Groundwater Governance in the Great Lakes Region:

A Comparative Study with Engagement

Describe your approach to the Scope of Work outlined in the Request for Proposals, including outline of proposed rubric or framework for state-to-state comparison of groundwater governance and capacities. (10,000 characters including spaces)

Groundwater knowledge and governance capacity across the geographic area of the Great Lakes states is expected to vary with: dependence on the resource for drinking water, industry or irrigation and how this dependence factors into the economy of an area; recognition of the ecosystem services of groundwater, and the more difficult to quantify cultural or spiritual value placed on water. An additional factor that may play into groundwater governance is the degree to which a jurisdiction understands and incorporates climate projections on future water use and recharge. Comparison of different groundwater governance approaches will therefore require a carefully constructed series of nested questions that will lead researchers deeper into the more fully evolved structures of some states or tribes, while identifying barriers and needs in others.

A decision-tree model will be co-developed by our interdisciplinary team early in the project and tested iteratively over the course of the research year. The background-research period will span the first one to two quarters of the project when our perspectives will be informed by environmental governance and political science literature review, research on institutions that manage groundwater and other common-pool resources, and legal analysis modeled after an approach devised by one team member to review regulation of high-capacity irrigation wells in all fifty states.

We will look not only at state agencies that have a formal role in groundwater regulation but also at the various local and regional governments that exist in the groundwater and adjacent policy domains, providing a delineation of authority and responsibility to regulate, assign property rights, assess penalties, give payments, and recruit into voluntary programs. We will also enumerate the types of intergovernmental interactions that exist and catalogue the presence or absence of revenue or funding mechanisms that are either explicitly or implicitly tied to groundwater value.

Team members have been selected for their field of expertise and history of work in the specific focus areas that relate to project scope. Cross-pollination between subgroups has been designed into the approach to bridge gaps and improve the communication of results. We have grouped the areas to be studied by topic:

1) hydrogeologic data (e.g. aquifer extent, flow, age, models) *Jennings, Noe*;
2) technical management framework (e.g. permitting, monitoring, sustainable-use definition) *Stine, Jennings, Kirby, Noe, Manydeeds, MS student*;
3) groundwater governance structure (e.g. institutional arrangement, laws, policy, local *vs* regional approaches, public participation, socio-economic considerations) *Keeler, Mayer, Noe, Kirby, Stine, Manydeeds, MS student*;

4) legal recourse and precedent (e.g. enforcement, hierarchy of uses, transboundary agreements) *Reid, Mayer, Stine, Manydeeds*.
5) Informal power structure and participatory engagement, *Kader, Leung, Reid, Kirby, Franklin*.

There are likely many rubrics and combinations of academics and consultants that can tackle even a complex comparative government project like this one. However, the softer world of practice also needs to be grasped in order to understand who is actually doing the work, whether formally empowered to do so, or not. For example, a small glacial aquifer shared across three states, Ohio, Michigan and Indiana, was protected by the USEPA as a sole source aquifer because of the action of the director of public utilities in one small town. He tried to enlist the help of the others in the tri-state region who were sharing the aquifer but ultimately the city completed the request for protection on its own, acquiring the geologic data to demonstrate that the aquifer was the only source of drinking water for the region.

We believe that this focus on soft power will not only set our team apart but will ensure better outcomes. To do this in more than an anecdotal way, we must engage participants at all stages of the project to discover the conventions and norms held by both public and non-public actors alike that drive them to act or place value on groundwater and assess their input in a semi-quantitative way. We see this as also being key to the robustness of recommendations for future directions for The Joyce Foundation. We deeply believe that lasting influence in the groundwater-governance sphere will depend on the strength of the relationships built during this year-long project. It is ultimately about the people involved.

Early background literature research will help us identify the individuals and institutions most involved in each region through their authorship, presentations at conferences and attendance at meetings. We will also rely on existing connections of team members whose work spans EPA Region 5 and the Midwest Region of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Through phone introductions, we will begin to build relationships and identify individuals who we would like to give input iteratively throughout the course of the project. We will focus on those who hold key institutional knowledge and are important members of their agency's social network. These short conversations will not only introduce them to the project but also make room for them to help us refine our scope and focus on data that ultimately may help them and their colleagues in other states. With short, recurring check-ins throughout the project year, participants can give feedback on the validity of our results and alert us to any gaps so as to avoid surprises at the time of the final cross-jurisdictional engagement. As they see their input being used, we hope that their trust in the process is increased, and that this motivates them to rally their networks of colleagues to more fully accept the final information presented.

Another strength of our team apart is the ability to identify potential risks to future groundwater supply. ***Keeler and Noe*** have recently completed a project using high-resolution climate models to project future groundwater scarcity in Minnesota by carefully incorporating current permit information, and changes in projected demographics, groundwater use and recharge under

different climate scenarios. (https://keeler.umn.edu/portfolio/23-2/). They will consider alternative indicators for groundwater vulnerability or risk for the Great Lakes region based on understanding gained from this work and further literature review.

Describe your proposed project work plan, including each project deliverable, a detailed timeline, and staff responsible for each component of the plan. (25,000 characters including spaces)

Tasks are subdivided by the quarter in which the bulk of the work will occur. Team leads are in ***bold italics***, other workers in *italics*.

Free exchange of information among our team members is necessary to avoid gaps, overlap or missed opportunities. A good internal process in an interdisciplinary project like this is therefore critical to establish to ensure that: team member strengths are fully utilized; there is a shared vocabulary and consistent way of describing and comparing findings, and that the project timeline has many intersection and check-in points. We will also have members dedicated to crossover work.

Quarter 1 Co-develop a framework for governance analysis

> ***Kader****, Leung, and Franklin* will facilitate a meeting for the full team at the project outset to finalize and refine expectations as they relate to roles, intersection points, data sharing and storage, and communication within the project team. This will achieve the additional goal of familiarizing the team with the participatory engagement methods used by Freshwater because they will be deployed throughout the year to gather content and build relationships with state and tribal participants.

Quarter 1 Populate the baseline data in each focus area with the additional goal of identifying key players

> -***Jennings*** *with Kirby and MS student* compile the hydrogeologic data including the status of aquifer mapping and monitoring and potential groundwater vulnerabilities. They will use recent reports and conference presentations to identify institutions and individuals with technical experience.
>
> - ***Reid*** *with Mayer, Kirby, Noe, MS student, Manydeeds, and Stine* will document and analyze baseline groundwater management tools and catalog the technical management framework in each jurisdiction while identifying key individuals involved.
>
> - ***Mayer****, Noe, Keeler, Kirby and MS student* will review and summarize political science, economics, social psychology research on groundwater to add theoretical and empirical context and build the data for the groundwater governance comparison. They will also identify key individuals involved.

-Reid will address the legal framework by extending her statutory review completed on high capacity wells. She will conduct a comprehensive review and analysis of existing laws, regulations, and related policy tools applicable to groundwater management in the project states and identify documented resource protections. *Stine* assists.

- ***Manydeeds*** will articulate native institutional perspective, both legal and socio-cultural

- ***Kirby*** will assist in all areas with additional literature and document review where needed and helps coordinate *MS student* research at the Humphrey School.

Quarter 1 Identify and make initial contact with key participants

Working with the list generated through the compilation of baseline data, as well as existing relationships of team members with state and tribal groundwater managers, ***Leung*** *and Kader* will create a stakeholder list identifying key individuals in each state, as well as a preliminary list of 15-20 participants that could be more deeply engaged at key points throughout the process. Brief, introductory phone calls will be made to share information about project goals and processes, gather initial feedback, and confirm participation of a subset of these people. The focus will be on beginning to build relationships and buy-in.

Quarter 2 Develop Technical Management Comparison

-***Jennings and Noe,*** *MS student and Kirby* assess:

-whether groundwater-level monitoring is spatially dense enough and of long enough duration to predict trends;
-if the jurisdiction is using these datasets to develop management strategies;
-if recharge and discharge areas are mapped and protected;
-if aquifer properties are being measured and archived for use in models of groundwater flow
-and the institution that is the primary source for data and technical models.

-Noe *, Mayer, , Jennings, Kirby and MS student* further populate groundwater data and modeling to develop the capacity framework with data review and (informal) interviews on topics including: inventory of groundwater monitoring data and well information, current data and modeling capacity in each state, and highest priority future collection needs for the basin and assessment of existing information distribution mechanisms.

Quarter 2 Develop Governance Framework Comparison

Mayer*, Noe, Keeler, MS student, Manydeeds and Kirby* compare the groundwater governance framework for Minn., Wisc., Mich., Oh., Ind., Ill. and tribal nations using document review and (informal) interviews. This is done in collaboration with *Reid* for legal statutory review. *Stine* will be consulted. Topics will include:

-How is groundwater governance distributed among state agencies and levels of government? This includes delineation of authority and responsibility to regulate, assign property rights, assess penalties, give payments, and recruit into voluntary programs as well as review of groundwater use permitting protocols.
-What sort of intergovernmental collaborations exist or are required? We will enumerate existing intergovernmental collaborations in groundwater and adjacent fields (i.e. joint powers agreements for water supply between multiple governments), and identify overlaps or gaps in governance capacity across jurisdictional layers from municipal/township, county, special purpose governments, to state agencies. This will include collection and analysis of jurisdictional spatial data.
-What price-setting or revenue-generating mechanisms exist? We will catalog the presence or absence and extent of special taxing districts, permit fees, and other funding mechanisms that are either explicitly or implicitly tied to groundwater value.
-What non-governmental actors play a role in groundwater governance? This will require a review of grey literature for a history of groundwater issues, conflicts, actions and an analysis of who the active actors are outside of statute and agencies.

Quarter 2 Engage identified participants to understand less tangible barriers

The higher level goal of understanding barriers to shared, sustainable, and integrated water management all require an understanding of the less tangible side of groundwater management. ***Leung,*** *Kader, Kirby and Franklin* will continue to engage the same 15-20 participants who will be invited to the convening at the close of the project to identify the following as it relates to groundwater management:

- opportunities they are interested in pursuing;
- challenges or barriers they encounter currently or anticipate;
- strategies that have worked well for them, and why those strategies worked, and
- what has not worked, and lessons that were learned.

They will also be updated on findings to date for feedback on their validity and any gaps they can foresee.

Quarter 3 Assess Future Threats to Groundwater in the Region

Noe*, Keeler, Mayer, Kirby and MS student* will extend their understanding of the future of groundwater in Minnesota under a changing climate and project the results to the other Great Lakes states. Although a high resolution climate model will not be created for this project, they will conduct:

-a literature review of existing climate and development risk indicators;
-an exploration of trends in withdrawal and monitoring data;

-an extraction of climate change projections for the region, and
-a sociodemographic analysis of risk from groundwater related problems (e.g., scarcity, contamination).

Quarter 3 Draft White Paper

-All team members will contribute materials, with ***Jennings*** *and Kirby* leading the compilation of the draft White Paper for internal review by the team and then the stakeholders.

-***Leung***, *Kader, Franklin and Kirby* will compile outcomes from the Quarter 2 engagements to complement comparison of management between states and tribal nations.

- ***Kirby*** leads development of draft Fact Sheets for review at stakeholder meeting

Quarter 3 Design and Host Stakeholder Engagement

-Kader*, Leung and Franklin* will design the final stakeholder engagement to review the draft white paper and begin identifying next steps. The final design will depend largely on the findings and content of the white paper, however, we anticipate using a workshop-style format which emphasizes small group discussions. This design is intentional as small groups create a context that makes sure everyone can fully participate, no one voice or perspective dominates the conversation, new ideas can emerge, and there is space to work through difficult challenges in a way that leads to agreed-upon outcomes. This provides four key benefits: 1) improved quality of information that is generated; 2) enhanced legitimacy of decisions made; 3) increased capacity of those involved to understand issues and move solutions forward, and 4) strengthened relationships to support continued collaboration after the convening is over. All notes from the conversation will be analyzed to develop a report specific to this event, with clearly identified changes for the white paper as well as content for the final report to the Joyce Foundation.

-All team members will participate in the final engagement

Quarter 4 Finalize White Paper and Fact Sheets

-All team members help compile best practices for their focus areas
-All team members help identify grant-making opportunities for their focus areas
-All team members help revise white paper and fact sheets with final compilation led by ***Jennings*** *and Kirby.*
-***Kirby*** leads development of professionally designed final fact sheets
-***Kader*** *and Leung* design final evaluation for participants to complete

Describe examples of past engagements that demonstrate capacity and experience with groundwater science and policy and experience working with state and tribal agency staff (4,000 characters including spaces)

Dr. Keeler's co-led efforts in water-science and collaboration with the public-sector:
-Assessment of the potential for groundwater scarcity under climate change and increased withdrawals

- Noe, R. R., **Keeler, B. L.**, Twine, T. E., Brauman, K. A., Mayer, T., & Rogers, M. (2019). Climate change projections for improved management of infrastructure, industry, and water resources in Minnesota.

-Collaboration with the Minn. Geol. Soc. and Dep. of Health to assess nitrate contamination risks to rural households.
-Statewide survey on assessing the values Minnesotans hold for clean water with the Center for Changing Landscapes
-Evaluation of the social costs of nitrate pollution in collaboration with the Minn. Ctr. for Env. Advocacy.
-Publication of peer-reviewed papers on the costs of groundwater pollution

- **Keeler, B.L.,** R. Noe, J. Gourevitch, P. Hawthorne, K. Johnson, B. Dalzell. (2019). Putting people on the map improves the prioritization of ecosystem services. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*.
- Gourevitch, J., **B.L. Keeler**, T. Ricketts. (2018). Determining socially optimal rates of nitrogen fertilizer application. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*. 254: 292-299.
- **Keeler, B.L.,** J. Gourevitch, S. Polasky, F. Isbell, C. Tessum, J. Hill, J. Marshall. (2016). The social cost of nitrogen. *Science Advances*. Vol 2:e1600219.
- **Keeler**, B.L. and S. Polasky. (2014). Land-use change and costs to rural households: A case study in groundwater nitrate contamination. Environmental Res. Letters 9:074002

Noe developed a decision-support tool to help state funding entities and agencies achieve the highest environmental benefits when acquiring parcels of land, developed relationships with agency staff and collected data on all state agency programs that acquire land for conservation. He synthesized insights on process and outcomes of conservation decision-making in Minn.

- Noe, R.R., Keeler, B.L., Kilgore, M.A., Taff, S.J., & Polasky, S. (2017). Mainstreaming ecosystem services in state-level conservation planning: Progress and future needs. Ecology and Society, 22(4).

Freshwater led an 18-month-long analysis of the potential for Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) in Minnesota. Aquifer sustainability under changing demographics, land-use and climate was examined in four test cases. Data used to model injection capacity were aquifer properties from pumping tests and monitoring. Aquifer- and source-water chemistry impacted chemical reactions that might compromise the project and influenced potential treatment options. These considerations factored into the economic analysis that also included ecosystem services and future groundwater value. Current legal barriers to ASR were listed with policy recommendations. Case studies included a project conducted by the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux community who were the first in the state to consider ASR. ***Jennings,*** *Kader and Kirby*

wrote portions of the report and presented it to agencies, stakeholders and legislators. The report will be available later this month.

As part of a legal research project on high-capacity wells in the U.S. for the National Agricultural Law Center, ***Reid*** conferred closely with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Water Use Section Chief for the Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater to better understand the current state of groundwater laws in Wisconsin.

In her former role as Executive Director of the Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, ***Reid*** worked closely with the WDNR Runoff Management Southeast Team and Basin Supervisor on efforts to improve water quality in the Greater Milwaukee Watersheds. Specifically, Linda worked with WDNR and regional municipal staff in Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) communities to plan and implement projects as part of the Milwaukee River Basin TMDL. She also worked closely with the WDNR Nonpoint Source Planning Coordinator and updated and drafted 9 Key Element plans in the region.

Describe examples of past engagements where you have prepared white papers, reports, or similar documents summarizing and providing analysis of state water policy, other state environmental policy, or other technical writing. Please include links, citations, or attach relevant document(s). You may attach relevant document(s) by clicking on the blue plus sign at the bottom of the application in Request Documents and selecting "Additional Proposal Narrative Information." (3,000 characters including spaces)

Freshwater convened representatives from eighteen interest groups and state agencies over the course of three meetings and a survey to identify ways to enhance outcomes from investments made through the state's Clean Water Fund. With a variety of perspectives and strong opinions about challenges and opportunities, a carefully crafted process was needed to surface differences and commonalities to get to a set of shared recommendations. ***Kader*** led the process design, supported other Freshwater staff for facilitation, led the input analysis and report writing, and continues to coordinate with participants and lead efforts to implement the recommendations. https://freshwater.org/trajectory-report/

Keeler and colleagues have over a decade of experience working with Minnesota state and federal agencies on water policy and planning, including ecosystem services assessment and valuation, hydrologic and economic modeling, and stakeholder engagement. Recent examples include:

- ***Keeler, Noe, and Mayer,*** with colleagues, analyzed dynamically downscaled projections of future climate data to produce maps and custom climate data for multiple state agencies and municipal leaders in Minnesota.
- ***Keeler, Noe*** and colleagues supported the Minn. Environmental Quality Board in drafting the decadal Minnesota state water plan, including providing text and maps for the report.
- ***Keeler, Noe,*** and colleagues are working with the Minn. Dept. of Health to identify and map risks to source water contamination.

- Noe integrated perspectives from funding entities, state agencies, and NGOs on the outcomes of investments in conservation.
- ***Noe*** is working with municipalities to plan for stormwater management under climate change.
- ***Keeler*** serves on the External-Environmental Economics Advisory Council, a group of environmental economists providing policy guidance on federal environmental regulations, including a recent report on the Trump Administration's roll-backs of the Clean Water Act.
- ***Mayer*** worked for two years as Special Projects Director for the Climate Impact Lab, where he coordinated projects that brought together two dozen climate scientists, economists and computational experts to update estimates of the Social Cost of Carbon

Kirby was part of a team that facilitated technical and manager stakeholder meetings for the Minn. Dept. of Health from 2018-2020 to research and develop a plan to address threats to drinking water. It identified regulatory, technological, behavioral, and cost barriers to addressing emerging threats and managing risk. Minnesota recommendations often lead federal drinking water standards. The project was recommended by the Clean Water Council.

Provide examples of past engagements where you have synthesized information and perspectives from a diverse group of stakeholders or potential partners and developed a cogent analysis or recommendations. (3,000 characters including spaces)

Kader interviewed government stakeholders and consultants about perspectives on integrated water management (IWM) to identify current examples, challenges encountered in attempting to further integrate, and opportunities. She synthesized stakeholder responses, articulated challenges and recommendations.

Kader, *Jennings and Franklin* helped a county that spans the metro-rural area and is reliant on groundwater update their Groundwater Plan. They designed and facilitated a year-long series of workshops to gain technical- and general-stakeholder input. The engagement allowed the plan to more fully address climate change, increased emphasis on water reuse, and refined expectations about ongoing engagement during plan implementation.

Freshwater staff were invited into an irrigated-agriculture area by a Soil and Water Conservation District to explore ideas to relieve pressure on groundwater. As a metro-based, environmental organization, producers were skeptical. Reliance on relationships was crucial so work to overcome skepticism and build trust had to happen first. The engagement designed by ***Kader*** emphasized participant experiences and knowledge. Three identical workshops to reach different groups gathered information on what producers were already doing, challenges faced, and steps they were interested in if barriers were removed. Participants developed solutions rather than having them imposed on them. An optional fourth workshop to review outcomes was attended by more than half and the report was used for strategic planning, grant proposals

and budget allocations. The project was credited with leading to continued adoption of new conservation practices and securing additional funding.

A recent watershed district rule change resulted in tensions in a community facing development pressure, undermining and dissolving partnerships between the watershed district and its member cities. Freshwater was engaged to resolve tensions. ***Kader*** led and designed facilitation and report preparation including technical and social recommendations. Participants worked together for 10 more months and re-engaged Freshwater to affirm progress and identify next steps.

Freshwater helped facilitate workshops with seven cities, three watershed districts, and a county to identify community-specific actions to improve resilience to climate change. They convened staff from several departments as well as community members to identify risks, vulnerabilities, and strategies. ***Kader*** co-designed, facilitated, and analyzed outcomes and summaries for each government were provided with language to be included in Comprehensive Plans.

Reid worked with two Milwaukee-based civil engineering firms to prepare a report for the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District documenting local municipalities' experiences and realities with green infrastructure maintenance -- the Green Infrastructure Maintenance Analysis & Lessons Learned for Municipalities report. Through surveys and interviews with municipalities, the team learned about efficiencies, tracking measures, funding sources, existing maintenance partnerships, and barriers that help shape future improvements.

Reid also led the update of the Kinnickinnic River Watershed Implementation Plan, which focuses on strategic implementation, consolidation and accountability in order to localize and strengthen watershed improvement projects. It takes a watershed-wide collaborative, adaptive, and cost-effective approach by combining water quality, water quantity, habitat and recreational improvements to restore the KK River Watershed.

Summarize the cultural competencies of project staff (more detailed information can be included in attached qualifications). (1,000 characters including spaces)

Manydeeds work at the BIA focuses on tribes and water. ***Reid's*** work to protect urban watersheds includes a diverse population. She also will train young adults after incarceration. ***Mayer*** was a community organizer working with BIPOC groups. ***Keeler*** co-directs CREATE, a program on representing BIPOC priorities in urban watersheds, trains students who work in marginalized communities and addresses environmental impacts of racism. ***Noe*** supports Keeler's training and research and supports environmental justice questions. **Jennings** mentored female, Native American, students for 2 years in an NSF geology program; they now have tribal, consulting and mining jobs and MS degrees. **Leung** worked with BIPOC communities on health issues, affordable housing, economic development, education, jobs and

environmental justice. **Kader** was a community organizer on climate change, food systems, and water-related issues in S. Minneapolis and is adept at navigating cultural differences.

Describe your recommendations for sharing your assessment of state groundwater policy with key audiences in the region, including a list of those audiences. (3,000 characters including spaces)

A website will be created and maintained by Noe at the Humphrey School to disseminate and archive results. Freshwater will link to this page and provide additional content.

We will share results personally with the participants we engage along the way and contacts that they suggest. Personal relationships have the highest value for distribution and trust in the content. We will then return to our initial list from which that subgroup was identified and make personal contact directing them to the website where materials will be archived.

Relevant agency staff will be personally contacted and sent fact sheets relevant to their states as well as neighboring states. Stine will follow up with phone calls where needed.

We will work to reach transboundary organizations that span the region, either through their staff, or potentially by presenting at their annual conferences. These groups include:

Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, Great Lakes Commission that hosts an annual Water Conference, the USGS-led Great Lakes Mapping Association, the USGS Water Resources Centers; the National Water Institute; and National Groundwater Association.

Other strong, non-profit, water voices in the region will receive the summary factsheets and links to the website. They include: Circle of Blue, Michigan League of Women Voters, Great Lakes Now, For Love of Water, Freshwater Future, Great Water Alliance, and Blue Accounting a partnership between the Great Lakes Commission and The Nature Conservancy.

Freshwater will disseminate information in Minnesota at the Minnesota Groundwater Association conference and with the State Legislature where appropriate.

Finally, we will prepare press releases for regional papers and radio outlets with a history of environmental reporting including: Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, Detroit Free Press, Minneapolis Star Tribune, Minnesota Public Radio, the Water Main of American Public Media https://www.thewatermain.org/, the Great Lakes Echo, and the Toledo Blade.

All organizations must attach:

- **Itemized project budget and narrative (if relevant), amount of funds requested from Joyce, the proposed uses, and the time period over which funds will be expended**
- **Names and qualifications of people involved in the project, including cultural competencies as outlined in the Request for Proposals**
- **Writing samples from related or similar projects (please combine multiple samples into a single pdf)**

- **Please complete and upload the DEI spreadsheet. If you'd like, you can upload an additional document with more information to supplement your application**

- **List of board members, including title, outside affiliation, and telephone number**

If your organization is not tax exempt, please attach your W-9 (W-8 for non-US orgs).

If your organization is tax exempt (501c3 organizations), the following documents are required:

- **Organizational expenses and income for the previous, current, and upcoming fiscal year**
- **Audited financial statements for the most recently completed fiscal year**
- **Internal Revenue Service Form 990 plus attachments for the most recently completed fiscal year**
- **Internal Revenue Service verification that the organization is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization and qualifies as a public charity as defined in IRS Code section 509 (a)(1), (2), or (3).**
- Fiscal Sponsor Agreement that describes the budgetary, legal, programmatic and administrative responsibility for the project. (if applicable) (Lynne, we need to add this to the application)

Note: If needed, you can upload additional documents by using the REQUEST DOCUMENTS and ORGANIZATION DOCUMENTS upload boxes below. Click on the '+" icon to upload your document and select the appropriate document type.

If multiple organizations are involved, create a pdf containing the names of partner organizations, participating staff, and their qualifications and use the "Additional Proposal Narrative Information" item in the Request Documents section below to upload the document.

Should you have any questions or feedback regarding the progress of your application, please email Elizabeth Cisar at ecisar@joycefdn.org.