

phenoxy herbicides as used today in California.

In summary, there is a tremendous volume of scientific information available on the phenoxy herbicides. These herbicides have been the subject of many carefully controlled toxicological experiments, perhaps more than any other pesticide on the market today. The known scientific data about these chemicals, combined with a 37-year history of safe use fully support these following

conclusions: The phenoxy herbicides are safe, efficient, and selective herbicides to control weeds and brush and their use has not caused cancer, birth defects, or miscarriages.

*Consultant, Agricultural Products
Dow Chemical USA
Midland, Michigan*

APPLYING FOR FEDERAL FUNDING GRANTS FOR URBAN TREE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

by Robert L. Tate

Abstract. Due to cutbacks in local sources of funding for urban tree maintenance activities, urban tree managers may become more reliant on federal funding grants. The need for information regarding the grant process was desired by a high percentage of surveyed urban tree managers. The sources of information about federal grants and the general process of writing and applying for them is summarized to enable tree managers to be in a more competitive position if outside funding is sought.

Generally in the 1970's a higher level of local, state and federal government activity was experienced related to trees in the urban environment. Unfortunately this has not necessarily brought with it a higher level of urban tree management (Richards 1980) because funding levels are in most cases inadequate for the proper

maintenance of urban trees. Due to general public dissatisfaction with taxes and the size of government, the move to cut state and local spending (Propositions 13 in California, 2½ in Massachusetts and the 5 percent budget cap in New Jersey) is firmly underway.

Even though local political decision-makers may be sympathetic, it is increasingly difficult to obtain minimal funds for tree maintenance activities when budgets for the more essential services such as police protection and fire control are in jeopardy. Because of this the urban tree manager is faced with a situation in which the reliance on local funding that has traditionally been the major source of municipal budget funds (Ottman and Kielbaso

1976) cannot satisfy critical maintenance activities needed to preserve the public urban tree resource.

Therefore, a greater reliance on federal and state-disbursed federal funding sources may play a more important role in the funding of a well-balanced program of tree maintenance. However, obtaining outside funding (always an extremely competitive process) may even become more difficult in light of cutbacks by the present administration in federal assistance programs.

Urban tree managers do not appear to be taking advantage of these important potential sources of revenue. In a preliminary survey of urban tree managers Tate (1981) found that over half of the respondents had never applied for a federal funding grant and nearly three-fourths had never applied for a federal technical assistance grant. Moreover, two-thirds did not feel they had sufficient information regarding the design and filing of grant applications and few of the thirteen potential sources of funding listed by Unsoeld (1979) were known to the respondents. However, nearly all (97 percent) would apply if information about the process was made available. What follows is designed to partially satisfy these needs and enable managers to be in a more competitive position to obtain outside funding.

Undoubtedly the best single source of information about federal funding agencies and programs is the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance published annually by the Office of Management and Budget. It is available from the Superintendent of Documents in Washington, D.C. The catalog describes the federal government's domestic programs and identifies the types of assistance, explains the nature and purpose of the programs, specifies who is eligible, tells what kinds of credentials and documentation is needed to obtain assistance, lists the application and award process and includes deadlines.

Although the catalog provides a tremendous amount of information, direct contact with the target funding agency is usually necessary (Sladek 1977) to acquire additional knowledge to clarify the instructions given in the written guidelines and to assess the potential of the target proposal for funding. Among the information to ac-

quire is the latest update about the particular program of interest, reaction of the agency to specific proposal ideas, lists and costs of projects funded in previous years, and the makeup of the proposal reviewing panel. Telephoning the agency is probably the best way to initially establish contact and to gain needed information.

After contacting the potential funding agency, the decision should be made on whether or not to actually write a proposal. This is the time to contact other urban tree managers for information about similar programs. It is also the time to determine if local funds are available to continue the project after external funding ends; if political decision-makers, superiors, and the community is behind the proposal; and are the resources available in the organization to properly complete the project. Since most federal grants are oriented to construction and development, ascertain if the proposal can be subordinate to the main thrust of a larger project. Unsoeld (1979) lists several urban tree projects that probably would not have been funded alone but were funded as parts of larger funding programs such as Federal Highway Funds, Resource Conservation and Development Funds and Community Development Block Grants. In this respect there is an obvious need to develop a close working relationship with engineers, architects, urban planners and grantspersons who are responsible for preparing and administering grants that may provide tree money.

If the decision is made to prepare a proposal as a subordinate part of a larger one or to stand on its own, most of the preparation skills needed can be generalized. Two of the many proposal writing guides available are: *Getting a Grant: How to Write Successful Grant Proposals* (Lefferts 1978) and *Grantsmanship* (Laufer 1977). Both stress that a good proposal should be well written and it should be organized according to the suggestions of the particular funding agency.

According to the Professional Services Institute's manual on obtaining external funding (1979) good proposals have similar characteristics. Some of them are:

1. The need for the project is clearly demonstrated
2. Important ideas are highlighted and

repeated

3. Project objectives are given in detail
4. Collaboration with all interested groups in the project planning stage is evident.
5. Commitment of all involved parties is evident
6. The uses of the funds are clearly indicated in the proposal
7. All government procedures have been followed
8. Directions given in the proposal guidelines have been followed
9. The proposal is in line with funding agency guidelines
10. The writing style is clear and concise

Submitting the proposal is the last but important step in the process. After it is written, follow the agency guidelines for submission. Note the date of the submission deadlines, they are inflexible. If the proposal is received beyond the stated deadline, it will be rejected and the effort expended will have been a costly exercise. In this respect, after the proposal is sent, it is wise to telephone the agency prior to the deadline to ascertain if the proposal has been received.

Applying for a federal grant is unquestionably a considerable amount of work. Because of this and other factors mentioned above, many urban tree managers who have tried it do not feel the effort justifies the results. It does take considerable effort and ability but one successful grant may more than justify the effort. Even if the proposal is rejected, learn why. Federal agencies are required to supply information as to the reasons for rejection. If the proposal is appropriate to the agency

and was rejected because of specific problems rewrite and submit it again.

Lastly, there are additional sources of help. An excellent treatment of the total process of obtaining external funding has been explained by White (1975). Most cities with greater than 50,000 population employ grantspersons or a person in a similar capacity to help obtain external funding. Many consultants provide training programs dealing with the process of obtaining grants.

Literature Cited

- Anonymous. N.D. Obtaining external funding: a seminar manual. Professional Services Institute, Inc. Boulder, CO.
- Lauffer, Armand. 1977. Grantsmanship. Sage Publications. Beverly Hills, CA.
- Lefferts, Robert. 1978. Getting a grant: how to write successful grant proposals. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Ottman, Kenneth and J. James Kielbaso. 1976. Managing municipal trees. Urban Data Service 8:11. Int. City Mgmt. Assoc. Washington, D.C.
- Richards, Norman and John Gredraitias. 1980. Community tree management in New York. ESF Pub. 80-002, SUNY School of Forestry, Syracuse, N.Y.
- Sladek, Frea. 1977. Personal contact: is it really necessary? Foundation News, Sept./Oct.
- Tate, Robert. 1981. Preliminary survey of the use of federal and state funding assistance for urban tree management activities. Unpublished.
- Unsoeld, Olaf. 1979. Federal assistance for urban forestry. USDA Forest Service, State and Private Forestry Monograph. Washington, D.C.
- White, Virginia. 1975. Grants: how to find out about them and what to do next. Plenum Press. New York.

*Department of Horticulture & Forestry
Cook College, Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey*