

## FY16 PROJECT PROPOSAL SUMMARY PAGE

### Continuing, Multi-Year Projects

*Proposals are due to catherine.boerner@alaska.gov and elise.hsieh@alaska.gov by September 1, 2015. Please note that the information in your proposal and budget form will be used for funding review. Late proposals, revisions or corrections may not be accepted.*

**Project Title:** NOAA Harbor Protection/Project Management

**Project Period:** February 1, 2016 – January 31, 2017

**Primary Investigator(s):** Laurel Jennings, Erika Ammann, Julia Royster– NOAA Restoration Center

**Study Location:** Prince William Sound/EVOS spill area

**Project Website** (if applicable): NA

#### **Abstract\*:**

In this project, NOAA Restoration Center is providing oversight, management and technical assistance for two projects; one focused on harbor protection and harbor clean-up as well as another focused on snow management/water quality improvement, both efforts take place in Cordova, AK. The goal of these projects is to improve habitat for the benefit of species impacted by the Exxon Valdez oil spill. In addition, habitat for herring populations will also benefit from the implementation of these projects. As of this reporting period (September 1, 2015), the Copper River Watershed Project Snow Management Project will be in the final reporting period for EVOS. NOAA RC will continue to offer oversight and post-project closeout and report review. NOAA RC technical support and management of the Native Village of Eyak's Harbor Protection and Harbor Clean-up Project will continue until 2017.

*\*The abstract should provide a brief overview of the overall goals and hypotheses of the project and provide sufficient information for a summary review as this is the text that will be used in the public work plan and may be relied upon by the PAC and other parties.*

**Estimated Budget:**

**EVOSTC Funding Requested\*** (must include 9% GA):

FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	TOTAL
		\$6,540	\$6,104	\$7,750	\$20,394

**Non-EVOSTC Funds to be used:**

FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	TOTAL
------	------	------	------	------	-------

*\*If the amount requested here does not match the amount on the budget form, the request on the budget form will be considered to be correct.*

**Date: September 1, 2015**

*Reviewers will have available your annual report, original proposal, and this proposal during their review. However, to assist reviewers, please highlight or otherwise distinguish any new or additional information that was not included in your original proposal.*

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

*Please provide a summary of the project including key hypotheses and overall goals, as submitted in your original proposal. If there are additional highlights that you would like to include since you submitted your annual report, please include them here. Also, please list any publications that have been submitted and/or accepted since you submitted your annual report.*

Identify community partners: NOAA was pro-active and sought members of PWS communities that we, and/or our partners, have worked with in the past and created announcements for a potential funding opportunity. The focus of the announcement was to solicit brainstorming and collaboration among the PWS communities resulting in identification of viable partners and identification of potential projects. We anticipated working with communities in the spill-affected area, including: Cordova, Valdez, Whittier. We held public meetings or took part in existing meetings during the months of January – March 2012, and focused on meeting and hearing from the interested public.

Creation of a Federal Funding Opportunity: We established a new funding mechanism for Prince William Sound coastal communities to aid in funding habitat restoration for species and habitats impacted by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill.

Selected community projects: After identifying community partners and forming working groups, we worked with these groups to identify the pollution issues, causes, and best treatments for their location. In cases where there was a potential applicant with a standalone idea for a proposal, NOAA worked individually with that applicant to hone a proposal. These events took place from April – July 2012. The newly formed groups were supported by NOAA and tasked with identifying needs in their area. Simultaneous with the formation of these working groups, an assessment of current equipment, equipment usage, location, and harbor hazardous waste disposal facilities was conducted for each community (to be completed by the working groups, with assistance from NOAA). Following this assessment, a working group meeting was

conducted in each community where ideas for improved storm water and wastewater treatment, oil abatement, and clean harbor projects were compiled as well as a lessons-learned draft document to record what is not working and why. These reports were brought together by the grantee (NOAA) and sent to the contributors in the community for review. Following a review and comment period, the community specific reports were finalized with cost estimates formulated by the working groups, August and September 2012.

Project Formulation: In this phase of the project an open request for funding proposal (RFP) to conduct storm water and wastewater treatment, oil abatement and clean harbor work was released to the communities, October – December 2012. Involvement in the working groups is not a requirement for submission to the RFP but these groups had an advantage of having already worked through some of the major needs for their particular harbors as well as cost assessments for the work needing to be accomplished. Once proposals were finalized and submitted, NOAA and partners did an initial ranking (but allowed for the final decisions to be made by EVOS TC members). NOAA worked with Alaska Clean Harbors, specifically Rachel Lord from Cook Inlet Keeper and Shane Serrano AK DEC, to create a work plan from the top ranked proposals from the communities, January and February 2013. The work plans detailed the community's plan for harbor improvement and mentioned the need for equipment, training, or other as well as a timeline and budget to complete the proposed work. The EVOS Trustees had a chance to review, comment on and approve each work plan, March and April 2013. Following their approval, NOAA contacted the sub-grantee organizations.

Project Oversight/Site Visit: NOAA Restoration Center visited the restoration sites in June 2014 and April 2015 to work with the community organizations, oversee the work done to date and to answer any questions or concerns that the award recipients had on the projects. NOAA Restoration Center verified the status of work goals and objectives against sub grantees proposals. Where necessary, modifications were made to the projects with the guidance of the NOAA Restoration Center staff. Some examples of this include: a change in the snow management project reporting due to a low snow year in 2013 for the Copper River Watershed Project and modifications to the mussel watch sample collection date for Native Village of Eyak. The following write up gives more information on the progress to date and annotates where deviations from the original proposal occur:

- **Copper River Watershed Project**  
In 2015 it was determined that The construction estimate for BMPs was low and a bid for similar work in the area made the Copper River Watershed Project aware that they would need more money to complete the tasks as originally proposed in their application. The CRWP was able to rearrange the EVOS funds to accommodate this change and proceed with the projects as planned.  
Construction is complete for the snow storage site at Odiak Pond the main on the ground element of this grant. Design work for the second site is currently underway. The second project will end with completed design work.
- **Native Village of Eyak**

Invitation to bids for harbor waste disposal were not successful and so NVE decided to take on the construction of the antifreeze shed and battery storage themselves. Shed construction is complete and hazmat collection equipment is enroute to Cordova.

NVWE has participated in outreach through the dock walk program and participated in a Science Night program describing this work. Harbor signs have also been purchased and displayed around the harbor.

The final mussel sampling occurred in August 2015 and is undergoing analysis at Auke Bay lab.

#### Project Management Facilitation:

NOAA Restoration Center (RC) staff responded to requests from the funding recipients to clarify EVOS and NOAA funding amounts and reporting requirements. RC HQ staff worked closely with recipients to complete NOAA financial forms required to award EVOS funds to the EVOS identified recipients. RC staff works with funding recipients to navigate NOAA and EVOS reporting formats and requirements. RC staff reviewed all funding recipients' reports for accuracy and made suggestions for improvements, as necessary to ensure the final documents met the needs of NOAA and EVOS. To address this, RC staff created a hyperlinked spreadsheet and timeline to inform the funding recipients of upcoming reporting requirements and deadlines. RC staff also worked with funding recipients on completion of the reporting requirements and oversaw the submission to EVOS personnel.

## **II. COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION**

### **A. Within a EVOTC-Funded Program**

1. NOAA RC staff has collaborated with Gulf of Alaska Keeper to aid in identification of Marine Debris Accumulations that may fall within the scope of these project areas and scopes. Gulf of Alaska Keeper is currently the recipient of funding under EVOS invitation for Proposals Federal Fiscal year 2012, focus area #3b) EVOS for Marine Debris.
2. NOAA RC, Copper River Watershed Project and Native Village of Eyak are conducting their restoration work in collaboration with Scott Pegau of the Oil Spill Response Institute who is currently funded by EVOS for herring work (see EVOS invitation for Proposals Federal Fiscal year 2012, focus area #1). An example of this is the coordination of the Native Village of Eyak on their harbor user survey for which continues some of the work that OSRI began to determine effects of boat users on pollutants in herring habitat.
3. NOAA RC has recently (Spring 2015) collaborated with EVOSTC ADF&G and USFWS to conduct restoration projects in the Kenai Peninsula to enhance environmental integrity of EVOS parcels.

### **B. With Other EVOSTC-funded Projects**

*Indicate how your proposed project relates to, complements or includes collaborative efforts with other proposed or existing projects funded by the EVOSTC that are not part of a EVOSTC-funded program.*

These activities complement the work of the EVOS Herring Program by improving herring habitat.

### **C. With Trustee or Management Agencies**

Early in the project development process NOAA Restoration Center sought guidance and input from AK DEC on project goals and deliverables. As the projects progress, NOAA Restoration Center has ensured that this guidance and goals are maintained.

## **III. PROJECT DESIGN – PLAN FOR FY16**

### **A. Objectives for FY16**

*Identify the primary objectives for your project for FY16 as submitted in your original proposal.*

This project aims for coastal communities to begin programs based on oil and pollutant abatement which will run past the life of this grant, with self-sufficiency being the main goal. By bringing current plans up to date and incorporating a process by which the waste management plans become living documents, we aim for these improvements to continue adapting and the clean-up programs to continue in “maintenance” mode. The program will also work to identify funding sources other than EVOS which will aid the communities if later upgrades are needed. The outcome of these programs will be cleaner marinas, workable programs for maintenance of these marinas, and education transfers to ensure that lessons learned are not lost with rotating staff.

Specifically the CRWP will end their grant with a completed snow storage project, plus set of designs for further stormwater work. These designs will enable them to pursue future funding for project implementation. These recent engineering designs are often difficult to fund, as most grant money is for implementation. With these designs, the CRWP is hopeful that implementation will occur.

The Native Village of Eyak will have completed a year of harbor surveys and data collection. Their grant runs into 2017 and will include analysis of this data collection.

### **B. Changes to Project Design**

NOAA Restoration Center worked with Copper River Watershed project to move more of their funding to construction. As part of the project oversight for this funding change, we made sure all changes were performed in accordance with federal funding requirements.

## **IV. SCHEDULE**

### **A. Project Milestones for FY 16**

*For each project objective listed (III.A), specify when critical project tasks will be completed, as submitted in your original proposal. Please identify any substantive changes and the reason for the changes. Please format your information as in the following example:*

**Objective 1.** Conclusion of funding transfer to CRWP

Winter 2016

**Objective 2.** Final reporting for CRWP and ongoing support for Native Village of Eyak  
Spring 2016

**Objective 3.** Oversight and assistance with timely report submission to EVOSTC by NOAA  
Restoration Center and subgrantees  
Ongoing as of Sept 2015

**B. Measurable Project Tasks for FY 16**

*Specify, by each quarter of each fiscal year, when critical project tasks (for example, sample collection, data analysis, manuscript submittal, etc.) will be completed, as submitted in your original proposal. Please identify any substantive changes and the reason for the changes. Please format your schedule as in the following example:*

**FY 16, 1st quarter (February 1, 2016 - April 31, 2016)**

February: Attend the Alaska Forum on the Environment conference and present work from projects  
March 1: Submission of EVOS annual report, if needed  
April 30: Site visit/mid-term check in on NVE work for 2016

**FY 16, 2nd quarter (May 1, 2016-July 30, 2016)**

July 30: Site visit and project oversight

**FY 16, 3rd quarter (August 1, 2016 – October 31, 2016)**

September 1: Oversight and support for the submission of NOAA annual report

**FY 16, 4th quarter (November 1, 2016- January 31, 2017)**

January 2017: Prepare final reports for both NOAA and NVE.

**V. PROJECT PERSONNEL – CHANGES AND UPDATES**

*If there are any staffing changes to Primary Investigators or other senior personnel please provide CV's for any new personnel and describe their role on the project.*

N/A

**VI. BUDGET**

**A. Budget Forms (Attached)**

*Provide completed budget forms.*

See attached

**B. Changes from Original Proposal**

*If your FY15 funding request differs from your original proposal, provide a detailed list of the changes and discuss the reason for each change.*

**C. Sources of Additional Funding**

*Identify non-EVOSTC funds or in-kind contributions used as cost-share for the work in this proposal. List the amount of funds, the source of funds, and the purpose for which the funds will be used. Do not include funds that are not directly and specifically related to the work being proposed in this proposal.*

NA

<b>Budget Category:</b>	Proposed FY 12	Proposed FY 13	Proposed FY 14	Proposed FY 15	Proposed FY 16	TOTAL PROPOSED	ACTUAL CUMULATIVE
Personnel	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Travel	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7,750.0	\$7,750.0	\$7,616.0
Contractual	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Commodities	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Equipment	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0		\$0.0	
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7,750.0	\$7,750.0	
General Administration (9% of subtotal)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$697.5	\$697.5	N/A
<b>PROJECT TOTAL</b>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$8,447.5	\$8,447.5	
Other Resources (Cost Share Funds)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	

**COMMENTS:**  
This summary page provides an five-year overview of proposed funding and actual cumulative spending. The column titled 'Actual Cumulative' should be updated each fiscal year to provide information on the total amount actually spent for all completed years of the project. On the Project Annual Report Form, if any line item exceeds a 10% deviation from the originally-proposed amount; provide detail regarding the reason for the deviation.

The travel actual cumulative cell has a grand total of FY12 (\$5,474.00), FY14 (\$1,542.00) and FY15 (\$600) spending, totalling \$7,616.00.

**FY12-16**

**Project Title: Harbor Protection / Project Management**  
**Primary Investigator: L. Jennings**  
**Agency: NOAA**

**TRUSTEE AGENCY  
SUMMARY PAGE**

<b>Personnel Costs:</b>		Months Budgeted	Monthly Costs	Overtime	Personnel Sum
Name	Project Title				
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
Subtotal			0.0	0.0	
<b>Personnel Total</b>					<b>\$0.0</b>

<b>Travel Costs:</b>	Ticket Price	Round Trips	Total Days	Daily Per Diem	Travel Sum
Description					
Travel for one person to fly from Anchorage to Cordova	525.0	2	4	250.0	2,050.0
Travel for two people (Ivy and Kristin) to fly from Cordova to Anchorage	500.0	2	4	200.0	1,800.0
hotel for one person in Cordova	100.0	4			400.0
hotel for two people in Anchorage	200.0	10			2,000.0
					0.0
AK Forum on the Environment registration fee for three people	500.0	3			1,500.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
<b>Travel Total</b>					<b>\$7,750.0</b>

**FY16**

**Project Title: Harbor Protection / Project Management**  
**Primary Investigator: L. Jennings**  
**Agency: NOAA**

**FORM 4B  
PERSONNEL & TRAVEL  
DETAIL**



