

Questions/Answers regarding the following RFPs, which closed on May 19, 2017.

- Citizen Engagement and Education Projects, RFP 2017-002,
- Restoration Projects, RFP 2017-003,
- Resilient Coastal Communities Planning Project, RFP 2017-004,
- Science and Innovative Technologies Projects, RFP 2017-005.

Question: What types of in-kind contributions are allowed as matches?

Answer: The following is from the Section 320 funding guidance provided to us by EPA regarding cost share:

Cost-share can be in the form of cash or in-kind contributions or services with the following caveats:

- Other Federal agency or other EPA funds may not be used as cost-share for funds provided under §320.
- Project partner or other government agency staff serving in a professional capacity on NEP committees can be counted as match as long as they are not paid by the NEP or counted as match for another Federally-assisted program.
- In-kind contributions are resources like staff time, space and equipment (e.g., office/lab space, photocopiers), or other services provided by partners in support of Management Conference activity such as CCMP implementation and revising a CCMP.
- Volunteer services may be used as in-kind match if they are integral to and a necessary part of a project. Those services must be provided by a volunteer who has the requisite skill; has received relevant, project-specific training by the NEP; or is professionally qualified to carry out a specific task (e.g., a carpenter who volunteers to construct a wooden boardwalk). Services provided by volunteers who do not have project-specific skills and training or who lack professional qualifications to carry out specific tasks **may not be considered** as in-kind match.
- It is important to develop and maintain a record keeping system that depicts how both professional staff and volunteer time is allocated to each Program activity and project. The system should depict the dollar value of services provided by both professional and volunteer staff for each work plan activity on which they work.

Question: Can other federal funds be used as matches for the Restoration fund (which is not from the EPA 320 funds)?

Answer: Yes, provided the “other federal funds” do not have further restrictions on use as cost share for state/county funded projects.

Question: We are proposing to enhance stormwater management by constructing a mitigation wetland system within a parcel previously purchased using state funds for the purpose of stormwater management. Can the land purchase and engineering costs be used as matches?

Answer: Prior purchases, outside the timeline of the project, would not be authorized as cost share. Engineering costs included in the timeline and budget of the project could be allowed.

Question: Are there any minimum/maximum award caps for the RFPs for Restoration, Science & Technology, and/or Citizen Engagement?

Answer: There are no min/max award caps for the RFPs.

Question: Do these grants have a limit for University IDC rates?

Answer: The RFPs do not establish a limit for University IDC rates. Entities with a federally negotiated F&A Rate may use that rate for EPA Section 320 funded projects. University applicants are encouraged to contact their office of sponsored programs to remain in compliance with the University's Facilities & Administrative Cost Policy.

Question: Concerning the 'Specific 2008 CCMP action plans addressed by project', how much detail is required in this portion of the application? Are we required to complete all aspects of each action plan to "address" it or is it acceptable to complete specific parts of an action plan?

Answer: You do not need to address all aspects of an action plan. It is enough to simply list which particular action plans the project will address. For example, if you are proposing a stormwater restoration project with a public involvement component, you could list FSD-1, FSD-7, and PIE-1 as the action plans being addressed.

Question: In the executive summary, it asks for an IRL Location Map and a Project Boundary Map. I am confused as to what the IRL Location Map is. For the project boundary, I have created a map with a yellow box outlining the exact range of our project. For the IRL Location Map, do you just want the IRL mapped, or a larger map of Florida with an icon over our general study area range?

Answer: The IRL Location Map should identify where in the IRL watershed the project will take place. The Project Boundary Map should outline the boundary of where the project will be conducted. For instance, an IRL Location Map may display the entire IRL watershed, with a star or other notation indicating where in the watershed the project will be conducted. The Project Boundary Map may zoom into the discrete area of the project.

Question: Does the proposal require letters of support from our collaborators?

Answer: No, we require a letter from the submitting entity's executive or person in a similar position endorsing the project application, funding request, and confirming the

matching funds commitment.

Question: Does the NEP Restoration grant have any restrictions in use of the EPA 319 grant as matching costs? I have contacted the FDEP office and they told me the fund can be used as a match as long as the NEP fund does not have restrictions.

Answer: Section 319 funds are federal funds, and may not be used as matching funds to our Section 320 funds (also federal).

Question: NEP Core Elements are identified in the Logic Model included with the RFP documents. Can you please identify specifically where these Core Elements are further described for background purposes?

Answer: We have removed the requirement to list NEP Core Elements from all RFPs.

Question: Are there other deliverables anticipated/required within the grant in addition to the quarterly and final reports?

Answer: The deliverables in the sample statement of work are just two examples of project deliverables. Other examples of deliverables are: "Engineering and final design plans for the project", "Copies of project permits", "Photographs of baffle box installation", etc. The deliverables may be quite different among the various projects.

Question: Title page, section 1. Is this to be a separate and individual page? Can section 2, follow on the same page?

Answer: Section 1 does not need to be on a separate and individual page and Section 2 may follow on the same page.

Question: Are attachments A,B, C, and D to be incorporated with the total six pages?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Would you please define "cost share in Kind".

Answer: Cost share refers to project funding and support that is not provided the IRL Council. In-kind contributions are resources like staff time, space and equipment (e.g., office/lab space, photocopiers) or other services provided by partners in support of Management Conference activity such as CCMP implementation and revising a CCMP.

Question: We were wondering if it would be better to apply for the science and technology RFP rather than the citizen engagement RFP since we'll be performing science-based research programs with citizens.

Answer: Projects may "fit" into several RFP categories. In this case of engagement and science, consider which element is the largest in terms of outputs and outcomes for the project effort.

Question: Would it be possible to apply for one of the smaller license plate grants to

fund materials and supplies if needed to supplement a larger citizen science/science grant?

Answer: It is possible to apply for the currently open RFPs, and then also the Small Grant RFP once it is released. You may apply for more than one.

Question: We are submitting a proposal for funding consideration under the education and engagement category. I just read in the RFP that we should not be in contact with the members of the Management Conference. We were about to solicit supporting letters from our partners who will work with us on this project. They are members of the management conference. How do we do this?

Answer: Management Conference members are encouraged to solicit letters from their project partners. The “contact” issue arises when the Management Conference Member acts in any way to give a proposal an unfair advantage. Management Conference members who are actively pursuing funding through the RFP(s) should limit their Management Conference contact about their proposal to members for whom they are seeking partnerships, and should not discuss their application with any other members of the conference. Management Conference members should recuse themselves from any action/ranking/voting/support of a project to which they are a partner, until after the final “notice of intent to fund” has been posted.