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| # | Question | Answer |
| 118 | Can we provide a landowner acknowledgment form in the proposal instead of a landowner agreement? If so, can we use the generic acknowledgement form on Ecology’s website? | Yes, that works for the application. |
| 117 | I am inquiring with a question about the cultural compliance that our proposed project will need from ECY:  Our proposal’s riparian planting activities encompass the formerly dammed Elwha reservoir footprints, where we have planted before. We have a current NHPA/NEPA from Department of Interior that covers compliance for the planting ground disturbance activities. It will expire in 2027. It is attached.  I am curious if at the time of application, do we need to include any of Department of Ecology’s cultural compliance documents mentioned such as an IDP or a Cultural Resources Review form? My interpretation is that if those documents will be required in addition to our existing NHPA/NEPA permit, they will be required after the proposal is awarded, but I might be misinterpreting the language and don’t want to leave out those completed forms at the time of application if they are required? | Good question. For the purposes of the application, you do not need to provide something that you don’t have. I recommend describing the current compliance documents and that you will likely need to adhere to Ecology’s processes. It sounds like it would be good to include time in your workplan to develop an IDP or work with our cultural resources specialist to determine what is best in this case. |
| 116 | I have another follow up question that popped up as our team works to finalize our submission. During a conversation this afternoon, their team noted a keen interest in securing grant funds to purchase a new modular plant cooler. It’s my understanding that their non-mobile current plant cooler is located further up river on the Reservation, which is quite far from their restoration projects and is necessitating an extra hour or so per day in commute time. In addition their current plant cooler is nearing the end of its life and is regularly encountering some mechanical issues.  Purchasing a replacement piece of equipment seems to fit nicely with the funding request’s goals for increasing Native Planting capacity, but the replacement cost is $30k+. I am aware that there is a $5k limit on equipment purchases without prior discussion with Ecology. Does your team have any thoughts on whether this would be appropriate to include with our request? | Our Funding Guidelines has some helpful language for nursery equipment purchase requirements: “Equipment purchases are limited to $5000. Any equipment costs above this must receive Ecology special approval. Proposals that include equipment purchases must provide an explanation of needs for proposed equipment purchases and why the proposed approach is the most cost-effective option.”    There is some back and forth about the limit being $5,000 or $15,000 as of October 1. The limit comes from EPA, so we would need to run equipment costs above that through them. This means we are open to receiving the proposal, and if the proposal is successful we will run it by EPA in contracting to request an exemption. |
| 115 | I’m working on a collaborative CR2SL grant application with partner organizations, and the lead org showed us today that there are not sections in EAGL where we would be copying/pasting from the word document template into EAGL, specifically sections we typically see in EAGL like the Scope of Work Tasks, or in this case places to copy/paste answers to the Riparian Strategy questions, and other sets of questions. So does that mean the actual grant application itself is us uploading the completed word doc template to EAGL?    Just wanted to confirm we are not missing sections where we should be copying/pasting into EAGL, like typical Ecology grant applications.  Do you want it uploaded as a PDF? Should we leave all of the questions/explanations/scoring criteria in there amongst our answers? | You are correct that there are usually fields in EAGL where you copy and paste the SOW. You are correct that we do not have all of the normal fields. You are not missing it- go ahead and submit the word document as an upload for the majority of the application.  I believe it needs to be a Microsoft word version of the document for the EAGL upload. If you want to delete some of the extra bits so that it’s not as long, the works for us. |
| 114 | If the project proponent is a tribe do we need to submit the tribal awareness letter? | You do not need to provide a Tribal awareness letter for your own Tribe, but if there are others Tribes near the focus area that have a potential interest in the work, benefits, or impacts, I would recommend submitting one to them. Otherwise, go ahead and note that the Lead applicant is a Tribe with no other Tribes in the area. |
| 113 | I’m just checking - are these grants only available in Puget Sound?  And if so, why? | Thanks for reaching out. Unfortunately, this funding is coming from the EPA Region 10 and is allocated for the Puget Sound. There is a small possibility that work being done outside of the region could qualify for some innovation work if there is a way to expand models of work from one location to another. However, the implementation funds cannot be used outside of the Puget Sound at this time. I have been collecting a fair amount of frustration for this limitation, and I truly understand the need in other locations.    If we can use this funding opportunity to prove that riparian implementation funds are needed and can be well used, it is a long-term goal to institutionalize the funding source and perhaps expand that to all of Washington. |
| 112 | Since our proposal will have several sub awardees (partners) I am a little confused as to how to put the budget worksheet together.     1. Is the task-by-task budget sheet (upper section w/ dollar amounts for Salaries and Fringe, plus other line item expenses) only for King Conservation District?  And therefore, all remaining subaward (partner) expenses get lumped under ‘other’ in the lower budget narrative, or do we need to list salary and fringe details for each partner by task? 2. Does each task have a budget narrative (so I would copy and paste budget narrative categories for each task), or is there one master budget narrative just under Task 1 as is currently in the budget spreadsheet template? | We do have some flexibility in how the application and the budget are filled out, so for the purposes of the application I encourage you to do what works best for you and what will come across clearly to the reviewers. If your partners are sub-contractors and you will be doing a procurement process to contract with them, you are correct that all of their expenses would fit under the “other” budget narrative. I would suggest to break them into separate “other” lines to help clarify the funding allocations for each partner and their tasks. The narrative could include some of that information for the review purposes. For contracting, we will not need the procurement details of the subawards.    There is one master budget narrative. I have seem others use that space to clarify things like individual rates for personnel and hours that they will work on a task. It’s basically a justification for the math that shows up in total on the spreadsheet. |
| 111 | Do all chemical applications need to be performed by WA State Pesticide License (or supervising)?  How long does a land owner agreement apply for implementation? | I wanted to be sure to follow up with you from the technical assistance workshop yesterday.  Thank you for your excellent questions – we had to discuss a few things with the full team this morning. The two that I think we promised to get back to you on and the answers are below:  Do all chemical applications need to be performed by WA State Pesticide License (or supervising)?  You are correct to ask about the chemical pesticide license question.  We said in the Funding Guidelines: “All chemical applications must be performed by staff holding a current Washington State pesticide license and follow appropriate application methods and rates indicated on the label.” But the state allows for a licensed applicator to supervise unlicensed workers (per the [regulations handbook](chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https:/cms.agr.wa.gov/WSDAKentico/Documents/Pubs/079-PesticideLawsRulesHandoutBooklet.pdf?/079-PesticideLawsRulesHandoutBooklet&_gl=1*18fz9mo*_ga*MTc4MDE4NzczOC4xNzEzMzY0OTcx*_ga_9JCK8SVQPE*MTczNjQ1OTIyMS4zLjEuMTczNjQ1OTMyNS4wLjAuMA..)). I would like to provide guidance that is different than what is in the Funding Guidelines to match what the state allows. We do not need to add extra burden/requirement on this. I am hoping that you can note that you are following the regulations guidelines from the state and Michelle and I can work on making sure that is appropriate. Go ahead and put it in the application as such.  How long does a land owner agreement apply for implementation?  The LOA template is available on our [Climate Resilient Riparian Grant application resources webpage](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fecology.wa.gov%2Fwater-shorelines%2Fpuget-sound%2Fhelping-puget-sound%2Friparian-restoration%2Fgrant-application-resources&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ECY.WA.GOV%7Cc0a7529d6c2944aed04908dd30f91c86%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638720568726821262%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=4Mc6MITosB2H%2BdovppJXGAoRQ5GglZ2TNGjlVbIyf3o%3D&reserved=0). It says this: “The parties intend that all terms of this Agreement shall remain in effect for a period of ten years from the date of project completion, and the agreement shall be binding on all successors in interest during this time. The date of project completion is the date of final payment to the Grant Recipient.” This language is not flexible. |
| 110 | Quick follow up—we WOULD need a QAPP for the vegetation monitoring data we are collecting, even though not uploading data to EIM or WQX, right?  I’m nearly positive we would, but just making sure. | Yes.  We would at least meet with the QAPP coordinator to determine the type and level of QAPP that is needed. And based on the project, I think they will determine that a QAPP is needed, so it would be good to include that time and expense in your proposal. |
| 109 | Can you tell me if this grant can be used to fund the design and permitting of stream restoration projects.  The grant webpage lists implementation which usually means construction but it’s not clear if the funds cover design and permitting. | Yes, these funds can be used for design and permitting of projects. It is requested that for the Implementation category, there is also an implementation component. However, this does not need to be in the same location. So you could have design and permitting in one place and plantings in another to round out the proposal. |
| 108 | Can I be sent a copy of the Riparian Planting Plan and Maintenance Plan templates? I have been redirected to the CR2SL webpage multiple times but I haven't found it labelled under any of the sub-headings. | I think we have examples of Riparian Planting Plan and Maintenance Plan, but not necessarily a template. I can check with our technical lead again tomorrow if you ask during the webinar. I’m not sure that you need a template for the application. We can address the format of the plan itself if the application is selected.  Submit any existing planting/maintenance plans that you already have along with the application. If you are successful, we can work with the subrecipient to gather additional information if needed. |
| 107 | I'm working on the mapping portion of the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Lead application and have two questions I hope you can help me with.   1. I'm unable to import the PSAU Impervious Surfaces layer linked on the Application Mapping Resources subpage. The file downloads as a ".lyrx", but shows an error screen when importing it into GIS. I would use the raster data instead, but those are huge datasets that will probably exceed the upload limit for our focus area.  [https://gis.ecology.wa.gov/portal/home/item.html?id=e89f10ef90fb49e68573f8cbb5f6b9f9](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fgis.ecology.wa.gov%2Fportal%2Fhome%2Fitem.html%3Fid%3De89f10ef90fb49e68573f8cbb5f6b9f9&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ECY.WA.GOV%7C69991c6505bb48be8ab208dd29ef7c07%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638712830729822048%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=ENeoTQ6WfylAVG%2BKY%2FTaDDyAz7qy%2BuIpXWW0AFc3IQ4%3D&reserved=0) 2. Our focus area is 3 WRIA7-level watersheds, and the shapefiles describing the watershed extents will exceed the 35kb upload limit, not to mention the data describing fish use, etc. Do you have guidance for how to upload data for such a large spatial extent? | Thanks for reaching out, and happy new year! I would be happy to help answer your questions:     1. I will need to look into the issue with this download on our Portal environment and may need to loop in someone from IT, which could take a couple days. So, in order to keep you moving forward with your application can you try downloading the *Puget Sound Assessment Units (PSAU) water quality, habitat, and landcover attributed* layer linked [here](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fgis.ecology.wa.gov%2Fportal%2Fhome%2Fitem.html%3Fid%3D5b01cc51858d47c3b020c0cc5c48b993&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ECY.WA.GOV%7C69991c6505bb48be8ab208dd29ef7c07%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638712830729808736%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=cI5nqvWewSqLpIYyU7zkm6j%2F0Y8NBegSjmT1oPGQWQ8%3D&reserved=0), and shown in the red box in the screen clip below. This download is a shapefile, and has the Percent Impervious (Percent\_Im) data attributed, you will just need to symbolize the data yourself. If you have issues with this download please let me know, and I will send you the layer directly while I resolve the issues with our IT department. 2. I want to clarify our mapping submittal requirements briefly, as it sounds like you may be intending to upload all of your data for question 5 and 5a. into the EAGL mapping section of the application. Within EAGL we only require that your project extent be mapped indicating areas where work may occur. There is an option to upload boundary data (which is limited by the 35kb you are referring to) as well as draw and edit polygon features provided within the mapping application to achieve an approximate polygon representing your project’s boundaries. Unfortunately upload limitations are pretty well set in stone by the EAGL team, and we are limited in what we can do to work around this. If the provided options within the EAGL mapping application are not sufficient to create a project boundary for your application, we may be able to work around this by creating a OneDrive link for you to upload to, and then link that data to your application through the backend.     For questions 5 and 5a. we require a series of maps be created as described in the application, and submitted as .pdf’s to be referenced within your application. There are no actual data files that need to be submitted. |
| 106 | Can you please clarify the overhead rules for this program?  The request for grant applications form includes the United States Environmental Protection Agency logo at the top — are these federal flow-through funds?  Please clarify the source of funds and applicable rate for this grant:   * If the source is state funds, the University of Washington will accept the clearly-written statement from the Yellow Book and use the indirect rate of 30%. * Or if the source is federal funds, the University of Washington will accept the clearly-written statement from the Yellow Book and use our federally-negotiated indirect rate of 55.5%. | Thank you for asking and for your interest in the program. For overhead rates, you may use UW’s federally approved rate with the EPA, as these are EPA funds. |
| 105 | I'm trying to understand how to define distinct tasks for the purposes of entering our proposal into EAGL.  Currently, each task is allocated to a partner organization, but many of the partners have multiple projects, muddying the information in each task.  Should each proposal component be its own task with its own budget such that a single partner organization may have multiple tasks associated with them in EAGL?  If that is the case, is there a limit to the number of tasks that can be associated with the proposal? | I could see that part of the application functioning either way you suggest. There is no limit to the number of tasks, and for the purposes of the application, clarity is always helpful. |
| 104 | We have leads for different aspects of the project, so we want to be clear about how to account for the two different kinds of administrative costs--is there any guidance you can provide us on this?  Additionally, is compensation for indirect costs associated with grant administration strictly limited to 10 percent, or can the overhead compensation requested be higher if it is substantiated? | The indirect costs will need to be in line with your negotiated federal indirect amount.  For the application, be sure to describe and differentiate the costs of different aspects of the proposal. We can make some adjustments in contracting if needed. |
| 103 | I write to ask for guidance on the Tribal Awareness Letters for the CR2SL application. XX Tribe Natural Resources Department is preparing an application in partnership with other entities working in the XX Basin. One issue that came up during our planning meeting had to do with the letters. I’m responsible for preparing the letters and am unsure how to proceed with delivering them to the respective Chairpersons of the affected Tribes. In the past with other grant applications, we have provided notification letters to Natural Resources Department level staff and THPOs at neighboring tribes and maintain a distribution list for communication with those persons. However, I don’t have email addresses for Tribal Chairpersons.  Can you please provide guidance on how you would prefer we communicate with Tribal Chairpersons? I appreciate your attention to this matter. | Great question. I recommend sending the letter to Tribal Chairpersons and anyone that you think within the Tribe that has interest in the proposal, including potentially natural resources or cultural resources departments.  Information on this website might be helpful: <https://goia.wa.gov/tribal-directory/tribal-chair-contact-information>. |
| 102 | Do you want all costs broken out by sub-task, or can we define task,scope and deliverables by sub-task, while rolling up costs to task. While we are doing detailed labor estimates, we are also aiming to develop a 5 year plan with flexibility, labor may shift among tasks and subtasks... however I suspect under task-based contracting you will want billing by task... to much sub-task breakdown creates an accounting nightmare without much benefit. For example, we have personnel/fringe costs as part of a backbone function that will be working across multiple sites and deliverables over 5 years, so I am planning on summarizing those all within "A Task" even though they will be working across and supporting multiple activities.    We can present all our basis, and reviewers can still evaluate us, but I am wanting to end up with accounting at a task/object class level. Does that work? | We would like to see the task totals included in your Scope of Work. These totals should be supported by the itemized budget spreadsheet showing the cost breakdown by sub-task with totals for each task and the overall project.    We understand that amounts may shift between sub-tasks, and we do allow actual costs to vary per task by 10% of the total eligible cost of the agreement. However, the total budget for the entire project cannot be exceeded unless the agreement is amended. More details are provided within *Section C. Budget design* (pages 40-41) of the [Administrative Requirements for Recipients of Ecology Grants and Loans](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapps.ecology.wa.gov%2Fpublications%2FSummaryPages%2F2301002.html&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ecy.wa.gov%7C6c104726e2cb46b7b4b608dd1b01c1d0%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638696417055324730%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=8I9t9MbpDkFMSm6%2BE%2FGXhQo1ty%2FE2svywTESW7ueVIc%3D&reserved=0), also referred to as the "Yellow Book".    For Grant Recipients, payment reimbursement requests should be provided by Task and Item (such as Salaries, benefits, etc.) and submitted within their Payment Request/Progress Report (PRPR) Form. These requests mush align with the back-up documentation submitted (receipts, etc.) and should reflect the completed amount of work detailed in the Quarterly Progress Report submitted. |
| 101 | The proposal says no "agroforestry practices" in the core zone. (80-120' for the kinds of systems we want to be working on). However NRCS calls "riparian buffers" themselves an "agroforestry practice". Agroforestry ranges from extremely low intensity to high intensity, and traditional tribal land management is within the anthropological umbrella of "agroforestry". And the program aims "to support a biodiverse and climate resilient riparian zone that will enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators and fish and aquatic species, and support the establishment of culturally significant plants." Further you appear to allow restoration thinning within the core zone. I would describe all salmon recovery riparian effort as a form of agroforestry, and probably more that than than "restoration" by most formal definitions of restoration (requiring reference conditions, which include tribes?).    Does this mean I can plant nettles in the understory of my riparian forest but I cannot pick them until after the grant? I can plant lupine in my young forest, but I cannot collect the seeds within 120' of the river? | The language in this section of our funding guidelines about what can and cannot be done within the riparian zones was guided in part by our Water Quality program and their funding guidelines, to ensure that all Ecology funded projects are protective of water quality. As you’ve noted, the minimum buffer widths are the “core zone” widths of a three-zone RMZ, and the activities that are restricted from the RMZ are primarily aimed at protecting habitat and water quality.    The following language from the [State Fiscal Year 2026 Water Quality Funding Guidelines](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapps.ecology.wa.gov%2Fpublications%2Fdocuments%2F2410048.pdf&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ecy.wa.gov%7C6c104726e2cb46b7b4b608dd1b01c1d0%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638696417055360725%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=dzJ8AKV6bAXybjbHXQDKt%2B7jKeiRfsIvbcWvYWOwjYM%3D&reserved=0) describes the intent of the core zone protection and what is meant by “minimally managed” riparian zones (Appendix J page 192):     * “Minimally managed” riparian vegetation should be established and maintained with the intent of achieving a native species mixture and plant densities that are within the range of natural variability for the site’s native vegetation community potential. * “Minimally managed” includes activities such as:   + Establishment or supplemental planting of native vegetation   + Minimal thinning that is only intended to increase growth of remaining plants (e.g., where growth of the desired dominant native tree species is suppressed in a densely crowded stand). Thin from below and remove only the smaller trees.   + Minimal harvest of mature trees for personal use. Do not harvest the largest/tallest trees.   + Control of invasive/noxious plant species, preferably through non-chemical means. Chemical weed/pest management should be limited to prescriptions identified within a RMZ management plan as being necessary to support ecological functions; use of pesticides included in the National List of substances allowed under the National Organic Program (7 CFR 205) is highly encouraged.   + It does not include harvesting of trees, removal of fallen trees, growing crops, or livestock grazing.     Based on this, it appears that traditional tribal land management practices would be permissible in the Core Zone, so long as they are in line with this definition of minimal management and will benefit the habitat. If a proposal received funding, the details around those activities and how they are beneficial and not harmful to the site would be described in the riparian planting plan. |
| 100 | There is some weird circular logic that could go into operation here around the definition of "agroforestry". Most riparian legal frameworks are ambiguous about the level and intensity of disturbance or application allowed within a riparian zone (I am not grazing cattle). Do I have room to work, or am I stuck in a Kafkaesque situation of ambiguous definitions? Can I work with regulators to define target ecosystem functions and appropriate levels of disturbance within a riverscape that starts to define this space as part of the grant? Would that have value? | I think there is value in ironing out the details of what “minimally managed” means and how that intersects with cultural use and management practices for indigenous people. Consistency in terms and across programs is so important and is a struggle that we could work to smooth out. We are in the process of building a number of workgroups to dig deeper into technical riparian topics like this. I will keep add this topic to our list and see if it fits into one of our groups! |
| 99 | Can we provide the budget in an alternate format that allows you to see task cost and object class, and roll up easily or do you want us to only use the provided template? (I'd much much rather put task breakdown in rows, and object class and then insert narrative into rows)... I can still give you all kinds of rollup... I promise it will be pretty.    The budget narrative appears consolidated in the budget spreadsheet to a single text block by federal object class rather than broken out by task. Is this how you really want it or can I break down cost justification in a way that makes it easier to map task/object costs to a justification. I believe it will be much easier for planning and review. | You can submit another version of the budget so long as it contains the same required information.  Yes, you can report the budget narrative by task. |
| 98 | I have a question about geography. Since we are operating in a portion of the xx boundaries, would their proposal trump ours? | We are encouraging collaborative proposals for an area, and it would be great to see a combined approach for an area. At the same time, there is no criteria for eliminating or prioritizing one proposal over another if they are in the same geography. Each proposal will be scored according to the merit of the proposal itself and the demonstrated need for the work. |
| 97 | Can you describe what engineered designs for stream restoration includes? | **The funding guidelines state:** Funding for engineered designs for stream restoration and enhancement projects is only eligible when implementation is included in the scope of work. *Some exceptions may be allowable with Ecology approval, such as large-scale projects that CR2SL will not fund implementation for but would support, including*:   * *Instream restoration projects involving channel creation or reconstruction, large woody debris, and some bank stabilization strategies;* * *Floodplain reconnection projects that involve removal of bank armoring or fill-removal.*   It sounded like your proposal would fit into the italicized text above. Given that, please see the additional context that was provided after you left the office hours, below:  Implementation needs to be started using CR2SL funds if the funds are being used to cover the design/engineering. Projects are not required to be completed using CR2SL funds. We would consider funding design in proposals even if CR2SL is not going to fund the implementation of that specific project in the following situations:   * The proposal also includes extensive work in other categories and design is not the only thing being proposed * The project being designed fits into a wider, programmatic-level approach within the focus area, is supported by the local priorities/planning, and makes sense as a next step in that watershed |
| 96 | We are working on a large partnership proposal for the CR2SL. This will include King Conservation District as the lead, but also include King County, Snohomish County,  Snohomish CD, Tulalip Indian Tribe, Snoqualmie Indian Tribe, several planting partners, Edmonds College and potentially a few others.  My question is around the Tribal Engagement Letter.  From my reading of the Grant Guidelines and the Tribal Engagement information I had a few clarifying questions and making sure I understand the intent and requirement:   1. This is different than Cultural Resource Advising and Cultural Resource Advising will still need to occur after the grant award for specific sites, correct? 2. This letter is to introduce the concept and offer opportunities for potentially impacted tribes to comment, engage and be aware of our intentions, correct? 3. We only need to send it to the impacted tribes (Tulalip and Snoqualmie Indian Tribes) in our case, correct? 4. I have the Template, but just to confirm the primary info needed is    1. A description of the proposal and expected activities;    2. A description of any potential anticipated impacts to Tribal treaty rights, interests or land; *(including potential positive impacts as a result of the program)*    3. A map and description of geographic footprint of the proposal focus area (*not necessarily all specific sites we will be restoring)* 5. Finally, since this is not specific to Cultural Resources, is the intent to send this letter to people at the Tribe more comprehensive than Cultural Resources staff? I noticed the Template identifies a “Chairperson”, in my mind that would be different that the folks we usually send Cultural Resources to, maybe a Tribal leader?  I guess I am a little confused as to who at the Tribes we should be reaching out to, Tribal Leadership, Cultural Resource Staff, or Directors of Natural Resources Departments, or maybe all of them? | 1. Yes, this is different and separate from the cultural resource requirements. You can find cultural resource review guidance and requirements in [Appendix G of the funding guidelines.](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapps.ecology.wa.gov%2Fpublications%2Fdocuments%2F2406020.pdf&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ECY.WA.GOV%7C182f7ec5f62a4020cafe08dd1ad4137f%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638696220338281286%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=flfdr6n7Lv83Us9KVPN2P6DBCkwDRC%2FwlhuYQG5W7A8%3D&reserved=0)  2. Yes, the letter is intended to support Tribal engagement and potentially identify opportunities for Tribal involvement if capacity allows.  3. Yes, please only send the letter to Tribes that you identify as being potentially impacted or having interest in the project due to its location.  4. This list covers the requirements for the letter. At your discretion, feel free to include any additional context/information/photos that you think best illustrate the work that is being proposed. The provided list is not meant to be exclusive of other materials you might have available to communicate about the work.  5. For the purposes of this letter, it would be best to send the letter to the Tribal chairperson and the Tribal natural resources staff/department contacts that you have. We don’t have robust guidance for this, but the intent is to intentionally separate from the normal cultural resources review process in order to facilitate better integration amongst partners and to get in front of any potential objections from Tribes early so that it can be incorporated and addressed prior to the contract negotiations process. You may also include the cultural resources staff too, if desired. Note that only a copy of the letter is due at the time of the application and that a response from the Tribe is not required to be eligible. |
| 95 | Given the buffer width requirements in the grant guidelines, should we abandon this project idea and look for another site, or would Ecology potentially allow a conditional exemption? | First of all, for the minimum buffer width, our funding guidelines states that we can make exceptions to the minimum buffer width requirements, where the limitations can be documented (such as private homes abutting the stream as in your case). It requires additional paperwork and a somewhat uncharted process to gain EPA approval for any exemptions to the buffer width. Ecology has a process for exemptions with state funding and we would likely try to use that process a precedent to get EPA approval.  With that in mind, I would say that a proposal of this nature may not be as competitive next to a proposal that can achieve the full buffer width requirements. I do believe that most of the proposals you would be scored against will meet the minimum requirement widths.  However, I see an opportunity to turn this idea into something that would be more competitive if there is engagement and support from the landowners on the abutting properties. This funding source is strongly encouraging work with private landowners to create holistic approaches to riparian restoration. In this case, that could include getting the landowners or HOA on board to do an engineering design to stabilize the bank, including outreach and education funding, and letters of support from abutting landowners. I realize this is beyond what you are asking about. I also think there’s an opportunity to turn your proposal into a showcase urban project by engaging landowners, doing the hard next steps for the bank, and strategizing the best way to do the work for the whole slope and have some assurances that what you do, even if it’s more costly, will solve the problems that landowners are worried about. |
| 94 | I wanted to check in about my work in X Creek and see if any of it is a fit for the Climate Resilient Riparian Lead program you are working on. In the short term, I need funding for engineering 2 project designs to 100% design; our consultant will only do 30% design with current funding. The designs will include dike set-backs, new training berms, stream remeandering, inset floodplains, reed canary grass removal, and riparian buffers. Construction will of course include heavy machinery whenever we can scrape together funding for that. Ultimately, there is no longer fish access to Colony and much of Harrison Creek, and we would like to get it back to where it was a couple years ago where fish could make it to upper reaches of the stream. Buffers will be part of the design in some places, but there is more work that needs to be done first. | Proposals that are funded through this round will need to be completed by 2030, so keep in mind that there is a good 5 year stretch of time to work with. We are requesting proposals that take a reach scale approach, not a project on a single property, and it sounds like you are talking about multiple sites along a stretch. Design costs are eligible so long as some of the construction is also funded by these funds (does not have to be a completed project within the 5 years but started if we paid for design). There is some wiggle room in there as far as the “heavy machinery” restriction because we want to consider this detail on a case-by-case basis. Mainly, these funds are not aimed at huge instream projects that are better suited for other funding sources. The goal is to fill funding gaps, so we are encouraging work on smaller streams and in collaboration with landowners and other partners (such as Tribal involvement). Proposals are encouraged to take a program rather than project approach and include elements from multiple categories such as outreach and education, riparian restoration and monitoring and maintenance, to holistically bring together the partners and fill any gaps/needs for work to be done in that system. |
| 93 | Does the scoring and evaluation take into consideration the number of proposals by a given project sponsor? If we were to submit two proposals, would we be competing against ourselves in ways other than project merit? That is, might only one get funded even if both scored highly?    If we submitted an application to the first round and were unsuccessful, would we be able to submit a similar proposal in subsequent rounds, or will that be discouraged?    Would the development of a professional habitat restoration crew in our organization to support riparian restoration needs in our service watersheds be an eligible proposal?  Would the removal of an earthen dam (complete fish passage barrier) and riparian restoration in the area that is currently ponded because of the dam be an eligible proposal? | Thank you for your questions.   1. The scoring and evaluation criteria do not include anything about multiple applications from the same lead applicant. You are welcome to submit more than one proposal, which will be scored and competed separately based on merit of the proposal itself. If both proposals meet the prioritization criteria and can show a pressing and strategic need for funding, they could both be scored and funded. At the same time, we are looking for programmatic and watershed approaches to riparian work. Are there 2 proposals because of the funding cap? Or are there separate ideas for each proposal? We intentionally placed a high funding cap so that many projects could fit under one proposal as a programmatic approach to restoration throughout a watershed. 2. Unsuccessful applications will be given an opportunity to receive feedback and will be welcome to submit again in the summer of 2025, as long as the funding opportunity allows for the work. We may make adjustments to the funding priorities for the next round. We will explore ways to make re-applying easier on applicants that were unsuccessful in the first round. That is to say, re-applying is encouraged. 3. Developing a professional habitat restoration crew is eligible. 4. Yes, removal of a dam is also eligible, though we have a criteria that discourages use of heavy equipment for instream restoration. It states: “Instream activities that require use of big equipment or heavy machinery (unless negotiated with Ecology).” This will mostly be considered on a case by case basis if the proposal is selected. |
| 92 | I wanted you to know that we will not be proposing any placement of LWD under this proposal, but will instead focus our program on projects that can be installed by hand.    I did not see anything in the guidelines that rule out installations on property owned by the applicant or by the County. Is that right?    We will also be including marine shorelines in our planning efforts. I assume those would qualify as "riparian," yes? | The guidance has some information about the ownership requirements for different activities. Mainly, restoration/protection activities cannot be done on state or federal lands or led by state or federal agencies. If Vashon Maury Island Land Trust is the lead applicant and the county is a partner, those are eligible applicants for this work.    Shorelines are eligible, yes. I am not able to speak to what will be competitive comparatively. If you have an area that needs re-vegetation or is under threat of development that needs permanent easements or acquisitions, have known water quality impairments, validated by tribal voices, and important to salmon, then the application would be competitive and eligible for this funding source. We are not assuming only freshwater systems will fit this criteria. There are probably limited areas in the marine nearshore environments that would have all of that. That is a more challenging environment for this work to be competitive, but there are likely areas that would be competitive in this grant process. |
| 91 | How many watersheds are going to apply for this funding? | We do not have a list of potential applicants at this point. There is a lot of energy around the funding opportunity and we have fielded a lot of questions to indicate interest. Lots of interest in single site eligibility and small scale opportunities, but we are emphasizing watershed-scale proposals. This is the largest dollar amount for the 7 years award. This is a good opportunity for those that have large programmatic proposals, at $9 million and almost 5 years for implementation. Any of the next opportunities will likely be smaller amounts and have fewer time to implement. |
| 90 | We have the prioritization in our Implementation Strategy for the Chinook Recovery Plan with Tiers for SERF Board funding. We could use that prioritization, along with the 2015 status update of riparian plantings which identified areas that could use riparian planting. We have room to grow in finalizing that list. Also, we have some priorities on Conservation easements. For our application, we could connect those 3 things for a prioritization. But we also need to include landowner willingness. We could discuss further. | Note that the things fit into the broader context questions on the application and are on the right track for the reach scale planning category. It sounds like you are thinking about the watershed scale, which is great. There might also be opportunities to explore smaller scale restoration and reaches within each of the criteria you mentioned. |
| 89 | If you are going to do invasive treatment in a riparian area, if the buffers are smaller than listed, does maintenance need to meet the minimum requirement as well? | As far as we understand it, the buffer width is intended for riparian restoration, not necessarily riparian plantings. The Terms and Conditions from EPA do not speak directly about EPA’s approval process. We have not spent a lot of time on determining the minimum standards for effective use of funding but we will need to work with you if that’s a key part of your programmatic approach in working with landowners to plant new sites and maintain existing sites. |
| 88 | For invasive species, does it have to be on an area that is being planted, or does it have to be in a riparian area for the entire watershed? If we have knotweed and private landowners that could use planting and maintenance support. | We can fund additional maintenance of invasive species in the watershed under the monitoring and maintenance category? |
| 87 | I have a critical question that will inform whether we put the effort into applying for the current Climate Resilient Riparian Grant:     * Will another opportunity open in the future for the same funding? If so, when? | Thanks for your questions. I don’t really have capacity to meet with everyone at this point, but if you have other questions, go ahead and send them via email.     * Will another opportunity open in the future for the same funding? If so, when? * We do have another funding opportunity likely opening in late summer of next year, likely early August through early November. We do not yet know if it will have the same funding priorities, or what the allocation will include. It will likely include similar priorities and categories. I am encouraging applicants to get an application in for the first round if possible, because there may be opportunities for this first round to guide the next solicitation, and it might be easier to re-apply if you choose to apply in the first round and don’t get funding. There would also be opportunities to receive feedback and adjust the application, if necessary. The funding next year will likely be the last big funding solicitation for this program. |
| 86 | Given the buffer width requirements in the grant guidelines, should we abandon this project idea and look for another site, or would Ecology potentially allow a conditional exemption? | First of all, for the minimum buffer width, our funding guidelines states that we can make exceptions to the minimum buffer width requirements, where the limitations can be documented (such as private homes abutting the stream as in your case). It requires additional paperwork and a somewhat uncharted process to gain EPA approval for any exemptions to the buffer width. Ecology has a process for exemptions with state funding and we would likely try to use that process a precedent to get EPA approval.    With that in mind, I would say that a proposal of this nature may not be as competitive next to a proposal that can achieve the full buffer width requirements. I do believe that most of the proposals you would be scored against will meet the minimum requirement widths.    However, I see an opportunity to turn this idea into something that would be more competitive if there is engagement and support from the landowners on the abutting properties. This funding source is strongly encouraging work with private landowners to create holistic approaches to riparian restoration. In this case, that could include getting the landowners or HOA on board to do an engineering design to stabilize the bank, including outreach and education funding, and letters of support from abutting landowners. I realize this is beyond what you are asking about. I also think there’s an opportunity to turn your proposal into a showcase urban project by engaging landowners, doing the hard next steps for the bank, and strategizing the best way to do the work for the whole slope and have some assurances that what you do, even if it’s more costly, will solve the problems that landowners are worried about. |
| 85 | We have been working and coordinating restoration in the South Sound Wildlife area located here in Lakewood for the past 4 years.  I have been working with NW Youth Corps for a number of years and work has started in the Riparian zone along Chambers creek this summer.    Work has included the West Bank from downstream of Steilacoom lake to the middle of the  Wildlife area owned by DFW. Primary focus will be downstream from the Hatchery at 82nd SW and Phillips RD  to the hatchery located at 85th ST SW.    None of this Riparian zone is maintained by the state along the creek but I discovered this exclusion in the manual for the grant:    "State and federal agency facilities and other duties and responsibilities"    Before I proceed with the process I wanted to be sure this will not be a stumbling block to the application All the scope of restoration work fits well into grant requirements. | From your description, here's my reply. If the restoration activities are taking place downstream of the hatchery on residential and Pierce County Parks lands, then I don't see an issue with the clause. If some of the work will take place at the hatchery or on lands owned by DFW, then the clause would apply. The primary focus of the funding is to engage private landowners and provide support to their needs in strategic places with a holistic approach.    Please clarify if I have that correct.  Are any of the lands you are including in the proposal owned by DFW? Is the hatchery included in the focus area of the work? |
| 84 | We are considering a Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Lead proposal with potential acquisitions, and I wanted to clarify some information from the funding guidelines.  Appendix M notes appraisal requirements and directs the reader to RCO manual 3 for general deliverable guidance. Regarding appraisals-  ***Appraisal and/or review appraisal determining the market value for individual acquisitions prior negotiating closing with a landowner. Appraisals must be performed to Ecology Yellow Book116 and Uniform Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions117 (USFLA);***  Are offers to a landowner restricted to the appraisal value, or is there any room to negotiate?  I would assume the answer is no if RCO manual 3 is the guiding document. | Thank you for your interest in the program and a good question.  I believe we will follow the RCO manual 3 guidance document regarding appraisals. I believe legally, government funding needs to follow appraised values. Though I understand the challenges associated with that in practice. |
| 83 | I hope this email finds you well. I am reaching out to propose a collaboration for the upcoming grant program, focusing on Hybrid Artificial Intelligence to analyze infrastructure resilience.  Given the significance of the issues at hand, I believe a collaborative approach would be advantageous in developing a strong and competitive proposal. I would like to propose a project titled "Measuring Infrastructure Resilience and Evaluating Climate-Resilient Effects on Geotechnical Properties Using Hybrid Artificial Intelligence." The specifics will depend on the quality and availability of data.  Please let me know if you are interested in pursuing this collaboration. I look forward to hearing from you. | Thank you for reaching out.  I am a bit confused by your request to collaborate. Are you intending to submit an application to the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program on behalf of Oregon State University? I do recommend putting together partners for a collaborative application. I would also recommend including some of the requirements of the program, including riparian systems into the proposal in a strong way.  I am limited in my knowledge about how hybrid artificial intelligence could be used for infrastructure resilience and what that means in practice and in concept. Is this in a modeling or monitoring capacity? We do have a funding priority that supports creative means to model or monitor existing conditions within a reach or watershed. This would need to be associated with rivers, streams, or other water bodies within a location. |
| 82 | We are curious if a bundles project would do better than a project that combined all of these ideas?  Colin mentioned that we would need to describe each of the areas and the conditions both ecologically and the landscape with the landowners, but we are not trying to get a feel for how well we would do if these were separate applications in case this feels like a lot of work for one project sponsor to handle.    This would be a way of lightening the load when it came to contracting the subawards. | Bundling focus areas like the ones you’ve described may very well make sense for the proposal. You will want to describe these different focus areas in detail and how the overall programmatic proposal brings the right partners together to account for nuances in landowner and land use dynamics. We want to see the right partners convened with the right reach-scale strategies to prioritize implementation that accounts for these differing or similar dynamics. If this is best done with an umbrella organizational structure that supports all three focus areas, and this could lead to durable and sustainable solutions into the future, this would meet the intent of our funding goals. |
| 81 | I’m working w/ a fisheries enhancement group and a landowner to advance a project to remove a small earthen dam and restore the natural stream and riparian area.  I noticed in the CR2SL solicitation guidelines that ineligible proposals include “Instream activities that require use of big equipment or heavy machinery (unless negotiated with Ecology).”  My team is considering applying for design funding for this dam removal and riparian restoration project, but I’d like to know your thoughts on whether we’d be considered eligible, or if it sounds like this program wouldn’t be a good fit for this project.  I’m happy to chat if that would be easier than an email. | Thank you for your interest in the program.  We are encouraging collaborative, programmatic proposals that include strategic planning, landowner outreach, and watershed restoration across programs. This seems like one good project, and I would encourage you to make partnerships and fold it into a larger restoration/protection effort.    You are correct that the Funding Guidelines includes flexible language about heavy equipment, which would mostly be considered on a case by case basis if the proposal is selected. I would encourage a proposal if you have all of the collaborative, programmatic approach to riparian restoration including this implementation and design project. |
| 80 | South Sound Beaver Recovery; we are interested in the grant opportunity.  We help manage beaver habitat thru doing co-existence strategies & techniques with landowners & relocate beavs from problem areas to non-conflict. We are very small, but mighty! We have relocated 17 beavers to non conflict sites this year for riparian restoration.  I'm unsure if we fit anywhere in this grant program.  Do you think there's a fit? Please let me know your thoughts. | Thank you for your interest in the program. I know we met at the south sound workshop and I saw you again on the South Sound riparian meeting today. Do you have any follow-up questions after the presentation?  We are encouraging a programmatic approach to riparian restoration and/or protection, and it might be better to collaborate with partners for this application. |
| 79 | I am reaching out today to inquire if you could point me toward the recording of last week's CRRS grant webinar? I am meeting with fellow stakeholders on Friday and would like to be sure to pass this along to my collaborators before the meeting. | Sorry this took so long. We don’t have it up on the website yet, we seem to have some holiday delays. But here is a link to [the YouTube video](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nbj1fP40kP8). |
| 78 | It sounds like a homeowner that has received a shore friendly grant for plantings would still be eligible, though less competitive, for this source? | If they have a bulkhead that is impeding function, it is not likely going to be competitive. If they have a naturally seeding shoreline, it is certainly eligible. |
| 77 | With this program, the geographical approach for long-term implementation to improve riparian habitat, would there be valuable in a marine shoreline pocket estuary project to see how this is impactful- how competitive would a project like that be to show a different impact. | Not able to speak to what will be competitive comparatively. If you have an area that needs re-vegetation or is under threat of development that needs permanent easements or acquisitions, have known water quality impairments, validated by tribal voices, and important to salmon, then the application would be competitive and eligible for this funding source. We are not assuming only freshwater systems. There are probably limited areas in the marine nearshore environments that would have all of that. That is a more challenging environment for this work to be competitive, but there are likely areas that would be competitive in this grant process. |
| 76 | Owner issues come up in each question. How receptive to including strategies to approach landowners? | Would like to be receptive. Ultimately the landowner discussions are at the core of private landowner work. We want to learn from your experience and these grants to learn how to and to work effectively with private landowners. |
| 75 | Does biochar increase the viability of riparian plantings, can we do it in a larger geographical area- if there is a theme tying those areas together, would it be reasonable for it to be beyond the specific geographic area. | We do want specific geographies to have the primary investment. Describe the research need in the native plant category, why it’s important, and what the research gap you could be filling in the application. |
| 74 | Interested in increasing the nursery availability of maritime juniper stock for maritime shoreline plantings and lower watershed river systems. Identifying work that has been done and finding the nursery space to do it. Would the research be able to be funded with this grant? | Yes- we want to learn how to do this work better for plant availability and assisted migration. No one knows what to do about it and we would like to see some research done. |
| 73 | Can this money be used for invasives removal?  Could this be inclusive as a specific area- to address invasives more than we currently do, not associated with new plantings. Hire additional seasonal noxious and invasive species management. | Yes- if being proposed as part of the package that includes invasives and plantings work, those areas are eligible.  Eligible yes, but will not speak to how competitive that may be when compared to other. |
| 76 | Are marine and nearshore waters eligible? | Yes. We want to see a programmatic proposal to show the scale of implementation and describe the larger need that the proposal supports. |
| 75 | Can you define 'light' restoration actions? Not using heavy equipment. | We are not trying to get involved in regrading and use of heavy equipment that have other sources. We want to make sure that what makes sense with a landowner that we have the flexibility to do so. We are really focused on the landowner incentives and riparian planting elements. |
| 74 | Can you help us see if something is competitive?  If we put in an application, will there be an opportunity for feedback? | Yes, Libby will follow up with applicants with information about the review after the grant round. Depending on the proposals in this first round will inform the next round of proposals. We have a lot of room to adjust the next round and provide feedback. |
| 73 | One of the issues with federal grants is the limitation for grant rates, which is below our overhead. Wondering if we are a subcontractor, can we negotiate rates that make sense for us? | Technically, we don't get involved with the subcontracts. Our agreement is with the overarching entity. Regardless of the entity: Contract or sub-contract, if the grant is federally funded the recipient receives their federally approved indirect/overhead rate. If they don't have an approved rate, it defaults to the 10% de minimus rate. No pass down of rates from contractor to sub-contractor. |
| 72 | If we are proposing a project that is maintenance or management, will we need to adhere to buffer widths? | It depends. The term and condition addresses new plantings, so there may be some flexibility on a case by case basis. The application may need to describe the reach scale, the trajectory, and how this proposed maintenance help to support that trajectory- describe the key elements for what makes sense to the restoration sites in your focus area. |
| 71 | What about contracting?  Will you be willing to contract with more than one partner, or will there be more than 1? | The application asks for a lead applicant and a single fiscal lead for this opportunity. |
| 70 | How much do partnerships with multiple jurisdictions/non profits factor into the priority for funding? | The evaluation criteria is available in the funding guidelines. The focus is having the right partnerships, more than the number of partnerships. This is supporting the right people convening to support a strategic approach for the area. Key partners lead to a sustainable approach and will be carefully considered. |
| 69 | How are federal lands taken off? We partner with Snoqualmie, can you speak to that?  We would be looking for partnerships- do you plan to share interested parties for potential partnerships? | We don’t have an ability to help support partnerships in that way. Collaboration and networks may have to happen through LIO coordinators and these implementation networks. |
| 68 | Can this be used to meet TMDL requirements assuming that it meets other grant requirements? And multi-year implementation. We do something every year as part of a programmatic approach and might need to include multiple years to meet the minimum threshold. | Yes. And yes- the project period goes until June 2030, pending our request with EPA to extend this opportunity to 2030. |
| 67 | What kind of criteria for measures of success are you looking for? Acres restored, or linear feet, with the program? | Great question. Each funding priority has some indicators and metrics associated. The Funding Guidelines has an appendix with metrics and measures. The obvious set of metrics are linear feet and acres, but there is a broader set for this opportunity for landowner engagement and other activities. I encourage you to review the appendix. |
| 66 | Are we looking only at freshwater? | No. Marine shorelines are eligible. |
| 65 | Can the application span into multiple WRIAs? | Yes. Would want to see how you are organizing with organizations. How the approach makes sense on an ecological and partner dynamics perspective. |
| 64 | I’m hoping you might have some time for a chat about the CR2S grants. I lead the Watershed Resilience Program at DNR and we are interested in a collaborative proposal with a couple of RFEGs, but I need some clarity about the limitations on working with state agencies and on state lands before I get much further down the road of proposal development and partners engagement.  Are state agencies eligible to provide much needed capacity for maintenance on other lands?  Can this work be done on state and private lands? | Thank you for your interest in the program!  As you likely know, State agencies are ineligible to be a lead applicant, though they can support other eligible applicants, like RFEGs. The state lands limitation includes restoration or permanent protection of riparian areas on state owned/managed lands. There are plenty of activities that DNR can partner with RFEGs on for this funding opportunity.  The funding is not intended to include state owned aquatic lands for implementation work, however, I encourage you to include the full strategy of riparian restoration in your proposal to show the need, though the work needs to be focused primarily on privately owned land. |
| 63 | I was reading about the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program in the latest DOE weekly digest bulletin email. Will this grant ever be available for the rest of Washington State? We are working with several Eastern WA cities to develop their Climate Element for the Comprehensive Plan. Future availability of a grant such as the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems program would go a long way to help local elected officials to see the benefit in creating meaningful local goals and policies that will set the city up for future success and potential funding. | Thanks for reaching out.  I’m glad to hear about this work and understand how far funding like this could go for you.  Unfortunately, this funding is coming from the EPA Region 10 and is allocated for the Puget Sound at this time.  There is a small possibility that work being done outside of the region could qualify for some innovation work if there is a way to expand models of work from one location to another. However, the implementation funds cannot be used outside of the Puget Sound at this time.  I have been collecting a fair amount of frustration for this limitation, and I truly understand the need in other locations. If we can use this funding opportunity to prove that riparian implementation funds are needed and can be well used, it is a long-term goal to institutionalize the funding source and perhaps expand that to all of Washington. |
| 62 | What is/would be the term length of the awarded funding?  How many years to use these funds? | The timing for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems:  Application selection released: March 5, 2025  Contract negotiations: March – July 2025  Grant period: May 2025 – June 2030 |
| 61 | Who do we reach out to to chat through a specific project? Need to talk about what they would like to do with "innovation". | Libby Gier ([Libby.Gier@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Libby.Gier@ecy.wa.gov)), and office hours published on the website. |
| 60 | Ineligible activities section mentions facilities, but what about facilities/materials in relation to nurseries? | Those activities and costs are eligible for nursery activities. |
| 59 | If there is a restoration project that requires more funds and would allow for more work, can funds be utilized towards a project, or is this strictly for the plantings? (leverage, using these funds for match) | This funding can be used for match for other programs. |
| 58 | Implementation category - implementation needs to be a part of the proposal if design is included. What if the project won’t be completed with CR2SL funds? | That’s ok, just need to get started on implementation with CR2SL funds, not complete the project. |
| 57 | Prior descriptions of this funding focused on innovative techniques - but this seems more focused on traditional. Any flexibility where we can't get the traditional buffer widths? | The program is intended to be innovative, give us your vision for landowner incentives. Buffer widths need to meet the minimum requirements in the FG. |
| 56 | Is there a scale to the restoration that is indicated for this funding? | Programmatic, collaborative, watershed scale. Mapping question looks at the whole watershed and focuses in from there. |
| 55 | Metrics - can we consolidate metrics for the whole grant, provides flexibility for number of plants per site. Do metrics have to be specific to the site or can be consolidated | The metrics do not be tied to specific sites, and can likely be consolidated. |
| 54 | Are the investment priorities are weighted equally? Are any of them less of a priority than others? | They are not in priority order, they are in more of a sequential order. No priority of one over another. |
| 53 | Should we focus on programmatic planning for this first round and save implementation for the 2nd round? What will the 2nd round of funding look like? | We encourage proposing the whole picture in this first round,  We don't know what the next round of funding will look like, changes could occur, we have funding now for the first round |
| 52 | We were not able to attend the informational meeting on November 13 to hear more about the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems funding opportunity. Was that meeting recorded and will it be accessible on the website? I was looking for it today and didn't see it, but I could have missed it. | We are working on getting the video posted on the website. It should be on the Climate Resilient website shortly.  I will be sure to send you a link when it’s up. |
| 51 | Kirkland is considering this grant application and we have a question about the potential requirements that may come into play with being awarded federal funding. If there is a hard infrastructure component to a project, such as removing or replacing stormwater infrastructure or bank protection, will there be additional federal contracting requirements? Other grants we have received State sources that include Federal funds have required American Iron and Steel and some even Build America, Buy America program compliance. | I’m happy to hear that Kirkland is considering the [grant opportunity](https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian). If you could share a bit more about the project idea, I can better advise you on the eligible activities. The [Funding Guidelines](https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/2406020.html) has a lot of specificity for eligible and ineligible activities. I’m wondering if there will be large construction equipment included in the proposal, as that is one of the activities that is ineligible for the most part. There is also specific streambank protection requirements lined out in the Funding Guidelines, Chapter 2.2.3. And of course, the work is intended to be a larger programmatic proposal with riparian restoration and/or protection at the core. It sounds like this may be a stormwater project with some riparian plantings unless I am missing something. |
| 50 | Is there any risk of this funding being affected by federal administration changes? | Very unlikely. Ecology has a portion of the funds in hand, and the rest will be dispersed over the next year. |
| 49 | Is there a water rights opportunity? | Not eligible or ineligible. Likely would work if tied to LO incentive |
| 48 | Our project is a construction project to restore a stream for salmon habitat. It appears that the grant dollars is based on Federal funding. Do we need to apply for a NEPA or is a SEPA sufficient?  Also, could you let me know the timeline in regards to when Awards will be announced and when funding is expected to arrive? | The funding is EPA BIL funding, passed through to Ecology. More information will be provided in the funding guidelines once it is available for sharing on November 5.  NEPA will not be required for implementation for this program.  The timing for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems:  Application selection released: March 5, 2025  Contract negotiations: March – July 2025  Grant period: May 2025 – June 2030 |
| 47 | A portion of our project would require us to place engineered log jams with helicopters and use machines on the ground to anchor them. In the list of ineligible activities you have:  "Instream activities that require use of big equipment or heavy machinery (Unless negotiated with Ecology).  If we can deliver everything you require, from planning, community engagement, and engineering through implementation for less than $2,750,000, can we negotiate that with you? | We are encouraging collaborative, programmatic proposals that include strategic planning, landowner outreach, and watershed restoration across programs. This seems like one good project, and I would encourage you to make partnerships and fold it into a larger restoration/protection effort.    You are correct that the Funding Guidelines includes flexible language "unless negotiated with Ecology" which would be a case by case basis if the proposal is selected. I would encourage a proposal if you have all of the collaborative, programmatic approach to riparian restoration including this implementation project. |
| 46 | The City of Redmond is considering applying for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grant opportunity for our Evans Creek Relocation project. The project includes approximately 12-acres of native planting, replacing a monoculture of Reed canary grass. The project is in the final design phase and is waiting on a flood permit and a few property agreements, but we anticipate going to construction in the summer of 2025, with planting in the fall of 2025 and winter of 2026.  Does that timing work for the grant process? I could not find the schedule on the website. | Thank you for your interest in the program! We are encouraging collaborative, programmatic proposals that include strategic planning, landowner outreach, and watershed restoration. This seems like one good project, and I would encourage you to make partnerships and fold it into a larger restoration/protection effort.  The timing for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems:  Application selection released: March 5, 2025  Contract negotiations: March – July 2025  Grant period: May 2025 – June 2030  Let me know if you have any questions. |
| 45 | Who is on the grant selection committee and how was this formed? | No details/nuances shared. Mostly coalition members and efforts to include Tribal participation. |
| 44 | How to address long term need for landowner incentives and maintenance funds within grant timeframe: | May be able to allocate funds to a trust that can be doled out over a longer time period. There is also an option for a lump sum payment. |
| 43 | How are we weighting impacts/adaptation to climate change and approach to doing riparian restoration? | Dynamics are evolving. We want to see proposals that acknowledge possible climate impacts, implementation will be flexible and adaptively managed. |
| 42 | Are there climate projections/models that applicants can use? |  |
| 41b | Ther are several properties in riparian areas/CMZs that have existing open code violations of solid waste (motorhomes, refrigerators, washers, etc) that end up in the creeks rivers when it floods.  The landowners do not have the means to clean up the property.  What we are thinking is creating a program where the landowner agrees to have the County help with clean up (landowner incentive) and they agree to work with Conservation District /an or myself to come up with a riparian restoration plan that they help with plantings and then then agree to steward the area(possibly a permanent protection easement).  We would also do outreach of other high priority riparian areas for voluntary landowners who want to restore their riparian area.  This is it in a nutshell.  I would love to chat more about this idea.  We see it as a way to keep solid waste out of salmon rivers/streams and implement riparian restoration. | Wow, that sounds great.  Here are the guidelines I can provide in response. We cannot fund mitigation or remediation for violations, even solid waste violations. We have a line item in our ineligible activities list that says “Solid and hazardous waste cleanup”. As long as the funds are used as you describe and are not used for the solid waste cleanup part of the program, it would be an eligible requirement.  The outcomes of this proposal certainly seem admirable. |
| 41a | Clallam County has interest in applying for this grant.  We have a novel idea that I wanted to talk with you about to see it is something that could be funded. | Thank you for your interest in the program.  I am excited to hear about Clallam County’s interest and would be glad to identify whether the proposal is eligible under the investment priorities for this funding opportunity. If you could write a brief summary of the novel idea, I will be able to advise.  We also have a pre-applicant webinar today at 2pm that might help answer some questions. The recording will be available shortly thereafter. |
| 40 | Are subsequent years of funding dependent of future federal budget application or is the $25 million currently set aside as obligated? | It is in EPAs hands and expect to see a final allocation by October of 2025. |
| 39 | Would we describe the kind of incentive we are wanting to lay the framework for the program, then put an estimated budget for the next funding round? | Great question. The application requests that you consider the types of incentives you could offer in a strategic approach to the program. You could put a funding estimate along with that response. We are more interested in what you are thinking about. We would like to see that you have considered and have interest in the types of landowner payments. Likely, we will be close to knowing what eligible expenses look like by the time we get to contracting. |
| 38 | What does ecology support look like for near final applications? | Our grant writing and reviewing support is very limited. We can verify that you meet all of the eligibility and activity requirements. You have all of the resources in front of you at this point, we do not offer grant writing assistance at this time, or advise on competitive advantages, to be sure to be fair to all applicants. |
| 37 | What are some of the different rates (flexibility in the program) for leases and acquisitions? | For acquisitions, we have an appendix that speaks to the standards. RCP’s state policies are in place. Up to 10% fair market value if approved by Ecology based on USFLA appraised value and yellow book standards.  For leases, we do not have a specific policy for leases at this time, though we can discuss more about ecosystem service payment options. Commodity basis for payment and an ecosystem service basis for payment. One lump sum payment is simple to do upfront with challenges of stewardship later. Potential for a payment over time managed by another entity, with funding placed into a trust that is drawn down over time. Looking into opportunities to do that.  If that is a critical part of the strategy, we want to hear about them. |
| 36 | We are trying to design an integrated, programmatic proposal working together on the riparian restoration approach, which is the future of this work. It’s complicated, has numerous objectives, where are the sideboards for what we should not consider? Example: we have some unique opportunities to engage with landowners that were previously enrolled in other programs, and now could be interested in permanent conservation easements. They might not be riparian acres exactly - how do wetlands and floodplains fit in? Should they intentionally be excluded from this grant source? | Riparian wetlands where hydrologically connected to a salmon bearing stream should be considered for this funding source. The strategy for scaling up the work and having a durable, long-term program to meet land owner needs would be a great backing for those types of ideas. We want to see early ideas and opportunities for supporting riparian restoration programs. What are the less risky approaches (with existing relationships) alongside the early opportunities. Want to have a lot of flexibility in what gets implemented over the five year time frame. Describe some of the projects where implementation can be done, and describe the vegetation task – can work with you to determine what to fund within the grant period. |
| 35 | We have large groups involved in this area and each has capacity to administer large grants. It’s difficult when the tasks are spread across different entities. Do you have to have 1 lead that the money goes through and is distributed? Could ecology contract separately with one application under a single proposal? | Up until now, Ecology has described the funding opportunity with a single lead. It is possible that we could consider administering multiple agreements within one grant award, but unlikely. |
| 34b | Thank you so much for the prompt response! Based on my read of the RFP, I’m thinking we would likely fit more into the riparian restoration implementation priority as at this point we’ve identified target areas and are in the process of drafting habitat restoration designs (about the 60% level or thereabouts). If we secured funding through we would likely be using it to complete the restoration designs and commence construction/site preparation. Our staff estimates about 50% of the work is occurring on private lands with the remainder taking place on federal lands. Based on that split, I’m thinking this particular project might not be the best fit for this specific funding source. Does that seem reasonable based on your understanding of the RFP?  Thank you again for helping us evaluate this funding source! | I would encourage you to apply with the riparian restoration implementation on private lands as the basis of the proposal. Perhaps there is a way to propose funding the private lands part of the proposal now, then work with other funding sources for the federal lands aspects. We discussed having flexibility for proposals like this, but do not have a sense of how well they will compare with proposals that are 100% on private lands. It still seems like a good fit to me. |
| 34a | I had a question regarding eligibility for this grant round that I was hoping you might be able to shed some light on. Long Live the Kings is supporting the Nisqually Indian Tribe to help design and implement a climate resilience focused habitat restoration plan for the Nisqually River Delta. We are confident that much of this work aligns with the goals of the funding opportunity, but I also know that portions of this project occur on or are adjacent to federal land as the delta includes the federal Nisqually Wildlife Refuge as well as land owned by Joint Base Lewis–McChord. I know the RFP lists “Riparian restoration implementation on most federal owned property” as being ineligible. Considering the “most” qualifier, do you have any guidance on when a project that includes federal land might be eligible?  I’m happy to hop on Zoom or a phone call to dig into this in greater detail. I also want to note that this project isn’t occurring exclusively on federal land and the climate resilience benefits will most certainly flow to flood prone communities along the Nisqually River. | Great question.  Eligibility for this funding opportunity depends on the kind of proposal. Most of what you describe would fit into the categories of reach-scale planning, which can include all types of lands in the reach and watershed. Most implementation activities on federal lands are ineligible, however, there is some flexibility in the funding given that these are intended to be programmatic, collaborative proposals across a watershed, and if some of the areas that are identified as the key reaches from reach scale planning lead to a suite of implementation activities across the stream, including some state or federal lands. If the most holistic approach includes “some” federal lands, it may be considered. |
| 33 | The Port of Camas Washougal maintains many acres of property along the Columbia River.  Would we be eligible for funding under 1.3.4. Maintenance, Monitoring and Adaptive Management ?  We do not have a past habitat restoration project site that needs maintenance but have significant areas of existing riparian habitat that need would benefit from maintenance and adaptive management. | Thanks for reaching out. Unfortunately, this funding is coming from the EPA Region 10 and is allocated for the Puget Sound. There is a small possibility that work being done outside of the region could qualify for some innovation work if there is a way to expand models of work from one location to another. However, the implementation funds cannot be used outside of the Puget Sound at this time. I have been collecting a fair amount of frustration for this limitation, and I truly understand the need in other locations.  If we can use this funding opportunity to prove that riparian implementation funds are needed and can be well used, it is a long-term goal to institutionalize the funding source and perhaps expand that to all of Washington. |
| 32 | There was one follow-up question after the presentation regarding Priority E: Maintenance, monitoring, and adaptive management.  We are still in the early stages of developing our ideal project list, but TNC currently has some monitoring occurring at their Port Susan Bay site. If they’d like to continue or expand upon an existing project that monitors effectiveness to help inform future restoration and track changes and there is currently a QAPP in place will they have to submit another QAPP for this funding source? | You would likely be able to submit the same QAPP materials to Ecology with some documentation about how this expands on the same methods and be able to use the same methods and a streamlined QAPP process. I think it will still need to be reviewed by our Quality Assurance officer and likely approved with a reasonable turn around time.  Thank you for your interest in the program, and congrats on receiving a National Coastal Wetlands grant. |
| 31 | ﻿…Is this Riparian Granting only for the PS area?...what about Eastern Washington, especially NE/Stevens County/Loon Lake? | Thanks for reaching out. Unfortunately, this funding is coming from the EPA Region 10 and is allocated for the Puget Sound. There is a small possibility that work being done outside of the region could qualify for some innovation work if there is a way to expand models of work from one location to another. However, the implementation funds cannot be used outside of the Puget Sound at this time. I have been collecting a fair amount of frustration for this limitation, and I truly understand the need in other locations.  If we can use this funding opportunity to prove that riparian implementation funds are needed and can be well used, it is a long-term goal to institutionalize the funding source and perhaps expand that to all of Washington. |
| 30 | I saw the Climate Resilient Riparian grants were released today. I was looking through eligibility and see that “local governments” are listed. In some grants this includes port districts, but I do not see them listed instead it just says counties, cities/towns.  I am wondering if ports are eligible for this grant program? I am hoping I would be able to distribute  this opportunity to our members.  Thanks for your time and attention to this. | Thank you for your question and interest in promoting the grant opportunity.  Great question- eligibility for ports will be based on who owns the land.  If ports would like to do restoration on the land or shorelines that are managed by the ports, eligibility would depend on who owns that land that the restoration would take place on. Port districts themselves may participate in some of the other priorities, like reach scale planning and outreach, without this clause.  I encourage you to distribute the opportunity to your members perhaps with this nuance called out, it would be a great way to include the ports.  Anyone interested in learning more should [sign up for updates here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) and can [visit the website](https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian). |
| 29 | To access additional funding later on, how much flexibility to build into the proposed scope of work? | Initially proponents will propose a set of tasks and deliverables, as new information is obtained or phases achieved, there will be opportunities to amend the agreements to incorporate new work as needed. It will be helpful if applicants can demonstrate that they have the structure in place to prioritize and implement new work. Example: a watershed may have a set of criteria that they use to evaluate different reaches based on habitat qualities, and target landowner outreach according to how individual parcels score within this criteria. Individual landowners and parcels do not need to be identified in the proposal, but sharing this prioritization strategy will give confidence to address emergent needs as they come up during the award period. |
| 28 | Will there be any "right-sizing" of proposed activities after proposals are ranked? | Yes, once all proposals are received and ranked, the grant team may work with applicants to right size their projects based on the amount of funding available and synergies or overlap with other projects. |
| 27 | Are any of the six categories higher priority than others?  ie., is there a project type that will rank better? | No, we encourage applicants to apply to any range of the categories, from one through six. No category is prioritized over another, though we will be looking for collaborative, programmatic approaches to this work. |
| 26 | This focus primarily on freshwater riparian?  Or do you distinguish between freshwater and marine shorelines? | We expect to see more freshwater riparian applications, but we welcome proposals that have good strategic justification for the type of riparian system that they would like to restore or improve. |
| 25 | I recently say the new Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grants opportunity through DOE and am excited about the potential of it. I did have one question about it and that is whether these grants are targeted to only streams that are identified today as “salmon streams” or if it was open for any riparian system that is in need of restoration (which probably covers most in western Washington)? Here in Island County we don’t have many streams today that are functional for salmon spawning but we certainly do have stream systems that could use restoration. Maxwelton Creek on the south end and Crescent Creek on the north end come to mind. Before I invest more time into thinking about potential projects, I wanted to confirm the scope.  What design criteria parameters exist for riparian restoration implementation projects? Would the use of the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service conservation practice standards that focus on riparian and associated area plantings be sufficient criteria to follow if applying for implementation projects?  If awarded funding, is there a specific time window of execution (for example, if awarded funding in the first round, when would the funding “start” and need to “complete” by?)? Are extensions available if need arises, so long as they do not extend beyond the 2030 time window specified in the announcement? | Thank you for your questions and interest in the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  More information will be available on November 5 when the solicitation period opens including an extensive funding guidelines, applicant resources, and application materials. I believe all of your questions will be answered by those resources.  I recommend that you sign up for updates from [our program here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) for information about how to register for the applicant webinar and dates for the office hours. [More information available on the website](https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian).  The funding guidelines has recommendations for the riparian restoration implementation projects, which specifically references WDFW and Ecology guidance. Check it out once it’s available and let me know if you still have a question.  The contract dates are March 2025 – June 2030.  The application will describe the requirements for each application. It includes some questions about the strategic plans that the proposal is based upon and the context surrounding how the focus area was selected. There is also a mapping component to show the surrounding conditions for the work. |
| 24 | We’re interested in learning about this new grant and would like to get the link to the webinar scheduled for Nov 13.  In addition to the link requested, may I know if you will be recording the webinar and if so, may I request for a recording. | Thank you for your interest in the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  More information about the program will be available on November 5. Be sure to check the funding guidelines. If you know you are interested, [sign up for updates on the program’s listserv here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). We will be sure to share registration information for the November 13 office hours there once it is available. We will also be hosting office hours to answer applicant questions later in the application period.  We will have multiple recorded resources available to assist applicants, including a recording of the applicant webinar on the [program’s website here](https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian). |
| 23 | The City of Bellingham is very interested in pursuing the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grant when it opens in November. A few quick questions;  Could you send me the invite to the webinar on November 13th? I didn't see a link to sign up in the email I received.  Would you be able to spend some time via teams or zoom to talk through our project idea and make sure we understand how it would fit in this program? We have a very specific need, and this funding source seems like a perfect fit for us.  Thanks! Have a great day. | Thank you for your interest in the grant program.  If you sign up for updates from [our program here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340), we will share registration information there once it is ready.  It might be worth noting that we are encouraging proposals from multiple partners to support large scale restoration within a watershed. The minimum amount for each proposal reflects that, at $500,000.  We will host an applicant webinar on November 13, and a few office hours intended to answer questions about specific proposals. If you need further information or assistance after that, I would be happy to help. |
| 22 | I’m working with Tribes and land trusts on food forest work in riparian areas locally (Nisqually delta, Puyallup, R and on Vashon). The below is really interesting! Can we talk some time?  The attached is a description of the work we are doing this year, and just applied to USGS to expand and relate to climate resilience. | Congratulations on your work and thank you for your interest in our program.  All that I can advise you on at this time is if proposal is eligible for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program. The application is intended to support programmatic and ongoing riparian maintenance throughout Puget Sound watersheds. It includes reach scale planning, restoration in strategic places, purchasing properties, and maintenance activities. While your proposal would fit into the outreach and education category, I would encourage you to collaborate with other partners in the key focus area to propose a larger application. The minimum amount for a single application is $500,000. [More information available on the website](https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian).  Be sure to check the funding guidelines once it is released on November 5 for more information on what might be competitive.  And for your convenience, sign up for updates from [our program here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). |
| 21 | Hello Libby, I am a consultant working, on behalf of Island County. I am writing to request the Department of Ecology's support and coordination as we prepare our application for the PROTECT (Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation) Grant Opportunity from the U.S. Department of Transportation.  We are in the process of developing a planning grant proposal that will include a comprehensive resiliency plan aimed at mitigating the impacts of climate change and enhancing the sustainability of our transportation infrastructure. Island County recognizes the importance of a collaborative approach in creating a resilient transportation network, and your department’s expertise in environmental stewardship and sustainability is essential to our success.  We would greatly appreciate your collaboration in this effort, including sharing any relevant data or resources, as well as providing input on best practices that can align our project with state-level initiatives. Additionally, we welcome the opportunity to discuss ways in which our proposal can support the broader environmental goals of Washington State.  Please let us know if we can schedule a meeting or call to further discuss how we can work together on this important initiative. We look forward to your insights and support.  Thank you for your time and consideration. | All that I can advise you on at this time is if proposal is eligible for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  This does seem like an eligible proposal from an eligible applicant.    Be sure to check the funding guidelines once it is released on November 5 for more information on what might be competitive.  And for your convenience, sign up for updates from [our program here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). |
| 20 | I wanted to make sure there was a way for me to become aware of any upcoming Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grant informational applicant webinars that are planned. | Thank you for your interest in the grant program.  We do have a way to sign up for [our program’s listserv at this link](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) for news and updates.  There will be an applicant webinar and two opportunities for “office hours” where you can drop in and ask questions. |
| 19 | I have a few questions for you about this funding.  Can you let me know when is convenient to talk? | Thank you for your interest in the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  We are getting ready to release more information about the upcoming opportunity on November 5. I believe many of your questions will be answered by the funding guidelines and applicant materials [on this website](https://ecology.wa.gov/water-shorelines/puget-sound/helping-puget-sound/riparian-restoration/riparian-systems).  Feel free to sign up for updates about [the funding opportunity on this program’s listserv here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). |
| 18 | I’m working with a private landowner to investigate removal of a small earthen dam on their property which spans an unnamed tributary to Cottage Lake Creek near Woodinville, WA.    A key part of the project is identifying possible funding and I’d like your thoughts on whether removal of the dam and restoration of the creek and riparian corridor is eligible for the upcoming Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grant.    Likely either the county or the local fisheries enhancement group would be the grant applicant. The dam impounds a pond/wetland approximately 20,000 sq. ft.in size upstream of it, much of which has filled in with sediment. The dam crest is about 9’ tall at the downstream face.    In the next 2 years, the county is planning to replace an undersized culvert under a county road a short distance downstream of the dam. The road culvert and the dam are the last two known fish passage barriers on this stream.    Reviewing the grant website, it looks like this project would meet Riparian restoration implementation (Priority D); Maintenance, monitoring, and adaptive management (Priority E); and possibly Permanent protection of riparian habitat (Priority F).    But the details for these categories could aim to something entirely different than a dam removal and creek restoration, so I want to check with you about your thoughts on project eligibility. | Thank you for your interest in the program and your questions.  All that I can advise you on at this time is if proposal is eligible for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  This does seem like an eligible proposal from an eligible applicant. [More information available on the website](https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian).  Be sure to check the funding guidelines once it is released on November 5 for more information on what might be competitive.  And for your convenience, sign up for updates from [our program here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). |
| 17b | Thanks. I’m all signed up for updates.  This meeting would not be to the whole group – rather just King Conservation District, and some partners. Do you have preferred times for a smaller meeting?  Some up front questions that we have:  How do you recommend that sponsors apply, as individual grants or a bundle of projects that connect with one another and address various priorities?  How are multiple applications evaluated that are some from same watershed?  How would you recommend that partners prepare for Nov 5th when the application and criteria becomes open? | More information to answer your questions will be available along with the funding guidelines on November 5.  And Kayla Seaforth from BEF will be reaching out to each LIO/LE about scheduling individual meetings with partners.  We recommend that an application with multiple partners be completed for programmatic support within a watershed.  Applications will be evaluated separately. Each will be ranked according to the evaluation criterion. More information will be shared on November 5. We will have an applicant webinar and office hours to answer more project-specific questions throughout the period of the grant.  For now signing up for updates on our program’s listserv is the best way to get information. |
| 17a | I am supporting partners in the Snoqualmie Basin for teeing up there projects to the new Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program (Congrats on getting it underway!!!).  Can you please share a copy of the application, as I am unable to access it through the SAW portal.  Also, we would like to set up a time to meet with you and ask a few questions about the grant and the projects that Snoqualmie partners have in mind. Are there preferred times that you have available within the next 2-3 weeks? | Thanks for reaching out. We would be happy to come to one of your working group meetings in November to discuss the funding opportunity, if there’s a time that works for you.  The grant solicitation opens on November 5, so the solicitation materials are not quite ready to share. We will have the funding guidelines, application instructions, and application materials available at that time.  Sign up for [the program’s listserv](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) for updates on the dates for the applicant workshops and office hours, and if you want to, potential applicants can fill out the [intent to apply form](https://forms.office.com/g/1taWurhz6h), which helps us gauge interest. |
| 16 | I have been browsing the website for your program to find rfp and specifics for the application process. Do you have an RFP available?  I have added the service to our SAW account, but cannot find any further information on this proposal.  I was able to add the service to our current account. Also, I am wondering if a vendor number is  required for the application?  [https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fecology.wa.gov%2Fabout-us%2Fpayments-contracts-grants%2Fgrants-loans%2Ffind-a-grant-or-loan%2Fclimate-resilient-riparian&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ECY.WA.GOV%7C993940ff51f34a7722a408dced8542d6%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638646403813696017%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=yZ3K%2BqRxAxl5ECN6XjJShWSD2wgowxCyA7rAf0%2B8jnQ%3D&reserved=0) | While Ecology did receive your registration request it has been denied because the one-time EAGL registration was missing your name and a Statewide Vendor (SWV) number for the organization you were registering. Please visit [Vendor payee registration | Office of Financial Management (wa.gov)](https://ofm.wa.gov/it-systems/accounting-systems/statewide-vendorpayee-services/vendor-payee-registration) to set up a vendor number for the organization it takes 3-5 days. Once received you can complete the one-time EAGL registration form again. Be sure to add your personal name in the Name field on the form and add the SWV# and we along with the other information and we will get you approved as soon as possible. |
| 15 | I saw that Ecology will be administering the new Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grants and I was hoping you might be able to address a couple quick questions for me:  The grant program [website](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fecology.wa.gov%2Fabout-us%2Fpayments-contracts-grants%2Fgrants-loans%2Ffind-a-grant-or-loan%2Fclimate-resilient-riparian%3Futm_medium%3Demail%26utm_source%3Dgovdelivery&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ECY.WA.GOV%7C542b3f7d88754895f87608dced5291f7%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638646186101867351%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=v2ITPkl0rRvnJkeMYzRmVJl3lWBToPTB4dvxMJSRGDo%3D&reserved=0) indicates that an RFP is forthcoming on November 5. I presume this document will include information regarding the applicant webinar and office hour sessions referenced on the website, but please let me know if the details of those learning opportunities are already known/shareable.  The website indicates that this is a federally (EPA) funded program. As such, I assume NEPA review will be required for funded projects, or at least “implementation” type projects. Can you please confirm? | Thanks for reaching out and for your interest in the program.  I can answer all your questions!  You are correct, that most of the information you will need will be released on November 5. Be sure to sign up for [the program’s listserv](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) to get updates on things like the date of webinars, office hours, and release of application materials.  The funding is EPA BIL funding, passed through to Ecology. More information will be provided in the funding guidelines once it is available for sharing on November 5.  NEPA will not be required for implementation for this program. |
| 14b | A couple of follow up questions below.  Is there a target budget for proposals?  What is the process to negotiate for a heavy equipment implemented project?  What are the “programmatic approaches to strategic restoration/protection”?  We have a shovel ready project which would also benefit the City’s water supply, so we would be very interested in a no match habitat restoration funding source that could allow us to implement next summer as the City’s water well is increasingly vulnerable during summer low flows as the river continues to migrate west away from the well intake.  I will sign up for the listserv. | All that I can advise you on at this time is if proposal is eligible for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  This does seem like an eligible proposal from an eligible applicant. [More information available on the website](https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/payments-contracts-grants/grants-loans/find-a-grant-or-loan/climate-resilient-riparian).  The range for this funding opportunity award limit is $500,000-$2.75 million.  Be sure to check the funding guidelines once it is released on November 5 for more information on what might be competitive.  And for your convenience, sign up for updates from [our program here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). |
| 14a | I’m interested in connecting to touch base of the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems opportunity.  We are considering an Elwha River project that encompasses floodplain restoration (inwater infrastructure removal, dike removal, engineered logjam construction and riparian revegetation to benefit salmon and to also slow down water and recharge the aquifer that supplies drinking water to the City of Port Angeles.  I wanted to run these ideas past you for further development of the proposal and also inquire as to when the funds with the Jan 15 deadline would be available for use.  Please let me know of some good times to connect. | Thank you for your question and interest in the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.    The intent of the funds are to be used for smaller scale projects. One of the ineligible activities includes instream activities that require use of big equipment or heavy machinery (unless negotiated with Ecology). Those kinds of project usually have other sources of funding, and this funding source is intended to focus on smaller streams and a programmatic approach to strategic restoration and/or protection.    The application period closes on January 15, and final proposals are selected by March 5, so the contract period could be as early as May 2025 – September 2028.  Be sure to [sign up for the program’s listserv](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) for updates on applicant webinars, office hours, and funding guidelines. |
| 13b | I hope this email find you well. I was wondering if you have a few moments to talk about grant funding, eligibility and the scope of City's restoration project. | Thank you for your interest in the program.  Do you have any specific questions for me?  The City of Bothell is an eligible applicant for the funding opportunity. I would mention that we are encouraging programmatic, collaborative applications for a watershed.  We have an applicant webinar coming up, and a few office hours which I know you know about that should have quite a few answers to common questions. |
| 13a | Do you have any dates yet for the webinars that will be offered for this grant. | Thanks for reaching out and your interest in the program.  The first applicant webinar is November 13 (2-3pm), with 2 technical assistance office hours for specific proposal questions on December 12 (9-11am) and January 8 (1-3pm). We will have a lot more information coming out soon. If you are interested, you can sign up for the [program’s listserv here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). |
| 12 | I'm working on a multi-phased project in SW Washington in the SF Toutle watershed. We've secured a variety of funding sources including SRFB, ECY Streamflow, ECY Terry Hussman, and private donations but we're always looking for new sources. This project covers about 500 acres and 17 miles of the SF Toutle River and its tributaries; I've attached a photo of the area we're starting to seek funding for. We applied for Floodplains by Design in 2024 but we're ranked pretty low on the list and don't anticipate getting funded.  I'm curious about the new ECY Riparian funding and whether our project is eligible for funding. Can you help me find out if we are eligible? | Thanks for reaching out and for your interest in this program. Unfortunately, your project area is not within the geographic confines of this grant opportunity. It sounds like a great project- good luck with your applications. |
| 11 | Work on state land would be eligible, correct? It is just that state agencies cannot be recipients, although they could be partners. A non-profit could apply for funds to do work that would occur on state land, right? | Thanks for reaching out. Sorry it took me a few days to get back to you.  Typically, work on state lands is ineligible for this funding opportunity. However, we are now clarifying the requirement. We have added this language to the funding guidelines, which is still being published:  Activities to take place on State owned lands are eligible under a narrow set of circumstances, subject to negotiations with Ecology. Activities on State owned lands must be supportive of a programmatic proposal that focuses on work on privately owned land.  Hopefully this helps accommodate a few good circumstances. |
| 10 | Just had a quick question about the grant.  Would the funds cover property acquisition costs or conservation easement costs? | Thanks for reaching out.  As long as the funding can be tied to riparian restoration and/or protection, some of the priority approaches include property acquisition costs or conservation easement costs. Yes.  We will release more information about applicant webinars and technical resources as it gets closer to when the funding opportunity opens on November 5. Be sure to [join our listserv](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) to stay up to date. |
| 9 | Today's announcement of the new Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grant is very exciting. I see that it is only for the Puget Sound WRIA's. Will this funding also be offered for eastern WA WRIA's in the future? So many of our riparian areas are heavily impacted by current and legacy livestock grazing, stream channelization, and road infrastructure. Our historic riparian corridors are most often dominated by static monocultures of pioneer riparian species such as Alder or upland community species instead of riparian ones.  Any information you can share on future riparian funding opportunities would be greatly appreciated. | Thanks for reaching out. Unfortunately, this funding is coming from the EPA Region 10 and is allocated for the Puget Sound. There is a small possibility that work being done outside of the region could qualify for some innovation work if there is a way to expand models of work from one location to another. However, the implementation funds cannot be used outside of the Puget Sound at this time. I have been collecting a fair amount of frustration for this limitation, and I truly understand the need in other locations.  If we can use this funding opportunity to prove that riparian implementation funds are needed and can be well used, it is a long-term goal to institutionalize the funding source and perhaps expand that to all of Washington. |
| 8d | I had sent a follow up question that may have been lost in the shuffle. It follows.  A portion of our envisioned project is to remove old Railroad infrastructure that is along the banks of the Hoko River. Here a bunch of creosote piling form a trestle and bridge abutments that impair river function and riparian zone recovery efforts. These are big, smelly structures Around 200 piles estimated at ~400 tons of creosoted wood. One abutment is across the Hoko River with no good access and very soft soils.  As such the estimated costs for removal approach $1M. We want to get them out before replanting 23 acres riparian zone, as after replanting we’d crush plantings for access. Do you think a big ticket item like this would compete? It is definitely an expensive riparian planting component. The partners are struggling to figure out how to get these out so riparian restoration can commence. (The trestle sits on private lands.) I include a page of trestle photos from our design report. | All that I can advise you on at this time is if proposal is eligible for the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  This does seem like an eligible proposal from an eligible applicant.  Be sure to check the funding guidelines once it is released on November 5 for more information on what might be competitive.  And for your convenience, sign up for updates from [our program here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340). |
| 8c | OK, Thanks for clarifying. I’m curious what is driving the rule that the implementation cannot occur on State owned lands? Hoko River State park desperately needs riparian plantings and they have been unable to secure any funds for such.  I do notice that State Partners are allowed by the grant source, not as applicants, but as partners. I’m curious what might be envisioned there if work cannot occur on state lands? Is it EPA not allowing state lands to benefit from the program, I’m curious about that wrinkle.  A portion of our envisioned project is to remove old Railroad infrastructure that is along the banks of the Hoko River. Here a bunch of creosote piling form a trestle and bridge abutments that impair river function and riparian zone recovery efforts. These are big, smelly structures Around 200 piles estimated at ~400 tons of creosoted wood. One abutment is across the Hoko River with no good access and very soft soils.  As such the estimated costs for removal approach $1M. We want to get them out before replanting 23 acres riparian zone, as after replanting we’d crush plantings for access. Do you think a big ticket item like this would compete? It is definitely an expensive riparian planting component. The partners are struggling to figure out how to get these out so riparian restoration can commence. (The trestle sits on private lands.) I include a page of trestle photos from our design report.  I know it is early in your process, so thanks for any input you can provide. | Thanks for reaching out. The focus of this funding opportunity is for privately owned lands and support for landowner incentives. For this purpose, typically, work on state lands is ineligible for this funding opportunity. However, we are now clarifying the requirement. We have added this language to the funding guidelines, which is still being published:  Activities to take place on State owned lands are eligible under a narrow set of circumstances, subject to negotiations with Ecology. Activities on State owned lands must be supportive of a programmatic proposal that focuses on work on privately owned land.  Hopefully, this helps accommodate a few good circumstances. |
| 8b | OK, in that case, the planting of state parks is ineligible too through this program?  If that is correct, we wouldn’t be seeking money to move the weather station either. | The location of the proposal makes it ineligible for the funding source, regardless of the activity. I like the proposal and wish you best of luck. |
| 8a | We plan to cooperate with our partners at the Makah Tribe and Washington State Parks to prepare and application for this grant.  I have a cost eligibility question. The Makah Tribe maintains a weather station on State Park lands that monitors weather and records long term weather data. This station ins in a large field we would plan to plant with this grant. A forest is not a good place for the station obviously. We are wondering if moving/replacing this weather station would be an allowable cost to the grant? Would you know such specifics yet? | Thanks for reaching out. It’s an interesting eligibility question with the Makah Tribe maintaining, but the land being officially owned by State Parks. It is unlikely that this is eligible for our funding, as state owned property is ineligible for implementation funds with this program. I could see a way for some of the funding to be eligible for the relocation of the infrastructure to a new site. I will continue to dig a little deeper into the nuance here, but it seems ineligible to me at this time. |
| 7 | This grant opportunity looks very interesting and might be very applicable to a Port proposal we’ve been working on.  Are Ports eligible to apply?  It’s not clear on the website.  Thank you, | Thank you for reaching out and for your interest.  Yes, ports are eligible to apply. Be sure to [sign up for the listserv here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) to get updates on the office hours and technical assistance as we get closer to opening the opportunity on November 5. |
| 6 | We wanted to ask about the eligibility and potential competitiveness of a proposed King County Metro project and the performance period of these awards.  The proposed project would daylight and restore two underground branches of Riverton Creek, a salmon bearing creek, within the project site of our South Base Operation Campus 11911 E Marginal Way S in Tukwila which is King County Metro owned property.  The project would increase water quality, stormwater and flood management, fish and wildlife habitat, and improve the livability of the built environment by daylighting 950 ft. of the west and east branches of Riverton Creek, installing three fish-passable culverts to improve fish passage of resident trout and coho salmon, and restore riparian vegetation.  This work is part of a larger project to build a new 544,000 operation base to support Metro’s battery electric bus fleet.  Any input you could provide would be helpful. | Thanks for reaching out.  It sounds like an interesting project and riparian restoration on King County Metro property is an eligible activity on an eligible land type.  Be sure to sign up for [the program’s listserv here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) for updates on the applicant office hours dates and more information about technical assistance. |
| 5 | I help run Whatcom County's Conservation Easement Program, which primarily purchases agricultural easements by removing development rights. We have a property that we are hoping to place a permanent riparian easement along the riparian corridor and then place an agricultural easement on the remaining portion of the property. I would love to learn more about the new Climate Resilient Riparian Grant Program to see if it may be an option for this property. Could we set up a time to meet? Maybe the week of October 14th? | Thank you for reaching out and for your interest in the program.  This does seem like eligible activity, with an eligible applicant and a good fit for the funds.  We are still getting ourselves ready for the application period to open on November 5, but at that point, many more resources will be available to help answer your questions.  Be sure to [join the program’s listserv here](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340) for updates on applicant office hours or technical assistance that we will share as it gets closer to the opening of the opportunity. We have included an office hours webinar times for specific proposal questions and can have other experts available to answer your questions at that time. |
| 4 | XXX. is providing engineering, funding and planning assistance to the Taylor Bay Beach Club for their Wastewater Treatment Plant and Marine Outfall Replacement Project in Pierce County. I received Ecology’s notice for the new Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grant Lead Program today and I’m wondering whether restoration of native vegetation to stabilize a steep marine hillside would qualify under your program? The parcel where the new WWTP will be located is within 200 feet of this steep, potentially unstable marine bluff that has been stabilized over the years in places with non-native plant species. Between a quarter  and a half mile of the hillside would benefit from a replanting with native vegetation that would stabilize the slope and protect the WWTP. Taylor Bay has received a Shellfish SIL Grant for extension of their marine outfall into deeper water to allow harvest of commercial geoduck beds and adjacent beaches along Taylor Bay near the southwest tip of the Key Peninsula, and a grant to protect the hillside above the outfall would benefit both marine and upland ecosystems. Please let me know if you think a re-vegetation project of this sort might be eligible for your new grant program.  Feel free to call me at xxxx if you have questions or require additional information about this potential project. | Thanks for your email and interest in this work.  The Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grant is focused on restoring and protecting riparian areas in key ecosystems throughout Puget Sound. We are encouraging large, integrated programs to boost riparian recovery in key watersheds. Each proposal will need to have a handful of selected project sites, and this might be a good one to include in a larger proposal. I don’t know of anyone in your area that is pulling together a proposal at this time, but the solicitation is not even open yet, so there is time. I know the Shellfish SIL grant team well- does this fit as part of a next phase of funding for that work?  We are building a listserv of interested contacts and just sent out the first, more detailed post this morning. See below.  If you would like to sign up for updates, please do. You will then be notified when the application period is open and can join technical assistance workshops if needed.  Additionally, the attached email just went out. It has a bit more information than the earlier Ecology blog post. Be sure to sign up for updates if you want them. If you have any other questions, please let me know. |
| 3 | My name is xxx. I am a veteran public affairs official: (7 years as Public Affairs Director for the Department of Natural Resources, 5 years corporate, 26 years as Public Affairs Director for the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission and 10 years as owner of SR Productions, a public affairs/lobbying company). Most of my work through the years as been in service to the tribes, particularly in western Washington. I retired my business in 2020 to write books, but am currently serving on several environmental/education boards of directors. Among these are the Pacific Education Institute, Washington Wild and This Is Indian Country. All of these are non-profit 501c3's.    I apologize for the long self introduction. But I felt it necessary to explain why I am writing to you. I coordinated the efforts of these boards along with the Tulalip Tribes recently to produce a Teachers' Workshop, "Tribes and Climate Change". It was a great success! A curriculum, a documentary and 25 new video interviews with tribal leaders across the state are online at [www.ThisIsIndianCountry.org](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.thisisindiancountry.org%2F&data=05%7C02%7Clgie461%40ECY.WA.GOV%7C0542ad5dccfb4ee3398008dce2fd93e7%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638634825948840707%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=3GY1HObdb3DyKX1jP%2BBCec5wWQz8YpaYhMUDF6JljQE%3D&reserved=0) (The concentration is on the impacts of climate change on tribes statewide and what the tribes are doing in response). The This Is Indian Country program is one we started with Billy Frank, Jr. before he passed away...I was Billy's "P.R. guy" for more than 30 years.    As I said, the workshop was a great success, and will result in tribal-based education for thousands of students. The 30 teachers who participated heard from such great leaders as Ron Allen, longtime chairman of the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe; Leonard Forsman, longtime chair of the Suquamish Tribe and President of the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians; Fawn Sharp, former President of Quinault Indian Nation, ATNI and the National Congress of American Indians...and many more. Due to successful fundraising, we were able to provide 5-star rooms at the Tulalip Inn for the teachers, travel expenses, all food for the 2-days, including a traditional salmon bake, and much more.    So, now that we have reached so many teachers in the North Sound region, we're in initial stages of planning to do a similar event for teachers in South Sound (then the Coast and then eastern Washington. In all, we anticipate reaching well more than 100,000  each year with this important tribal message/information.    So why am I bothering you with all this? I'm hoping you can direct me to prospective fund-raising opportunities for this effort.    I will appreciate anything you can do to help. | Thank you for reaching out. This sounds like a great project.  I received your email from Michelle Quast, so I’m assuming this question is about the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program.  I can see this proposal being a potentially compelling eligible component of a larger, cooperative proposal for the fall solicitation of the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems grant program. We are just getting ready to open the funding opportunity on November 5. You would likely need to find some partners to coordinate on a proposal to include tribal-led education and outreach with an emphasis on climate change, and tie it directly to riparian restoration and/or protection for this opportunity.  There is another program that facilitated the Coastal Hazards Organizational Resilience Team that focuses a bit more on climate resiliency. They have a lot of opportunities that might be more in line with the work that you are interested in doing. I’ve cc’d Jay Krienitz on this email- he will be able to get you more information about that effort and any upcoming opportunities to support your efforts.  Let me know if I can help with anything else. |
| 2 | I'm interested in the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Grants but am having trouble finding the guidelines and criteria referenced in the "how to apply" webpage: Applicants should review all solicitation documents on the application webpage, including the funding guidelines and evaluation criteria, to give the application the best opportunity for success.  Can you point me to those? Thank you! | Thanks for reaching out. We are still working on the application and evaluation criterion for the funding opportunity. We are currently messaging out about the solicitation that will open November 5. The email below has more information about the solicitation itself, it still does not have the information you are looking for, but will be available on November 5. I will look into changing those links to say “Coming soon”.  [Climate Resilient Riparian Systems](https://links-1.govdelivery.com/CL0/https:%2F%2Fecology.wa.gov%2Fabout-us%2Fpayments-contracts-grants%2Fgrants-loans%2Ffind-a-grant-or-loan%2Fclimate-resilient-riparian%3Futm_medium=email%26utm_source=govdelivery/2/010001925370c6d9-21f2463a-ebd5-4e62-b331-0db0af94ebac-000000/nQ4vwyEo4ri25aixNzoi-xvhjPrB68u7vQB971eR0gg=373) grant funding web page.  [Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Lead](https://links-1.govdelivery.com/CL0/https:%2F%2Fecology.wa.gov%2Fwater-shorelines%2Fpuget-sound%2Fhelping-puget-sound%2Friparian-restoration%2Friparian-systems%3Futm_medium=email%26utm_source=govdelivery/2/010001925370c6d9-21f2463a-ebd5-4e62-b331-0db0af94ebac-000000/zTd0p8XDErIZev_IBVxxVEnrq-WGdGBw0tdLxkQ_TVU=373) overview web page.  [Climate Resilient Riparian Systems](https://links-1.govdelivery.com/CL0/https:%2F%2Fecology.wa.gov%2Fblog%2Foctober-2024%2Fnew-grant-program-aims-to-restore-protect-puget-sound-riparian-areas%3Futm_medium=email%26utm_source=govdelivery/1/010001925370c6d9-21f2463a-ebd5-4e62-b331-0db0af94ebac-000000/eImTtCyvH6ygcc1wz7-bgXK2GJ-yXYITcBqQogPRBoQ=373) blog.  Please join the listserv so you can get an email when it opens and when those materials are ready for review.  If you have any other questions, feel free to reach out. |
| 1 | Can you please add me to the email list? | Yes. This email just went out. I’m checking to make sure you got it, and if you have any other questions, please let me know.  You can also sign up for updates on the program’s website here: <https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WAECY/subscriber/new?topic_id=WAECY_340> |