standard Grant Proposal: 2008 Eligibility Criteria and Processes*, Accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/US/Overview.shtm>>.

Requirement: 1:1 match requirement

Type: Non-federal; cash or in-kind contributions; no more than 2 years old

Application Format

Bound hardcopy and email electronic version

Awards²⁹

Total: From FY2003 – 2007, averaged \$34.9 million annually. Standard Grants funding has increased recently from \$27.6 million in FY2005 to \$40.6 million in FY2006 and \$38.0 million in FY2007. Available dollars increased dramatically for U.S. Standard Grants in FY2008 to an all-time high of \$52.9 million because of a previous year's bump in funding sources, including treasury bond yields, above-average fines collected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and damages that were paid due to an oil spill. This increase created a surplus of funds that rolled over into subsequent years. However, funding levels are expected to return to approximately \$40 million per year.³⁰

Number: From FY2003 – 2007, averaged 38 grant awards per year

Range: From FY2003 – 2007, individual awards ranged from \$300,000 to \$1,000,000. Minimum grant award is \$75,001, and grants may only exceed \$1,000,000 if applicants justify the additional costs.

Mean and Median: From FY2003 – 2007, the mean grant award was \$915,400 and the median grant award was \$1,000,000.

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: Typically 65-75% of proposals are funded. In general, the Program is becoming more competitive. However, the one-time increase in available funds led to a temporary increase in the proportion of successful proposals. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service typically fully funds all selected proposals. The Service may rollover remaining dollars to the next grant cycle.

Strategies: Partners interested in applying for NAWCA Standard Grants should first contact their local Joint Venture Project Coordinator for assistance developing proposals, information on how proposals are ranked, and guidance on compliance requirements with the Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and National Historic Preservation Act.³¹ Input from Joint Venture Coordinators is critical. If a Coordinator is unfamiliar with a proposal, it will likely receive a low rank and not be funded.

Proposals are scored based on the following criteria:

- Contribution to conservation of waterfowl habitat (most points for priority species' habitat);
- Contribution to conservation of wetland-associated migratory birds (most points for priority species' habitat);

²⁹ Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2007), *Division of Bird Habitat Conservation: Standard Grants Projects by Date*, accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/US/ApprovProj.shtm>>.

³⁰ Congress has authorized up to \$85 million annual for NAWCA Grants, but the Program has never been fully funded. If it were, available dollars for the NAWCA Standard and Small Grants would likely total \$100 million when combined with US Treasury Bond proceeds and fines.

³¹ Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2008), *Division of Bird Habitat Conservation: How do I prepare a 2008 proposal?*, accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/US/Overview.shtm>>. See <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/JointVentures/Directory.shtm> for a complete list of Joint Venture Project Coordinators throughout the U.S and <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/JointVentures/Map.shtm> for a map of Joint Venture locations.

- Overlap with priority wetlands identified by the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Partners in Flight, U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan, or the North American Waterbird Conservation Plan (most points for national priority areas; fewer points for regional priorities);
- National status and trend of wetland type addressed in proposal (most points for conservation of declining wetlands types);
- Contribution to long-term conservation of wetlands and associated habitat (points for proposals that will yield benefits in perpetuity);
- Contribution to the conservation of wetlands habitat associated with federally listed endangered species, species proposed for federal listing, or state-listed species (most points for federally-listed species; points increase with number of listed species); and
- Extent of partnerships, particularly among public and private entities (increases with ratio of match:grant).³²

Proposals are more likely to receive funding as their cost effectiveness (acres acquired or restored per grant dollar) increases. Therefore, projects with large acreages or in proximity to other protected lands will score higher, as do projects that minimize the ancillary use of funds (eg, compliance monitoring) and focus grant dollars on direct, on-the-ground restoration and protection efforts. Reviewers may also assign more points to multi-faceted proposals that involve many or diverse partners or will yield ancillary benefits such as water quality improvements, flood storage, carbon sequestration, or restoration of threatened wetland types. Many applicants generally describe the multiple benefits of wetlands restoration and protection, but few quantify these benefits. Therefore, proposals might receive more attention if they substantiate these outcomes. However, applicants should keep in mind that the primary purpose of the grants program is to protect migratory bird habitat and only include these additional details if they are readily available. Finally, reviewers tend to score well-written proposals higher, in part because it indicates that applicants might be better prepared to administer the grants. Therefore, states and tribes should carefully edit and check any figures for consistency.

As mentioned above, large conservation organizations tend to be the primary recipients of Standard Grants. However, many of these organizations partner with state agencies. These partnerships save state agencies the time and labor associated with writing proposals and administering grants while still allowing them to get their priorities implemented. Therefore, one strategy for state or tribal wetlands programs interested in leveraging NAWCA resources is to approach conservation organizations that have received grants in the past and share their restoration goals.

A final strategy for state and tribal agencies interested in accessing NAWCA grants is to develop a wetlands conservation plan that identifies needs and targets restoration efforts. The existence of such a plan increases the likelihood that wetlands programs receive funding for priority projects through grants that they apply for directly or in partnership with other organizations.

Other Notes

The NAWCA Grant Programs resulted from the North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989. Grants are divided into two categories, Standard and Small, and standard grants are disbursed to three countries, the United States, Canada, and Mexico. This section describes *only* the standard grants awarded to the United States.

³² More information on priority species, priority wetland areas, and other evaluation criteria is available at North American Wetlands Conservation Council (2007), *North American Wetlands Conservation Act United States Standard Grant: 2008 Proposal Instructions*, accessed at <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/US/Overview.shtm>.

Standard grants undergo multiple rounds of review. First, individual countries preliminarily review standard grants. In the U.S., the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Bird Habitat Conservation, Joint Ventures Coordinators, and North American Wetlands Conservation Council staff conduct this preliminary review over the course of two meetings and forward eligible proposals to the 11-member North American Wetlands Conservation Council for additional review and ranking. The Council then recommends a subset of projects for review by the 7-member Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, which makes final funding decisions. Division of Bird Habitat Conservation staff administer grants for approved projects.

North American Wetlands Conservation Act Small Grants Programs³³

Contact Information

Agency: Department of Interior

Office: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Contact: Ken Kriese, Division of Bird Habitat Conservation, 703-358-1888, ken_kriese@fws.gov; Rodecia Mcknight, Division of Bird Habitat Conservation, 703-358-2266, rodecia_mcknight@fws.gov

Website: <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Small/index.shtm>

Overview

Since 1996, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) Small Grants Program has awarded grants to organizations for the long-term protection, restoration, and/or enhancement of wetlands and associated uplands in the United States for the benefit of wetlands-associated migratory birds and wildlife. The Small Grants Program is identical to the Standard Grants Program, except that it only covers the United States and is for grants up to \$75,000.

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: The proposal deadline for the FY 2009 grant cycle is November 28. The North American Wetlands Conservation Council typically makes award decisions at its March meeting, approximately 4 months after the proposal deadline.

Eligibility³⁴

Any organization or individual is eligible to receive NAWCA grants, including state and tribal wetlands programs. The majority of tribal governments that receive funding are located in the Great Lakes and Pacific Northwest regions.

Eligible activities include the acquisition of land title, conservation easements and/or long-term leases and the associated acquisition costs, restoration or enhancement of wetlands and surrounding buffers that are migratory bird habitat and establishment of wetland habitat.

Grants may fund personnel, administrative costs, travel, supplies, and equipment directly related to the project. Stewardship, monitoring for compliance with easement and management requirements, evaluation, and planning costs are ineligible for NAWCA funds, although monitoring and evaluation costs can count as match if they directly contribute to improved conservation practices. Any activities that are mitigation for permitted activities are also ineligible. The performance period for NAWCA Grants is two years.

Match

Requirement: 1:1 match requirement

Type: Non-federal; cash or in-kind contributions; no more than 2 years old

³³ Sources: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2008), *Division of Bird Habitat Conservation: Small Grants*, Accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Small/index.shtm>>; Buie, David, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2008), personal communication with Katherine Antos, June 19.

³⁴ Source: North American Wetlands Conservation Council (2008), *North American Wetlands Conservation Act Small Grants Program: Proposal Application Instructions*, accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Small/Overview.shtm>>.

Application Format

Electronically (pdf) or hardcopy

Awards³⁵

Total: Annual awards for the NAWCA Small Grants totaled on average \$1.8 million from FY2003 – 2006 before peaking at \$3.2 million in FY2007. Because funds can be transferred from the Standard Grants Program to the Small Grants Program, the same bump in funding for the Standard Grants caused by above-average Treasury bond yields, Migratory Bird Treaty Act fines, and oil spill damages led to the all-time high funding levels in FY2007. Also like the Standard Grants, funding is expected to return to normal levels of approximately \$2 million per year.

Number: From FY2003 – 2007, averaged 44 grant awards per year

Range: From FY2003 – 2007, individual awards ranged from \$4,500 to \$75,000. Grants may range from \$0 - \$75,000; larger grant proposals must apply for NAWCA Standard Grants.

Mean and Median: From FY2003 – 2007, mean grant award was \$48,979 and the median grant award was \$50,000.

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: Typically 65-75% of proposals are funded. In general, the Program is becoming more competitive. However, the one-time increase in available funds led to a temporary increase in the proportion of successful proposals. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service typically fully funds all selected proposals. The Service may rollover remaining dollars to the next grant cycle.

Strategies: NAWCA Small Grants are selected using the same criteria as the Standard Grants Program. The only differences are: a) projects tend to be smaller since grants are capped at \$75,000; and b) the Small Grants Program prioritizes applicants and partners new to the NAWCA Grants Programs.

As with the Standard Grants Program, states and tribes interested in applying for NAWCA Small Grants should first contact their local Joint Venture Project Coordinator for assistance developing proposals, information on how proposals are ranked, and guidance on compliance requirements with the Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and National Historic Preservation Act.³⁶

Proposals are evaluated based on:

- Whether proposal engages partners that have not previously participated in NAWCA projects;
- Benefits to waterfowl species (more points if benefits high priority species);
- Benefits to nongame migratory birds, particularly those listed in the RFP and Partners in Flight, U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan, North American Waterbird Conservation Plan, or the Joint Venture plans;
- Benefits to federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species; and
- Type of wetland addressed in proposal.³⁷

³⁵ Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2007), *Division of Bird Habitat Conservation: Small Grants Projects by Date*, accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Small/ApprovProj.shtm>>.

³⁶ Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2008), *Division of Bird Habitat Conservation: Proposal Application Overview*, accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Small/Overview.shtm>>. See <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/JointVentures/Directory.shtm> for a complete list of Joint Venture Project Coordinators throughout the U.S and <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/JointVentures/Map.shtm> for a map of Joint Venture locations.

³⁷ More information on priority species, priority wetland areas, and other evaluation criteria is available at North American Wetlands Conservation Council (2008), *North American Wetlands Conservation Act Small Grants Program: Proposal Application Instructions*, accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Small/Overview.shtm>>.

Proposals are more likely to receive funding as their cost effectiveness (acres acquired or restored per grant dollar) increases. Therefore, projects with large acreages or in proximity to other protected lands will score higher, as do projects that minimize the ancillary use of funds (eg, compliance monitoring) and focus grant dollars on direct, on-the-ground restoration and protection efforts. Reviewers may also assign more points to multi-faceted proposals that involve many or diverse partners or that will yield ancillary benefits such as water quality improvements, flood storage, carbon sequestration, or restoration of threatened wetland types. Many applicants generally describe the multiple benefits of wetlands restoration and protection, but few quantify these benefits. Therefore, proposals might receive more attention if they substantiate these outcomes. However, applicants should keep in mind that the primary purpose of the grants program is to protect migratory bird habitat and only include these additional details if they are readily available. Finally, reviewers tend to score well-written proposals higher, in part because it indicates that applicants might be better prepared to administer the grants. Therefore, states and tribes should carefully edit and check any figures for consistency.

Although a greater portion of Small Grants go to states and tribes than under the Standard Grants Program, wetlands programs should still consider partnering with other organizations on Small Grants projects in order to save time and effort. Also similar to the Standard Grants program, wetlands programs become more likely to receive Small Grants either alone or in partnership with other organizations if they have a wetlands conservation plan that identifies needs and targets restoration efforts.

Other Notes

The NAWCA Grant Programs resulted from the North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989. Grants are divided into two categories, Standard and Small. This section describes *only* the Small Grants, which are awarded exclusively in the United States.

Small Grants undergo two rounds of review. First, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Bird Habitat Conservation, Joint Ventures Coordinators, and North American Wetlands Conservation Council staff conduct a preliminary review and forward eligible proposals to the 9-member North American Wetlands Conservation Council. The Council then reviews and makes final award decisions. The Migratory Bird Conservation Commission delegated the authority to make final approvals for Small Grants to the Council and is not involved in the review process. Division of Bird Habitat Conservation staff administer grants for approved projects.

Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program

*****Please note that only tribal programs are eligible to apply for this program*****

Contact Information

Agency: Department of the Interior

Office: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Contact: The Partners coordinator for your state:

<http://www.fws.gov/partners/contactUs.html>

Website: <http://www.fws.gov/partners/index.html>

Overview

The Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program is a diversified habitat restoration program assisting thousands of private landowners across the Nation. The Partners Program provides technical and financial assistance to private landowners and Tribes who are willing to work with us and other partners on a voluntary basis to help meet the habitat needs of our Federal Trust Species. Locally-based field biologists work one-on-one with private landowners and other partners to plan, implement, and monitor their projects. Partners Program field staff help landowners find other sources of funding and help them through the permitting process, as necessary.

This program funds restoration work only on a one-time basis. This program does not fund the ongoing maintenance of the lands restored.

Timing

Frequency: Ongoing until funding runs out

Deadlines: n/a

Eligibility

The program is limited to “private landowners,” which is defined as land not owned by the state or federal government. Tribes are eligible for the program, but states are not.

National priority ranking factors for the Partners Program are used to assign funding priority status to proposed projects that meet these conditions:

- Improve habitat for Federal Trust Species, including migratory birds; threatened and endangered species; inter-jurisdictional fish; marine mammals; and, other declining species.
- Complement activities on National Wildlife Refuge System lands, or contribute to the resolution of problems on refuges that are caused by off-refuge practices.
- Address species and habitat priorities that have been identified through Service planning teams (with our partners), or in collaboration with state fish and wildlife agencies.
- Reduce habitat fragmentation or serve as buffers for other important Federal or state conservation lands.
- Result in self-sustaining systems that are not dependent on artificial structures.

Match

Requirement: None required

Type: n/a

Application Format

Applications begin by contacting the state office for the Fish and Wildlife Service. To find your local office, please visit this page:

<http://www.fws.gov/partners/contactUs.html>

A representative from the state office will conduct an on-site assessment to determine whether the project is eligible for funding. If the project is eligible, the tribe or landowner will continue the application process through the state office. Grants are awarded on a revolving basis until the annual appropriation of funds runs out.

Awards: Varies by state

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: In the past, the federal funding for this program has varied greatly from year to year. In 2006, Congress approved the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Act which has provided more stable funding. The probability for an award varies greatly state to state.

Strategies: The most important strategy for the Partners program is to work closely with the state offices. Regardless of whether a tribe or landowner receives an award, the program can provide technical assistance to the wetlands program. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and stakeholders also set state and local priorities and geographic focus areas. Therefore, interested tribes should contact their appropriate Regional or State Coordinator for more information on how their project aligns with state and local goals.³⁸

In addition to protecting and restoring habitat for Federal Trust Species, the Partners program strives to increase public understanding and participation in conservation. Therefore, if projects equally contribute to national, state, and local goals, they are further prioritized based on whether they link habitat on private and public lands; duration of the cooperative agreement; number of partners; and cost-effectiveness.³⁹

Other: The Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program represents a potential partnership opportunity for state wetlands programs. While state agencies cannot receive technical or financial assistance from the program, they can work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to target restoration activities.

³⁸ For information on Partners for Fish and Wildlife activities in each state and contact information, see <<http://www.fws.gov/partners/contactUs.html>>.

³⁹ Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2008), *Partners for Fish and Wildlife*, accessed at <<http://www.fws.gov/partners/index.html>>.

Community-based Habitat Restoration Program Grant⁴⁰

Contact Information

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

Office: National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Habitat Conservation, Community-based Restoration Program

Contact: Cathy Bozek, 301-713- 0174, Cathy.Bozek@noaa.gov; Robin Bruckner, 301-713-0174, Robin.Bruckner@noaa.gov

Website: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/projects_programs/crp/partners_funding/callforprojects.html Federal Funding Opportunity announcements for this solicitation and other solicitations run through the NOAA Restoration Center, including the Open Rivers Initiative, Marine Debris Program, and Community-based Habitat Restoration Partnerships, can be found on www.grants.gov

Overview

Provides funding and technical assistance through cooperative agreements for grassroots habitat restoration projects that benefit living marine and coastal resources and provide educational and social opportunities for local communities.

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: Typically announced in June, applications due end of September, and awards announced in early February; see announcement for exact dates.⁴¹

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are: colleges and universities; hospitals; other non-profit organizations; for-profit organizations; organizations under the jurisdiction of foreign governments; international organizations; and state, local and tribal governments.⁴² Eligible projects must involve restoration of habitat to benefit living marine and coastal resources, including diadromous fish species. Restoration sites include, but are not limited to, marshes, coastal habitat, and areas that NOAA identifies as essential fish habitat (EFH). Projects in areas where NOAA species recovery plans are underway must be consistent with recovery plans. Application packages must include documentation of support from private landowners or public land managers of affected property to ensure that the project will be maintained for its intended purpose. Projects must have clear goals and measurable objectives. Applicants must also incorporate timely monitoring procedures involving at least one structural and one functional parameter to document progress.⁴³ Applicants may also receive funding for monitoring of previous Community-based Habitat

⁴⁰ Sources: NOAA Fisheries (2007), *NOAA Community-based Restoration Program Project Grants*, accessed at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/projects_programs/crp/partners_funding/callforprojects.html>; NOAA Fisheries (2007), *Announcement of Federal Funding Opportunity*, accessed at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/projects_programs/crp/partners_funding/final%20FY08%20CRP%20FFO%20match%20change%206-25-07.pdf>; Bozek, Cathy and Melanie Gange, National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration (2008). Personal communication with Katherine Antos. June 19.

⁴¹ There is currently no solicitation for FY 09 due to budget constraints. If funds allow, a solicitation will be announced in December 2008.

⁴² State, local, and tribal governments must receive clearance from their state or tribal Single Point of Contact (SPOC), as required by Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs."

⁴³ Additional information on monitoring requirements is available at <www.habitat.noaa.gov/restoration/rmp> or <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/projects_programs/crp/>. Applicants may also consult with Community-based Restoration Program staff.

Restoration Projects that go beyond existing monitoring requirements. Applicants should plan to complete restoration and monitoring activities within 24 months of the date that funding is awarded.

Monitoring that does not involve Community-based Habitat Restoration Projects is ineligible for funding. Projects that are required mitigation, restoration for natural resource damages, or otherwise required by consent decree, court order, statute, or regulation are also ineligible for funding.

Match

Requirement: 1:1. Community-based Restoration Program (CRP) does not disqualify projects with lesser matches, but will score them lower. As a result, proposals with less than 1:1 match are less likely to receive funding.

Type: Cash or in-kind services from non-federal sources

Application Format: Federal forms and PDF narratives are submitted electronically through www.Grants.gov

Annual Awards (Based on FY2003 – 2007 Data)⁴⁴

Total: Annual awards have declined over last 5 years from \$2.3 million in FY2003 to \$710,000 in FY2007, averaging \$1.4 million. The decline is primarily due to added priorities and lack of funding for the program, though it is important to note that CRP continues to provide funding for coastal habitat restoration through the Community-Based Restoration Partnerships Program (see discussion in “Other” section).

Number: 16

Range: Stated minimum and maximum awards are \$30,000 and \$250,000, respectively, but over this period grants ranged from \$19,000 - \$260,000

Average: \$88,900

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: The Community-based Habitat Restoration Program has become more competitive in recent years because the restoration field growing, the program is becoming better known, restoration costs are increasing as practices become more technological, and Program funds are decreasing. Approximately 20% of proposals typically receive funding from the Community-based Habitat Restoration Program; the Community-Based Habitat Restoration Partnerships Program described in the “Other” section tends to fund a higher percentage of proposals through subawards.

The Community-based Habitat Restoration Program offers partial funding for project proposals. In a typical year, only the top 2 or 3 proposals may get full funding, and the Program will partially fund some additional projects. The Program works with regional NOAA staff and grantees to ensure that projects are still viable with partial funding.

Any type of habitat for marine or coastal species is eligible; this can include coral reefs, seagrass beds, or riparian habitat used by diadromous fish, as well as coastal wetlands. However, the majority of Community-based Habitat Restoration Projects involve coastal wetlands, saltwater marshes, and oyster beds. In recent years, an increasing number of riparian restoration projects have received awards in order to aid the recovery of salmon and other diadromous fish species. It is important to note that freshwater

⁴⁴ FY2003 and 2007 data: Bozek, Cathy, National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration (2008), written communication with Katherine Antos, June 19; FY2004 – 2006 data: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Announcement of Federal Funding Opportunity*, National Marine Fisheries Service, accessed at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/projects_programs/crp/partners_funding/final%20FY08%20CRP%20FFO%20match%20change%206-25-07.pdf>.

projects are only eligible for funding if they directly affect the life-cycle of marine species (eg, diadromous fish).

Less than 50% of grant recipients are state or tribal agencies. Any state or tribal agency is eligible to apply for grants, although the most common government partners have been conservation districts and state or county departments of natural resources, conservation, and environmental protection. The largest recipient group for the Community-based Habitat Restoration grants are nonprofit organizations. Program staff note that many nonprofit organizations receiving grants partner with state agencies, and they encourage states to use these partnerships as another way to leverage Community-based Habitat Restoration funds for their program goals.

Strategies: The Community-based Restoration Program is willing to play an active role in helping interested agencies to identify and apply for grants. Therefore, the first step that a wetlands program should take is to contact the Headquarters Program office (see contact information listed in this profile) or Regional Restoration Centers.⁴⁵ These staff can provide advice on:

- Available funding opportunities;
- Priorities and competitiveness of funding programs;
- The structure and content of proposals; and
- Compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.⁴⁶

Furthermore, Community-based Habitat Restoration Grants are cooperative agreements, meaning that CRP plays an active role implementing, monitoring, and publicizing grant projects. Therefore, recipients are encouraged to contact CRP for technical assistance.

After conversations with CRP staff, wetlands programs choosing to apply for Community-based Habitat Restoration grants should familiarize themselves with the selection process. Reviewers assign proposals up to 100 points based on the following criteria:⁴⁷

- **Technical/Scientific Merit (up to 30 points):**
 - Assurance that project meets all applicable federal, state, tribal, or local environmental laws and will expeditiously obtain any necessary permits. Projects that already have environmental assessments or necessary permits score higher;
 - Proposal includes realistic implementation plan that can be completed within 24 months of project award and yield monitoring data;
 - Technically feasible from biological and engineering perspectives. Uses appropriate and proven methods to achieve desired results on both an ecological and community stewardship level;
 - Effective mechanism to evaluate success (monitoring protocol); and
 - Project sustainability and likelihood of providing long-term benefits, including assurance of landowner or manager support, choice of self-sustaining restoration techniques, adequacy of long-term maintenance plan. Scores higher if addresses causes of habitat loss or degradation;
- **Proposal Importance and Applicability (up to 20 points):**

⁴⁵ For Regional Restoration Center contacts, see <<http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/contact.html>>.

⁴⁶ Applicants should be aware that grants from federal agencies other than EPA tend to have additional NEPA and ESA requirements.

⁴⁷ Based upon evaluation criteria provided in NOAA Fisheries (2007), *Announcement of Federal Funding Opportunity*, accessed at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/projects_programs/crp/partners_funding/final%20FY08%20CRP%20FFO%20match%20change%206-25-07.pdf>. See most recent announcement for current criteria.

- Potential to restore, protect, conserve, or enhance ecosystems vital to sustaining living marine and coastal resources. More points if benefits multiples species or protects significant resources such as essential fish habitat;
- Likelihood of leading to long-term ecological or socio-economic benefits;
- Ability to identify evaluation parameters and targets, and likelihood that project will lead to measurable environmental results;
- Addresses priority habitat, as evidenced by reference in watershed assessment, restoration plan, stewardship plan, or other public planning document; and
- For projects that monitor previously-funded CRP projects: potential to comprehensively evaluate restoration success;
- **Project Costs (up to 20 points):**
 - Project cost-effectiveness and cost: benefit ratio;
 - Ratio of funds for direct implementation and monitoring compared to general program support and overhead;
 - Realistic budget proposal. Justification for purchase of equipment greater than \$5,000 (in general, equipment purchases are a low funding priority).
 - Demonstrated funding need and that NOAA support is critical; and
 - Documentation of acceptable match; higher score for cash match. Projects with less than 1:1 match are eligible but are scored lower and thus less likely to receive grants;
- **Outreach, Education, and Community Involvement (up to 20 points):**
 - Broadens citizen participation in restoration and/or monitoring, leading to long-term stewardship and heightened conservation ethic;
 - Plan for public outreach and information dissemination of project goals, partnerships, results, and funding, and likelihood that outreach will lead to further restoration or protection;
 - Depth and breadth of community support, as measured by diversity, strength, and contributions (cash or in-kind services) of project partners; and
 - Letters of support and commitment; and
- **Applicant Qualifications (up to 10 points):**
 - Applicant's ability to conduct scope and scale of work as demonstrated by past experience, education, and training; and
 - Level of support from administrative resources and facilities to manage project.

Applicants may receive funding for planning or design of restoration efforts, and their chances of receiving grants for these efforts increase if they provide enough information for reviewers to estimate the likelihood of project success. Land acquisition and conservation easements are eligible expenses, but a low priority, and an award for this project type has not been made in recent years. As specified above, priority is given to on-the-ground restoration efforts and proposals involving planning or acquisition are less likely to receive funding. Applicants may count acquisition/easement costs as match if the action occurs within the award period.

Reviewers use evaluation scores to rank projects. However, the agency can fund projects out of their ranked order based on:

- Availability of funds;
- Balance or distribution of funds by geography, type of institutions, type of partners, or project type;
- Duplication with other projects funded by NOAA or other federal agencies;
- Applicant's prior award performance;
- Partnerships or participation of targeted groups; and
- Adequacy of information necessary for NOAA staff to make a NEPA determination.

States and tribes should also be aware that the Community-based Restoration Program places a significant emphasis on the “community-based” and “partnership” aspects of the Program. If all else is equal, reviewers will award grants to projects that establish partnerships and meaningfully involve members of the community. If an agency submits an otherwise strong application but proposes to work alone, it is less likely to receive funding.

Reviewers will give some consideration to the ancillary benefits of proposed projects such as water quality improvement or protection from storm surges. However, the primary purpose of this grant program is to restore habitat for NOAA trust resources, so applicants should concentrate on explaining the proposed project’s benefits to the habitat and resources within their proposal.

Other

Funds are awarded through cooperative agreements rather than grants because NOAA Fisheries is substantially involved in aspects of projects including, as applicable: technical or permitting assistance; development of monitoring protocol; tracking restoration progress through site visits or progress report evaluation; or involvement in public meetings or outreach efforts.

The Community-based Restoration Program offers other grant programs in addition to the Community-based Habitat Restoration Program. First, the Community-based Restoration Partnerships Program provides large umbrella grants to national or regional organizations every three years to restore habitat across a larger geographic scale typically involving multiple states. Partnerships are often established with nonprofit organizations, such as the Association of National Estuary Programs, and these grantees then issue sub-awards for smaller-scale restoration efforts. In FY2007, NOAA awarded 17 grants totaling \$8.8 million to the Program. These awards ranged from \$100,000 to \$1.9 million and averaged \$516,800.⁴⁸ State and tribal grantees are encouraged to visit the Community-Based Restoration Partnerships website or contact Program staff for information on sub-grants that they might be eligible to receive from Partnership grantees.⁴⁹ Staff are also willing to advise potential grantees on what sub-grant programs best suit their program needs and goals. Second, CRP began offering Community-based Marine Debris, Prevention and Removal grants in 2006. State and tribal agencies can receive these grants to restore wetland areas, and the Program has funded some wetlands projects to date.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Bozek, Cathy, National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration (2008), written communication with Katherine Antos, June 19

⁴⁹ For more information on Community-Based Restoration Partnership recipients and sub-grant opportunities, see http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/funding_opportunities/funding.html.

⁵⁰ For more information, see http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/restoration/projects_programs/crp/partners_funding/callforprojects2.html.

Coastal Zone Management Program Administrative Grants⁵¹

Contact Information

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

Office: National Ocean Service, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM)

Contact: Liz Mountz, 301-713-3155 x148, elizabeth.mountz@noaa.gov

Website: <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/programs/czm.html>

Overview

The National Coastal Zone Management Program (CZM) is a voluntary, cost-sharing partnership between NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) and coastal and Great Lakes states, territories, and commonwealths to protect and restore the nation's coastal resources while recognizing ecological, historical, cultural, aesthetic, and economic needs and values. Thirty-four of the 35 eligible states, territories, and commonwealths have developed NOAA-approved coastal management programs, and OCRM annually distributes noncompetitive CZM Administrative grants (also known as Section 306 grants) through cooperative agreements to implement these programs.⁵² In addition, OCRM provides mediation and technical assistance, with a specialty in policy and planning.⁵³ Coastal management programs have the option to utilize these funds within their program or pass them through as sub-grants to other state, local, or tribal governments to conduct projects in the coastal zone that align with program priorities. NOAA awards states one cooperative agreement each year that includes sections for 306 funding, 309 funding, and 310 funding.

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: Approximately half of coastal management programs receive their funds around July 1 of each year, so their applications are due to OCRM in March. Funds go out to the remaining programs around October 1, so the second set of programs submits their applications in April.

Deadlines for coastal management programs offering sub-grant competitions vary by state.

Eligibility

Any state, territory, or commonwealth with a NOAA-approved coastal management program is eligible. There are no tribal coastal management programs, but tribes are eligible for sub-awards from state programs that opt to pass-through their CZM funds. State wetlands programs (as well as other state and local government agencies) are also eligible for these sub-awards. Eligibility requirements for additional

⁵¹ Sources: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Coastal Programs: Partnering with States to Manage Our Coastline*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/programs/czm.html>>; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Coastal Zone Management*, accessed at <<http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/topics/coasts/management/welcome.html>>; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Funding for our Programs*, accessed at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/funding/fund_programs.html#cmp>; Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (amended 1996), 16 U.S.C. § 1455 (c), accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/about/czma.html#anchor206619>>; Castellan, Allison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), personal communication with Katherine Antos, June 30.

⁵² Illinois is the only eligible state that has not developed a coastal zone management program (<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/welcome.html>).

⁵³ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Coastal Zone Management Program Strategic Plan: Improving Management of the Nation's Coastal Areas (FY 2007 – 2012)*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/programs/czm.html>>.

types of applicants (eg, nonprofit organizations) and specific actions vary depending on the needs and priorities of the coastal program offering the sub-grant competition.

Activities related to the implementation of state and territory coastal management programs are eligible for Section 306 grants. Wetland-focused projects that state programs have supported in the past have included: implementation of wetland permitting programs, development of new wetlands policies/regulations, providing training/technical assistance to local governments on land use planning to preserve wetland and other sensitive habitat areas, monitoring, wetland education and outreach, etc.

Only small-scale (less than \$100,000) acquisition and restoration projects are eligible for CZM grants if states choose to set aside a portion of their 306 funds for Section 306a, the Coastal Resource Improvement Program. Low-cost construction or acquisition projects funding under 306a much meet additional funding requirements (*See Coastal Zone Management Act Section 306A Guidance, February 1999*).

Match

Requirement: 1:1

Type: Non-federal; cash or in-kind services

Application Format

States coastal zone management programs create their annual cooperative agreement application using the Coastal and Marine Management Program (CAMMP) system and submit to NOAA for review via Grants.gov. CAMMP applications include descriptions and outcomes for all projects the state plans to fund as well as a budget narrative for each task. NOAA then reviews the applications and negotiates with the state coastal management programs if modifications are needed to ensure all goals of the National Coastal Management Program will be met.

Application format and processes for coastal management programs offering sub-grant competitions vary by state.

Awards (Based on Analysis of FY2003 – FY2007 Data)

Total: Relatively constant in recent years, ranging from \$55.8 million in FY2007 to \$59.5 million in FY2004 and averaging \$57.1 million⁵⁴

Number: 34 (the number of NOAA-approved coastal management programs)

Range: Distribution of funds based on the size of the state's coastal zone, and coastal population. Congress imposes a \$2M cap on Section 306 funds for each state.⁵⁵ Over 5-year period, grants ranged from \$788,000 (American Samoa) to \$2.08 million, and the number of large programs that are receiving the maximum grant award has increased to 16 states and 1 commonwealth in FY2007.⁵⁶

Average: \$1.68 million⁵⁷

Hints for Success

⁵⁴ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *The National Coastal Management Program: A Partnership to Sustain the Nation's Coastal Resources and Communities*, presentation by Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.

⁵⁵ Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (amended 1996), 16 U.S.C. § 1455 (c), accessed at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/about/czma.html#anchor206619>.

⁵⁶ Castellán, Allison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), written communication with Katherine Antos, June 30 and July 1.

⁵⁷ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *The National Coastal Management Program: A Partnership to Sustain the Nation's Coastal Resources and Communities*, presentation by Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.

Probability of Success: All states with NOAA-approved coastal management programs receive financial support and technical assistance from OCRM. The probability that CZM funds are used for wetlands activities depends on the needs and priorities of each state. Only approximately two-thirds of coastal management programs pass through a portion of their CZM funds to other entities through a sub-grant competition. Furthermore, the portion that is passed through has declined in recent years as total CZM funds remain constant but fixed coastal management program and staff costs increased. In states that do hold sub-grant competitions, the probability that wetlands programs receive these funds varies by state.

Strategies: State wetlands programs interested in collaborating on coastal wetland activities and utilizing CZM grants should contact their state coastal management program to determine program needs, priorities, whether pass-through grants are available, and if so, the application and selection process for these funds.⁵⁸

Other Notes

Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 provides funding to states, territories, and commonwealths for the administration of their CZM programs. Therefore, CZM grants are also sometimes referred to as Section 306 grants.

⁵⁸ For CZM programs and contact information, see <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/welcome.html>>.

Coastal Zone Enhancement Program⁵⁹

Contact Information

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

Office: National Ocean Service, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM)

Contact: Diana Olinger, 301-713-3155 x149, diana.olinger@noaa.gov

Website: <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/enhanc.html>

Overview

Section 309 of the 1990 Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA) requires NOAA-approved state, territory, or commonwealth coastal management programs to assess nine areas of national significance within their programs every five years and develop and implement strategies to enhance these nine program areas, of which wetlands is one. NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management provides funding to state and territory coastal zone management programs under the Coastal Zone Enhancement Program (also known as Section 309) to implement these strategies as part of its comprehensive cooperative agreement for the Coastal Zone Management Program (see also descriptions for the Coastal Zone Management Program Administration Grants (CZMA Section 306) and Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program (CZMA Section 310 funds) which are also included in this cooperative agreement).⁶⁰ NOAA awards states one cooperative agreement each year that includes sections for 306 funding, 309 funding, and 310 funding.

As of the most recent round of self assessments, 21 of the 34-approved programs have developed strategies to improve management and identify the primary needs of coastal wetlands. The most common needs are: additional wetland monitoring data to assess trends in acreage and quality, improved effectiveness monitoring of voluntary and regulatory wetland restoration sites, and new state authorities to protect isolated or non-tidal wetlands that may no longer fall under federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction.⁶¹

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: Approximately half of coastal management programs receive their funds around July 1 of each year, so their applications are due to OCRM in March. Funds go out to the remaining programs around October 1, so the second set of programs submits their applications in April.

Deadlines for coastal management programs offering sub-grant competitions vary by state.

⁵⁹ Sources: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2006), *Coastal Zone Enhancement Program*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/enhanc.html>>; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2006), *Coastal Zone Management Program – Enhancement Grant Assessments and Strategies: Wetlands*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nationalsummary.html>>; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Funding for our Programs*, accessed at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/funding/fund_programs.html#cmp>; Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (amended 1996), 16 U.S.C. § 1455 (c), accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/about/czma.html#anchor206619>>; Castellán, Allison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), personal communication with Katherine Antos, June 30.

⁶⁰ Other areas of national significance include aquaculture, cumulative and secondary impacts, energy and government facility siting, coastal hazards, marine debris, ocean and Great Lakes resources, public access, and special area management plans.

⁶¹ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2006), *Coastal Zone Management Program – Enhancement Grant Assessments and Strategies: Wetlands*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nationalsummary.html>>.

Eligibility

Any state, territory, or commonwealth with a NOAA-approved coastal zone management program which has developed an approved section 309 assessment and strategy. Compared to the Section 306 Coastal Zone Management funds, fewer activities are eligible for funding under Section 309. Funds can only be used for activities that implement approved enhancement strategies; they may not finance routine program activities. For example, 309 funds have been used to support seven local Planning District Commissions in developing local conservation corridors that identify and prioritize habitat areas for conservation and restoration and to develop new public guidance to support implementation of wetland mitigation rules. Section 309 funds are less commonly used to test new monitoring methods for conditional or functional assessments. A program may not use Enhancement funds to perform ongoing permit reviews, inspections, or monitoring. Costs associated with restoration and acquisition are also ineligible.

Because there are no tribal coastal zone management programs, tribes cannot receive direct Coastal Zone Enhancement Program grants. However, coastal management programs do maintain the option to issue sub-grant competitions and pass through funds to state, local, and tribal governments. Few state coastal management programs pass through Coastal Zone Enhancement grants.

Match

Requirement: None.

Type: N/A

Application Format

States coastal zone management programs create their annual cooperative agreement application using the Coastal and Marine Management Program (CAMMP) system and submit to NOAA for review via Grants.gov. CAMMP applications include descriptions and outcomes for all projects the state plans to fund as well as a budget narrative for each task. NOAA then reviews the applications and negotiates with the state coastal management programs if modifications are needed to ensure all goals of the National Coastal Management Program will be met.

Application format and processes for coastal management programs offering sub-grant competitions vary by state.

Awards (Based on Analysis of FY2003 – FY2007 Data)

Total: Consistently funded at \$10 million.⁶² The maximum total amount that OCRM can distribute is 10% of the total amount available for Section 306 Coastal Zone Management grants.

Number: 34 (the number of NOAA-approved coastal management programs)

Range: Distribution of funds based on the size of the state's coastal zone, and coastal population. Congress imposes a \$2M cap on Section 306 funds for each state.⁶³ Distribution of funds based on the extent and nature of the coastal area, coastal area population, and other factors.⁶⁴ Over 5-year period, grants ranged from \$76,000 (American Samoa) to \$540,000⁶⁵

⁶² National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), The National Coastal Management Program: A Partnership to Sustain the Nation's Coastal Resources and Communities, presentation by Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.

⁶³ Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (amended 1996), 16 U.S.C. § 1455 (c), accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/about/czma.html#anchor206619>>.

⁶⁴ Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (amended 1996), 16 U.S.C. § 1455 (c), accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/about/czma.html#anchor206619>>.

⁶⁵ Castellán, Allison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), written communication with Katherine Antos, June 30 and July 1.

Median: \$294,100⁶⁶

Hints for Success

Probability of Success

All coastal and Great Lakes states, territories, and commonwealths with NOAA-approved coastal management programs and enhancement strategies receive Coastal Zone Enhancement Program grants and technical assistance from OCRM. Currently, 33 of the 35 eligible states, territories, and commonwealths have these programs and strategies in place and receive the funds. The probability that Enhancement grants are used for wetlands activities depends on the needs and priorities of each program. As of the most recent 5-year assessment cycle, 21 of the 34 programs (62 percent) have developed strategies to improve wetlands management and thus can direct Enhancement grants to implement these wetland strategies.

Coastal management programs do not pass through Coastal Zone Enhancement grants as often as they pass through CZM funds. If they did, however, the probability that state or tribal wetlands programs receive these sub-awards would vary by state.

Strategies: State wetlands programs interested in collaborating on coastal wetland activities and utilizing Enhancement grants should contact their state coastal management program to determine whether the program has developed a wetlands strategy, the priority needs, if the program is interested in collaborating on a project, whether pass-through grants are available, and if so, the application and selection process for these funds.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), The National Coastal Management Program: A Partnership to Sustain the Nation's Coastal Resources and Communities, presentation by Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.

⁶⁷ For CZM programs and contact information, see <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/welcome.html>>.

Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program⁶⁸

Contact Information

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

Office: National Ocean Service, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM)

Contact: Allison Castellan, 301-713-3155 x125, allison.castellan@noaa.gov

Website: <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/welcome.html>

Overview

Section 6217 of the 1990 Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA) requires NOAA-approved coastal management programs to develop and implement plans to reduce nonpoint source pollution from six sources, including loss of wetlands and riparian and areas.⁶⁹ The Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program is jointly administered by NOAA and EPA and provides funding to coastal management programs to implement these strategies through cooperative agreements. The Program emphasizes pollution prevention, particularly local land-use planning and zoning, over clean-up. NOAA awards states one cooperative agreement each year that includes sections for 306 funding, 309 funding, and 310 funding.

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: Approximately half of coastal management programs receive their funds around July 1 of each year, so their applications are due to OCRM in March. Funds go out to the remaining programs around October 1, so the second set of programs submits their applications in April.

Deadlines for coastal management programs offering sub-grant competitions vary by state.

Eligibility

Any state, territory, or commonwealth with a NOAA-approved coastal management program and Coastal Nonpoint Program (CNP) may use Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control grants to implement nonpoint source reduction plans. Since FY2001, Congress has appropriated funding for states to implement approved portions of their CNPs under Section 310 of the CZMA. Currently, approximately two-thirds of the 34 coastal management programs have fully approved CNP programs. The remaining programs are conditionally approved so can only use Section 310 funds to implement portions of their program that are not conditioned.

Because there are no tribal coastal zone management programs, tribes cannot receive direct Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program grants. However, coastal management programs do maintain the option to issue sub-grant competitions and pass through funds to state, local, and tribal governments. Only some states choose to pass-through CNP funds.

⁶⁸ Sources: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *The Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/welcome.html>>; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2006), *Coastal Zone Management Program – Enhancement Grant Assessments and Strategies: Wetlands*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nationalsummary.html>>; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Funding for our Programs*, accessed at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/funding/fund_programs.html#cmp>; Castellan, Allison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), personal communication with Katherine Antos, June 30.

⁶⁹ Remaining sources on nonpoint source pollution listed under CZARA include forestry, agriculture, urban areas, marinas, and hydromodification.

Activities eligible for Section 310 funds include most efforts related to implementing a CNP. NOAA encourages states to spend a portion of their 310 funding within at least one of three priority funding areas: clean marinas, on-site sewage disposal systems, and capacity building. Although installing some on-the-ground best management practices are allowed if they meet specific requirements, generally funding on-the-ground construction projects with Section 310 funding is discouraged due to the small amount of funding available. Land acquisition is ineligible for Section 310 funding.

Match

Requirement: 1:1

Type: Nonfederal; cash or in-kind services

Application Format

States coastal zone management programs create their annual cooperative agreement application using the Coastal and Marine Management Program (CAMMP) system and submit to NOAA for review via Grants.gov. CAMMP applications include descriptions and outcomes for all projects the state plans to fund as well as a budget narrative for each task. NOAA then reviews the applications and negotiates with the state coastal management programs if modifications are needed to ensure all goals of the National Coastal Management Program will be met.

Application format and processes for coastal management programs offering sub-grant competitions vary by state.

Awards (Based on Analysis of FY2003 – FY2007 Data)

Total: Over past 5 years, sharp decline from \$9.5 million in FY2004 to \$0 in FY2007. On average, grants totaled \$4.7 million.⁷⁰ Unclear what future funding levels will be for the CNP Control Program, although some funding is available in FY2008.

Number: 34 (the number of NOAA-approved coastal management programs)

Range: Previously distributed funds based on the state, territory, or commonwealth's CNP program, but due to decrease in funding now provide every program the same amount plus a set bonus if they have an approved CNP plan. Over 5-year period, grants ranged from \$0 (in FY2007 when no funds were distributed) to \$580,000.⁷¹ In FY2008, conditionally-approved CNPs will receive \$42,000, and fully approved CNPs will receive \$68,000.

Average: Excluding FY2007 when no funds were available, \$172,700⁷²

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: All coastal and Great Lakes states, territories, and commonwealths with NOAA-approved coastal management programs receive Section 310 Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program grants and technical assistance from OCRM. Of the three funding sources authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act that are included in this compendium, the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program is the least suited to offer funding for state or tribal wetlands programs. The likelihood that programs direct Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control grants toward wetlands activities depends on

⁷⁰ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), The National Coastal Management Program: A Partnership to Sustain the Nation's Coastal Resources and Communities, presentation by Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.

⁷¹ Castellán, Allison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), written communication with Katherine Antos, June 30 and July 1.

⁷² National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), The National Coastal Management Program: A Partnership to Sustain the Nation's Coastal Resources and Communities, presentation by Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.

whether their state CNP plan identifies wetland and riparian loss as a major source of nonpoint source pollution. However, because of the small amount of dollars available for state CNP programs particularly in recent years, states have very little, if any funds available for pass-through grant programs. Any activities related to wetlands that do occur tend to be along the lines of rain gardens. If pass-through grants do occur, however, the probability that state or tribal wetlands programs receive these sub-awards would vary by state.

Strategies: State wetlands programs interested in collaborating on coastal wetland activities and utilizing Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control grants should contact their state coastal management program to determine if the CNP has identified wetlands loss as a major source of nonpoint source pollution, is interested in collaborating on a project, if pass-through grants are available, and if so, the application and selection process for these funds.⁷³ In addition, wetlands programs should be aware that OCRM considers the following criteria when negotiating cooperative agreements with CNPs for Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control grants:

- Clear and direct tie to specific measures in approved CNP;
- Justification for project, including outcomes and explanation of how project will protect or improve coastal water quality. Proposals are more competitive if they include objective and quantifiable measures of success that are consistent with goals and objectives outlined in CNP plans and if they link to coastal water quality and coastal dependent uses/community development theme areas of the Coastal Zone Management Act Performance Measurement System. However, OCRM does not expect project-specific effectiveness monitoring; and
- Consistency with long-term strategies identified in CNP or similar plan (eg, 319 plan).⁷⁴

OCRM also encourages states to use Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control grants to enhance coordination at the state and local level on coastal nonpoint pollution control issues, including forging new partnerships with other agencies, building capacity at the local level, and developing tracking and compliance audit tools. OCRM prefers that these grants be used for program coordination, outreach, and other activities that are not readily eligible for other federal funding sources. Therefore, wetlands monitoring and restoration are technically eligible but seldom funded under this Program.⁷⁵

⁷³ For CZM programs and contact information, see <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/welcome.html>>. For CNP information by state, see <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/pro_approve.html>.

⁷⁴ Source: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2006), *Funding Guidance for State/Territory Expenditure of Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program Implementation Funds*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/guide.html>>.

⁷⁵ Source: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2006), *Funding Guidance for State/Territory Expenditure of Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program Implementation Funds*, accessed at <<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/guide.html>>; Castellan, Allison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), personal communication with Katherine Antos, June 30.

Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program⁷⁶

Contact Information

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

Office: National Ocean Service, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM)

Contact: Elaine Vaudreuil, 301-713-3155 x103, Elaine.Vaudreuil@noaa.gov

Website: <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/welcome.html>

Overview

Since 2002, the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program (CELCP) has provided grants to state and local governments to acquire title or in-perpetuity conservation easements on coastal or estuarine land considered to have significant ecological, conservation, historical, aesthetic, or recreational values and that are threatened by conversion.

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: Varies by state

Eligibility

Coastal or Great Lakes states, territories, or commonwealths with NOAA-approved coastal zone management (CZM) programs and CELCP plans that prioritize lands for acquisition can nominate up to three projects each year to the national CELCP grants competition.⁷⁷ Both state and local government agencies can submit proposals for acquiring title or easements to lands to their designated-CELCP agency for nomination to the national competition. Often, CELCP leads are the CZM programs. Lands must be located within a coastal zone or coastal watershed boundary, identified as priorities in the CELCP plan, and, if title or easement is acquired, allow public access.⁷⁸ Projects must also comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Management and Conservation Act, National Historic Preservation Act, and federal consistency requirements under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

States may use up to five percent of awarded funds for stewardship activities on the property within the first three years of ownership. However, costs associated with ongoing stewardship and land management are ineligible. States may also use up to five percent of CELCP funds for program administration.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Sources: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), *The Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program*, accessed at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/welcome.html>; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), *CELCP: In Depth*, accessed at http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/celcp_indepth.html; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2003), *Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program: Final Guidelines*, accessed at http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/celcp_indepth.html; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2007), *Funding for our Programs*, accessed at http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/funding/fund_programs.html#cmp.

⁷⁷ Most coastal and Great Lakes states, territories, and commonwealths are in the process of developing CELCP plans. For state CELCP contacts and plans, see http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/celcp_indepth.html.

⁷⁸ Public access may be limited for resource protection or safety reasons.

⁷⁹ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2003), *Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program: Final Guidelines*, accessed at http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/celcp_indepth.html.

Match

Requirement: 1:1

Type: Non-federal cash or in-kind services

Application Format

Typically hard copy, but varies by state

Awards (Based on FY2003 – 2007 Data)⁸⁰

Total: Over past 5 years, sharp decline from \$50.6 million in FY2004 to \$27.5 million in FY2007. Total awards over this period averaged \$38.5 million per year.

Number: 17 – 35 projects awarded per year, averaging 26 awards

Range: Maximum award is \$3 million.

Average: \$1.5 million

Hints for Success

Strategies: Governors of coastal and Great Lakes states, territories, and commonwealths designate a lead agency to coordinate and nominate up to three projects annually to the national CELCP competition. Often this designated lead is the state, territory, or commonwealth's CZM program. State CELCP plans describe priorities and the nomination and selection process. Therefore, state and tribal wetlands programs interested in utilizing CELCP funds to help advance their programs should first review their state CELCP plan and discuss priorities and goals with their CELCP contact.⁸¹

Other Notes

States, territories, and commonwealths must update CELCP plans every five years. In addition, NOAA plans to update its national CELCP guidelines outlining application requirements, procedures, and ranking criteria in 2008. Therefore, wetlands programs should check the NOAA and state CELCP websites for updates.

Through FY2006, CELCP projects were selected by Congressional direction. The Program switched to a competitive funding process in FY2007.⁸²

⁸⁰ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), *NOAA: Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program*, accessed at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/celcp_indepth.html>.

⁸¹ For state CELCP contacts and plans, see <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/celcp_indepth.html>.

⁸² National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2008), *Funding Opportunities*, accessed at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/land/celcp_fundingop.html>

Legacy Resource Management Program

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Department of Defense

Office: Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations & Environment

Contact: Jane Mallory, (703) 604-1774, Jane.Mallory.ctr@osd.mil or Pedro Morales, (703)604-1933, Pedro.Morales.ctr@osd.mil

Website: <http://www.dodlegacy.org/Legacy/intro/about.aspx>

Overview

The Legacy Resource Management Program assists the Department of Defense in protecting and enhancing resources while supporting military readiness. A Legacy project may involve regional ecosystem management initiatives, habitat preservation efforts, archaeological investigations, invasive species control, Native American consultations, and/or monitoring and predicting migratory patterns of birds and animals.⁸³ Past wetlands projects include several wetlands restorations in the Chesapeake Bay region.⁸⁴

The Legacy Program is a source of conservation management funds for projects that directly support the DoD mission. Legacy is NOT a grant program, despite similarities to grant programs with proposal, review, and award processes. Legacy funding requires the recipient(s) to enter into a contractual obligation with DoD (or designee) to provide services for an agreed-upon amount of money. Legacy funding, as noted below, also has expiration dates and periods of performance that must be satisfactorily met. Recipients of Legacy funding who fail to meet the terms of their project (expected products, deadlines, etc) as agreed-upon at the time of disbursement will be subject to appropriate corrective actions.⁸⁵

Timing

Frequency: Annual

Deadlines: DoD issues the RFP in May. Pre-proposals must be submitted by mid-September for the coming federal fiscal year. A committee reviews these pre-proposals and invites some to submit full proposals, which are due by mid-November. Notifications of approved and rejected proposals are made in December or January, and project funds are released.⁸⁶ The submission deadlines schedule is updated at <http://www.dodlegacy.org/Legacy/intro/dates.aspx>.

Eligibility

Project proposals may be submitted by anyone, although non-installation individuals, organizations, or businesses must supply a letter of support from the cooperating military installation or installations if their proposed work is to take place on installation grounds..⁸⁷ States and tribes are both eligible to apply.

Legacy projects must meet the following four criteria:

1. Project must have regional or DoD-wide significance and involve more than one military department;
2. Project must be necessary to meet legal requirements **or** to support military operations;

⁸³ <http://www.dodlegacy.org/Legacy/intro/about.aspx>

⁸⁴ See http://ian.umces.edu/pdfs/dod/defending_our_national_treasure.pdf

⁸⁵ http://www.dodlegacy.org/Legacy/intro/LegacyGuidebook_print_June07.pdf

⁸⁶ Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program, Funding Process & Submittal DOs and DON'Ts

⁸⁷ Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program, Funding Process & Submittal DOs and DON'Ts

3. Project must be more effectively managed at the DoD level; and
4. Project must not be an Executive Agent responsibility.

Applicable activities eligible for Legacy funding include:

1. Development of ecosystem-wide land management plans.
2. Wildlife studies to ensure the safety of military operations.
3. Identification and return of Native American human remains and cultural items in the possession or control of the DoD, or discovered on land under the jurisdiction of the Department, to the appropriate Native American tribes.
4. Control of invasive species that may hinder military activities or degrade military training ranges.
5. Establishment of a regional curation system for artifacts found on military installations.⁸⁸

Match

Requirement: Matching funds from the applicant are not required but are encouraged when appropriate.

Type: Cash and/or in-kind services considered

Application Format

All applications must be submitted through the Legacy Tracker website: www.dodlegacy.org. To create a user account for Legacy Tracker, visit: <http://www.dodlegacy.org/Legacy/intro/usersrequest.aspx>

Awards

Total: Approximately \$7 million to \$9 million per year

Number: 60 to 70

Range: A few thousand dollars to a few hundred thousand dollars. Most projects receive \$130,000 or less.

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: The Legacy program receives about 165 pre-proposals per year for natural projects. About 2/3 of these pre-proposals are allowed to submit full proposals. Of that group, about 60 percent receive funding.

Strategies: To learn more about current projects, the Legacy program recommends signing up for its electronic newsletter by contacting Pedro Morales at 703-604-1933 or Pedro.Morales.ctr@osd.mil. Also, by creating a user account in the Legacy Tracker system, potential applicants can view accepted projects, rejected projects, and rejected pre-proposals dating back to 1999. (Note: items that appear as “projects” were accepted for the Legacy program. Items marked as “proposals” were accepted as pre-proposals but later rejected as projects. Items marked as “pre-proposals” were rejected as pre-proposals). Wetlands programs may wish to contact Ed Miller prior to submitting pre-proposals at Edmund.Miller@osd.mil or 703-604-1765. Ed works with wetlands projects

The following are some hints provided by the Legacy program that will help proposals during the review process⁸⁹. For pre-proposals:

- Clearly define the benefit to the military mission.
- Present a project synopsis that clearly and concisely defines the proposed project in one or two sentences.
- Clearly indicate the service benefit, regional benefit or DoD-wide significance of your project. Installation specific projects are not acceptable.

⁸⁸ http://www.dodlegacy.org/Legacy/intro/LegacyGuidebook_print_June07.pdf

⁸⁹ Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program, Funding Process & Submittal DOs and DON'Ts

- Define expected products that will result ONLY from the current proposed effort, and clearly define any potential follow-on work.
- Define an itemized budget not to exceed 12 months of labor.

For proposals:

- Clearly outline the project approach.
- Include a budget that details all expenditures over \$1,000, and include a budget that details all travel expenses by number of persons, number of trips, and trip origin and destination.
- Clearly demonstrate a direct military mission benefit.
- Include a map if it helps illustrate your project or need for your project.

The Legacy program also recommends that applicants avoid jargon as people with diverse backgrounds will review the proposal. Also, abstracts must be concise and not lengthy. Proposals cannot be predominately research and development. Do not include web links. Often reviewers only see hard copies and so web links are not helpful. Finally, lists of literature cited or references are not necessary.

Wetlands Reserve Program

*****Please note that only tribal programs are eligible to apply for this program*****

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Department of Agriculture

Office: Natural Resources Conservation Service

Contact: **Tony Puga**, 202-720-1067, tony.puga@wdc.usda.gov

Website: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Programs/WRP/>

Overview

The Wetlands Reserve Program is a voluntary program offering landowners the opportunity to protect, restore, and enhance wetlands on their property. The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provides technical and financial support to help landowners with their wetland restoration efforts. The NRCS goal is to achieve the greatest wetland functions and values, along with optimum wildlife habitat, on every acre enrolled in the program. This program offers landowners an opportunity to establish long-term conservation and wildlife practices and protection.

There are two options for enrollment. The land can fall under a cost-share agreement that requires the wetlands to be maintained for 10 years, or the land can fall under a 30-year contract. The awards will vary based on the type of agreement.

Timing

Frequency: Ongoing until the annual appropriation is spent

Deadlines: none

Eligibility

This program is intended for landowners, which includes tribal governments. State programs are not eligible to apply on their own. To be eligible for WRP, land must be restorable and be suitable for wildlife benefits. This includes:

- Wetlands farmed under natural conditions;
- Farmed wetlands;
- Prior converted cropland;
- Farmed wetland pasture;
- Land that has become a wetland as a result of flooding;
- Range land, pasture, or production forest land where the hydrology has been significantly degraded and can be restored;
- Riparian areas which link protected wetlands;
- Lands adjacent to protected wetlands that contribute significantly to wetland functions and values;
- Previously restored wetlands that need long-term protection.

Match

Requirement: The Wetlands Reserve Program finances up to 75 percent of the cost of the restoration process in a cost-share agreement. There are caps on total funding based on geographic location.

Type: Tribes and landowners are responsible for paying for the balance of the restoration.

Application Format

Applications are accepted through a continuous sign-up process. Applications may be obtained and filed at any time at your local USDA Service Center or conservation district office:

<http://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app>

Applications also may be obtained through USDA's e-gov Internet site at:

<http://forms.sc.egov.usda.gov/efrms/formsearchservlet>

Enter "Natural Resources Conservation Service" in the Agency field, "Wetlands Reserve Program" in the Program Name field, and "AD-1153" in the Form Number field.

Awards

Total: Congress authorizes the Wetlands Reserve Program to enroll a certain number of acres annually in its program. The total money spent annually is based on this acreage. In the past few years, Congress has allocated about 150,000 acres annually. In FY 2007, the program obligated \$218,933,050 in financial assistance.

Number: Varies. In FY 2007, there were 632 contracts nationally

Range: Varies greatly based on the individual project location and acreage.

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: Historically, tribes have had minimal participation in the Wetlands Reserve Program. This may be because, in the past, there was an easement requirement for participation in the program that some tribes could not meet. The new contract option may allow more tribes to participate. The availability of funds varies state to state.

Strategies: Work through your local USDA Service Center.

Other Notes

This program is undergoing changes as a result of the 2008 Farm Bill. The specifics of the program are still in the rulemaking process as of October 1, 2008 and will likely not be finalized until January 2009. Any website documents marked "Farm Bill 2002" may be out-of-date depending on the final rules. Please contact your local USDA Service Center for the most recent information.

Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Department of Agriculture

Office: Natural Resources Conservation Service

Contact: Albert Cerna, 202-720-9358, albert.cerna@wdc.usda.gov

Website: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/>

Overview

The Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) is a voluntary program for people who want to develop and improve wildlife habitat primarily on private land. Through WHIP USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service provides both technical assistance and up to 75 percent cost-share assistance to establish and improve fish and wildlife habitat. WHIP agreements between NRCS and the participant generally last from 5 to 10 years from the date the agreement is signed.⁹⁰

Timing

Frequency: Ongoing

Deadlines: none

Eligibility

Eligible lands include privately owned land; Federal land when the primary benefit is on private or Tribal land; State and local government land on a limited basis; and Tribal land.⁹¹ Generally, it is mostly tribes who will be eligible for this funding.

In order for land to be eligible for WHIP, it must meet one of the following program priorities:

- Promote the restoration of declining or important native wildlife habitats.
- Protect, restore, develop or enhance wildlife habitat of at-risk species (candidate species, and State- and Federally-listed threatened and endangered species).
- Reduce the impacts of invasive species on wildlife habitats.
- Protect, restore, develop or enhance declining or important aquatic wildlife species' habitats.

Match

Requirement: WHIP is a cost-share program that reimburses participants up to 75 percent of the cost of the conservation practice. The landowner is responsible for the remainder of the cost.

Application Format

The application begins when a landowner or tribe submits an application to an NRCS local office, conservation district office, or office of a designated cooperating entity. For a list of offices, visit:

<http://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app>

Based on the state's wildlife priorities, The NRCS State Conservationist commits allocated funds to high ranking landowner offers and enters into long-term agreements with selected participants.

Following agreement signature by NRCS and the selected entity, funds are obligated to the project, and the participant may begin to implement the wildlife habitat development plan.⁹²

⁹⁰ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/>

⁹¹ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/farmbill/2002/pdf/WHIPFct.pdf>

⁹² <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/farmbill/2002/pdf/WHIPPrDs.pdf>

Awards⁹³

Total: For the past several years, the program has obligated between \$30 million and \$35 million annually

Number: On average between 2,000 and 3,000 annually

Range: Varies greatly

Median: \$16,700

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: Over the past few years, WHIP has funded roughly one-third to one-half of the applications.

Strategies: The purpose of WHIP is to develop and improve wildlife habitat, especially for candidate species. Wetlands protection is one potential means to meeting those objectives, where appropriate. To utilize these funds, applicants will need to show a clear connection between preserving wetlands and the prioritized wildlife in their area.

Each State develops a ranking system to ensure consistent and efficient WHIP implementation. The ranking process assists the State Conservationist in determining parcels that merit WHIP enrollment. Ranking criteria, derived from the State WHIP plan, enable the State Conservationist to prioritize proposals. The State Conservationist, with assistance from the State Technical Committee, establishes a weighted ranking process to prioritize eligible proposals and parcels. Priority is given to projects that will protect habitat or species of National or regional significance.⁹⁴ Applicants should discuss the priority species in their geographic areas with their local NRCS representatives.

Other Notes

This program may undergo changes as a result of the 2008 Farm Bill. Contact your local NRCS office for updated information.

⁹³ http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/FY07contract_info/WHIP_fy2007_Contract.html

⁹⁴ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/farmbill/2002/pdf/WHIPPrDs.pdf>

Healthy Forests Reserve Program

Contact Information

Agency: U.S. Department of Agriculture

Office: Natural Resources Conservation Service

Contact: Astor Boozer, 202-720-0242, Astor.boozer@wdc.usda.gov

Website: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/HFRP/ProgInfo/Index.html>

Overview

The Healthy Forests Reserve Program (HFRP) is a voluntary program established for the purpose of restoring and enhancing forest ecosystems to: 1) promote the recovery of threatened and endangered species, 2) improve biodiversity; and 3) enhance carbon sequestration.⁹⁵ These forest ecosystems can include forested wetlands. HFRP offers landowners financial and technical assistance to restore and protect healthy forests through 99-year easements, 30-year easements, and restoration agreements.⁹⁶

The program offers three enrollment options:

1. A 10-year cost-share agreement; for which the landowner may receive 50 percent of the cost of the approved conservation practices;
2. A 30-year easement, for which the landowner may receive 75 percent of the easement value of the enrolled land plus 75 percent of the average cost of the approved conservation practices; or
3. An easement of not more than 99 years, for which landowners may receive 100 percent of the easement value of the enrolled land plus the cost of the approved conservation practices.⁹⁷

Timing

Frequency: Ongoing

Deadlines: none

Eligibility

To be eligible for enrollment, land must be private land or Tribal lands which will restore, enhance, or measurably increase the likelihood of recovery of a threatened or endangered species, must improve biological diversity, or increase carbon sequestration.⁹⁸

Land enrolled in the HFRP must have a restoration plan. The cost effectiveness of each agreement or easement and associated restoration plans must maximize the environmental benefits per dollar expended. Restoration plans must have practices necessary to restore and enhance habitat for species listed as threatened or endangered or are candidates for the threatened or endangered species list. Technical assistance will be provided to help program participants in complying with the terms of restoration plans under the HFRP.⁹⁹

Currently, the program is operating in only four states-- Arkansas, Mississippi, Maine, and Minnesota. The program hopes to expand to other states in FY 2009 and beyond.

Match

Requirement: Depends on the type of agreement (see above)

⁹⁵ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/HFRP/ProgInfo/Index.html>

⁹⁶ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/HFRP/ProgInfo/OldHFRPInfo/HFRPQandA6-06.pdf>

⁹⁷ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/HFRP/ProgInfo/OldHFRPInfo/HFRPQandA6-06.pdf>

⁹⁸ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/HFRP/ProgInfo/OldHFRPInfo/HFRPFACTSHEET6-06.pdf>

⁹⁹ <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/HFRP/ProgInfo/OldHFRPInfo/HFRPTalkingPoints07-3-06.pdf>

Application Format

Applicants should contact their local NRCS office to begin the application process. The local office can determine if your lands are eligible for this program. For a list of local NRCS offices, please visit:

<http://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app>

Awards (Program started awards in FY 2006)

Total: About \$2 million annually

Number: About 20 per year

Range: Varies depending on project

Hints for Success

Probability of Success: Because Healthy Forests is a relatively new program, there is not much historical data on applications. In 2006, the program accepted about 25 percent of applications.

Strategies: The purpose of the Healthy Forests program is to restore and enhance forest ecosystems as habitat for endangered and threatened species. Wetlands protection is one potential means to meeting these objectives, where appropriate. To utilize these funds, applicants will need to show a clear connection between preserving wetlands and the prioritized wildlife in their area. Applicants are encouraged to work with their local NRCS offices on program priorities.

Other Notes

As mentioned above, this program is relatively new and is only operating in a few states. Tribes from other states should check back to see if their state has been added for the coming fiscal year.

Other Useful Resources

Federal Grants Database

<http://grants.gov>

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

<http://www.cfda.gov/>