Abstract
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AN INTERNSHIP WITH THE NOAA RESTORATION CENTER

by Karla C. Garcia

The Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship Program affords graduate students an opportunity to work on marine policy and related activities within the Legislative and Executive branches of government. Fellows spend one year with host offices in the Washington D.C. area learning about the policy decision-making process and how the process affects coastal and Great Lakes resource management. As a Knauss Fellow with the NOAA Restoration Center in 2007, I had many duties ranging from day-to-day operations to helping put together major program-highlighting events. Aside from my office responsibilities, I also had many opportunities for professional and educational development through Knauss-sponsored activities. My goals through the Fellowship were to learn about the marine policy decision-making process and to understand how existing policy affects on-the-ground work of federal and state agencies as well as non-governmental organizations.
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Introduction

Background
In partial fulfillment of the Masters of Environmental Sciences degree at the Institute of Environmental Sciences, I completed a 12-month internship as the Knauss Fellow for the NOAA Restoration Center.

I applied for the Fellowship following the recommendation of a Knauss alumnus, as it sounded exactly like the experience I needed in order to learn more about opportunities available to someone in the environmental field with an upcoming Masters degree. Working at the federal level also gave me the opportunity step closer to the policy-making process, which is something that should be of interest to anyone who is working in an environmental sector position.

As this is a report of my experiences as a Fellow, it highlights the organizational hierarchy of both the Fellowship and my host office. NOAA hosts both the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO), which oversees the Knauss Program, and the Restoration Center.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is a federal agency housed within the Department of Commerce (DOC) whose mission is “to understand and predict changes in the Earth’s environment and conserve and manage coastal and marine resources to meet our nation’s economic, social and environmental needs,” (www.noaa.gov). To this end, there are six line offices in NOAA each charged with specific roles that contribute to NOAA’s mission:

- National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS);
- Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR);
- National Ocean Service (NOS);
- National Weather Service (NWS);
- National Environmental Satellite, Date, and Information Services (NESDIS); and
- Office of Program Planning and Integration (PPI).
Figure 1. NOAA Organizational Chart (noaa.gov)
NOAA also serves as a trustee for natural resources and protects, conserves, and restores coastal marine and Great Lakes habitats and organisms on behalf of current and future generations of Americans. Native American tribes and some state agencies also serve as co-trustees. Trust resources include but are not necessarily limited to:

- Commercial and recreational fishery resources;
- Anadromous species (fish, like salmon, that spawn in fresh water and then migrate to the sea);
- Catadromous species (species, like the American eel, that spawn in the sea and then migrate to fresh water);
- Marine mammals, including whales, dolphins, and seals;
- Endangered and threatened marine species and their habitats (salmon, steller sea lions, and sea turtles, for example);
- Marshes, mangroves, seagrass beds, coral reefs, and other coastal habitats; and
- Resources associated with National Marine Sanctuaries and National Estuarine Research Reserves.

Public lands, waters, and living resources are held in trust for the benefit of all people and future generations. Stewardship of these resources is shared by several federal agencies. Federal statutes mandate the President to designate natural resource trustees to protect and restore these trust resources when they are threatened or harmed by oil or hazardous substance releases. As the federal agency responsible for managing and protecting coastal and marine fisheries, it is only natural that the resources noted above, which are all tied to marine and Great Lakes coastal environments, are entrusted to NOAA’s guardianship (darrp.noaa.gov).

**National Sea Grant Office**

The National Sea Grant Office (NSGO), housed within NOAA’s Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR), is the administrative head of the Sea Grant program, a collaboration of thirty universities around the country located in coastal and Great Lakes states and Puerto Rico involved in scientific research, education, training, and extension projects geared toward the conservation and practical use of U.S. coasts, the Great Lakes and other marine areas. As of 2007, the Sea Grant network boasts “over 300 participating institutions
involving more than 3000 scientists, engineers, educators, students, and outreach experts,“ (seagrant.noaa.gov). The program’s mission centers on addressing resource management issues through this vast network of scientific professionals.

**What is the Knauss Fellowship?**
The National Sea Grant Federal Fellows Program was established by the NSGO in 1979 “to provide a unique educational experience to [graduate] students who have an interest in ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources and in the national policy decisions affecting these resources,” (seagrant.noaa.gov). In 1987 the U.S. Congress stipulated in P.L. 100-220 that the Sea Grant Federal Fellows Program become a formal part of the National Sea Grant College Program Act. The recipients are designated Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellows in honor of one of Sea Grant’s founders and former NOAA Administrator, John A. Knauss [33 U.S.C. 1127 (b)] (seagrant.noaa.gov).

*Eligibility and Application Process*
In order to be eligible for the Program, the applicant must be a graduate student enrolled in an accredited university at the time of the submission of his/her application. Applicants submit applications to his/her state’s Sea Grant office. Each state is only allowed five applicants per year. In the event that a student is in a non-Sea Grant state, the NSGO provides assistance and contacts.

Before an application can be submitted, prospective applicants must discuss their intent to apply with their state’s Sea Grant director; a student may not apply for the Fellowship without the written endorsement of the director. My interview with Dr. Jeffery Reutter, Ohio State Sea Grant Director, lasted for approximately an hour at which time he first gauged my dedication to and enthusiasm for the program as well as my qualifications. After a lengthy discussion of my professional goals and what I hoped to take from the program, Dr. Reutter outlined the application process for me and discussed the responsibilities of a Knauss Fellow. We concluded with his verbal support of my application and worked out a timeline for him to receive my paperwork.
Applications are evaluated by a committee comprised of members from the current class of Fellows, the Knauss program director, and staff from previous and current host offices. Over a week-long session, the committee whittles down the pool from over one hundred applicants to the Finalists. For the class of 2007, the committee approved 46 Finalists.

Placement Week
Once a student is accepted into the Program as a Finalist, s/he must participate in a one week placement process in order to find a host and formally become a Fellow. Placement Week takes place in Washington DC the November or December before the February start date. After an introductory dinner where all the Finalists meet each other as well as the Knauss staff, the students spend the rest of the week separated into their legislative and executive schedules. The “leges [pronounced ledges]” spend the next three days on Capitol Hill while the “execs” spend their time primarily at NOAA headquarters in Silver Spring, Maryland. All Finalists are also encouraged to attend the evening events, which are basically mixers where hosts as well as current and previous Fellows can meet and talk to the Finalists in a less formal setting.

An Executive Fellow in the Knauss Program has the chance to work with a wide variety of host offices in federal agencies including U.S. Fish & Wildlife, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and – a new addition to the program – the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The large majority of the Finalists, however, are placed within one of the line offices of NOAA. Executive Finalists spend all of Monday watching presentations by all of the host offices. For the 2007 class, that entailed forty-nine presentations in eight hours. While each Finalist has access to a brief online description about each position before coming to Washington DC, the presentations attempt to flesh out the finer details of what a fellow can expect from each office.

Tuesday through Thursday are set aside for interviews for the Finalists. With the help of the Knauss staff, they schedule between twelve to twenty interviews beginning after lunch on Tuesday until end of day on Thursday. Interviews typically last no longer than forty-five minutes. On Thursday afternoon, Finalists are highly encouraged to call their top five choices
and notify the offices of their favored positions in his/her ranking. Presumably this helps the
offices with their rankings which will come into play on the last day.

Friday morning (or afternoon for the legislative Finalists) is arguably the most stressful part of
the week. The Finalists and staff are locked into a meeting room, and the big decision on which
office to sign-up with is made. Each office’s ranking sheet is displayed for the Finalists. For
each position, the highest ranked Finalists have the first choice, and finalists ranked below must
wait until the finalists ranked ahead of them cross their names off the list in order to become
eligible to choose the position. For example, I was ranked first on two lists which meant that
until I crossed my name off of either (or both) list, the second ranked Finalists could not choose
that office. The process continues until all of the finalists have chosen their positions. Once all
the choices have been made, each Finalist signs the ratification papers with his/her host office
and officially becomes a Fellow.

*My Placement Week Experience*
Meeting the other finalists was quite exciting. It was an incredibly gratifying and pleasant
experience to be surrounded by my social and intellectual peers. I remember using the term
thermocline in a joke and having everyone laugh. Usually I have to explain what a thermocline
is to at least two people in groups larger than four.

I did not realize it coming into Placement Week, but being a Knauss Finalist (let alone Fellow)
carries a lot of responsibility. Our behavior in interviews, evening events, even on the subway
was constantly under scrutiny. On the other hand, being part of such a large community (the
“Knauss Costa Nostra” is roughly 600+ strong), brings a lot of comfort and confidence for each
incoming class. No less than two-thirds of my eighteen interviewers were Knauss alumni, and
no matter what office an alumnus was part of, s/he was so open and helpful whenever a Finalist
needed to discuss any of the options available or was looking for any advice.

Each interview gave me an opportunity to learn more about federal agencies in general and,
specifically, how offices at different levels interact with each other within the system. I had the
chance to talk to heads of divisions at the finest scale of the hierarchy with yearly budgets as
small as $500,000 to office staff that routinely worked with budgets in excess of $10 million in any given year.

Before coming to Placement Week, I had my heart set on a particular office, Biogeography within NOAA’s National Ocean Services (NOS), because of the intense field work with coral. However, the best advice the Placement Week staff had to give was to keep as open a mind as possible because who knew what the interviews would bring. I realized that while the Biogeography office would probably still be a top choice, I had many other options that brought a lot of different advantages that I may not have considered beforehand. Some example questions I had to ask myself were “What are the different skills I could acquire from each office? What kind of network would I have access to outside of the Knauss Mafia?” and, perhaps most importantly, “What would my professional future look like from each office?”

In the end, after weighing all the pros and cons, I chose the Restoration Center. My interview with Dr. Perry Gayaldo was surprisingly animated for 8 o’clock AM despite the fact he had just walked into the office seconds before I walked through his door. The Restoration Center offered the unique opportunity to be part of the process on three levels: in the field, working on administrative/office responsibilities, and (potentially) attending any Congressional hearings concerning any projects of which I happen to be a part. No other office offered such a complete experience. Also, the Restoration Center partners with many offices from the regional down to the community level, so my professional network would be fairly huge. While I would love to stay in the DC area for my career, realistically I need to prepare for the possibility of moving elsewhere.
My Host Office

*National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS)*

“Stewardship of living marine resources through science-based conservation and management and the promotion of healthy ecosystems” (nmfs.noaa.gov)

NMFS is one of the oldest federal offices; in fact the agency that eventually became Fisheries pre-dates NOAA by over a century. 2007 marks the 200th anniversary of the beginning of NOAA: the Survey of the Coast. Today, Fisheries oversees and manages a wide variety of subjects from aquaculture to helping implement the Magnuson-Stevens Act to funding partnerships towards habitat conservation.
Figure 2. NOAA Fisheries Organizational Chart (www.nmfs.noaa.gov)
The Office of Habitat Conservation

The Office of Habitat Conservation – one of the offices within NMFS – consists of four separate divisions: Habitat Protection, Ecosystem Assessment, the Chesapeake Bay Office, and the Restoration Center (RC), my host office. Dr. Perry Gayaldo, my direct supervisor, is also the Deputy Chief of the office, which gives me a bird’s eye view of what direction the RC is working towards. It is an interesting combination of being able to discuss the office on the directorate level as well as with specific programs within the RC.
Figure 3. Office of Habitat Conservation Organizational Chart (Tavel)
The Restoration Center

The RC contains three major programs dedicated to different aspects of restoration work, and I worked with the Damage Assessment, Remediation and Restoration Program and the Community-based Restoration Program. The third major program, the Coastal Wetland Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA, also known as the Breaux Act), works specifically to address problems along the Louisiana coast and the alarming rate at which the state is losing coastal wetlands. CWPPRA projects are usually large-scale, upwards of 2000 acres at a time, and utilize many federal and state-level partnerships.

Aside from the staff at headquarters, the RC also has four regions with offices throughout each region:

- Northeast: coastal states from Maine to Virginia as well as the Great Lakes;
- Southeast: stretches south from North Carolina and around the Gulf to Texas, also Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands;
- Southwest: California and Hawaii; and

These regions are distributed in the same way as the NMFS regions, but RC regional staff do not report to the heads of the NMFS regions and instead are under the supervision of the RC itself.

While headquarters staff only work with one program, regional staff work with multiple programs within the RC as well as potentially collaborate with NOAA staff from other offices as needed. Oftentimes the regional offices share office space with NOAA laboratories and science centers that facilitate cooperative relationships. In this respect, my work detail more closely mirrors that of regional staff though my actual tasks and responsibilities are at the headquarters level. Headquarters staff mostly serve as the administrative heads while regional staff are the technical experts for projects in their geographical zones. A more detailed explanation of these duties can be found in sections three and four, which focus on my experiences and duties with the two programs of the RC with which I work.
Overview of Accomplishments and Notable Events

FEBRUARY

- Damage Assessment, Remediation and Restoration Program (DARRP)
  - Joined planning team for the Hill Event – Outreach event targeting Congressional members and staff
  - Collected and compiled data from DARRP projects to highlight DARRP accomplishments

- Community-based Restoration Program (CRP)
  - Observed meetings as an introduction to the program
  - Completed training from Management Concepts, Inc. – Introduction to Grants and Cooperative Agreements for Federal Employees
  - Assisted with data collection for permits chapter of Restoration Portal
  - Wrote proposal for fish ladder model

MARCH

- Knauss
  - Various receptions/evening events ex. Knauss Alumni reception with Sea Grant directors
  - Voted chair of planning committee for class trip

- CRP
  - Assigned ongoing projects to manage
  - Assigned current applications for negotiations and future management
  - Assigned authorship over corals chapter for Restoration Portal
  - Assigned competition manager for FY2008 Great Lakes Program partnership solicitation

- DARRP
  - Solicited bids from potential event coordinators for Hill Event
  - Finalized Hill Event brochure to be sent to printer – participated in meetings to discuss text and pictures, set up paperwork for printing process
APRIL

➢ Knauss
  o Attended Aquariums and Zoos Association’s “Party for the Planet” hosted by Speaker Nancy Pelosi with guest speaker Jack Hanna
  o Organized and tabulated vote on dates of the class trip
  o Organized and tabulated vote on the top three destination choices for class trip – wrote request for proposals from class, disseminated proposals for vote
  o Attended 2nd National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration

➢ DARRP
  o Assisted the finalization of Hill Event plans – day-of tasks, signing on the event contractor, printing the necessary materials (brochures, invitations, posters, fact sheets)
  o Tasked with creating the briefing packet for the Hill Event emcee, Scott Rayder Chief of Staff for NOAA – agenda of event, talking points for Rayder, brief biographies of speakers

➢ CRP
  o Inherited partnership with The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
  o Began the review process for reviewing and selecting projects under the TNC partnership – request for proposals closed, began identifying who among the regional staff would review each proposal

MAY

➢ Knauss
  o Finalized the Oregon coast as the class trip destination

➢ DARRP
  o Hill Event – May 23rd

➢ CRP
  o Led negotiations on my 7 grant applications and participated in negotiations with my 2 partnership applications
    ▪ 1 project through the CRP Direct Solicitation
    ▪ 3 Marine Debris Program projects
    ▪ 2 Open Rivers Initiatives projects
- 2 partnerships: TNC and the Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership (SARP) with the Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
  - First site visit to Pennypack Park in Philadelphia, PA – press event at a site of previously funded dam removal
  - Scheduled review calls with each region for TNC proposal reviews

**JUNE**

- **Knauss**
  - Stepped down as committee chair – Oregon subcommittee formed in order to finalize the paperwork for the trip

- **CRP**
  - Completed regional discussion of TNC proposals resulting in a national ranking of proposals based on RC priorities
  - Discussed review results with TNC staff
  - Submitted all of my grants to the Grants Management Division (GMD) for approval
  - Inherited one more CRP Direct Solicitation project after negotiations
  - NOAA Restoration Day – participated in restoration activities in Jug Bay Natural Area, a component of the Chesapeake Bay Natural Estuarine Research Reserve

**JULY**

- **Knauss**
  - Attended Caribbean Derelict Fishing Gear Workshop

- **CRP**
  - Submitted corrections and clarifications on paperwork for grants as requested by GMD

**AUG**

- **CRP**
  - Participated in site visits in Puerto Rico with a member of the Southeast region
  - Participated in field work on pre-dam removal monitoring in Merrimack, NH with staff from the Northeast region – in lieu of the Knauss class trip
The Knauss Experience

Travel and Educational Funds
Each Fellow is allotted $7000 his/her grant for travel and academic opportunities. Fellows utilize these funds for conferences, academic related travel, and career enrichment through training courses and workshops. Usually the top choices are international conferences; after all how often does one get a chance to have an all expenses paid trip to an exotic destination for work? However, I chose to take the more conservative route and focused on conferences within the United States that would help me build my expertise in the restoration field. Through out the year, organizations such as American Fisheries Society and the Estuarine Research Foundation, hold conferences that bring together scientists, environmental professionals, and up and coming graduate students. By attending such conferences, I could learn about widely used restoration techniques in various ecosystems and different approaches to conservation management. I would also stay on top of the most pressing issues facing conservation and restoration professionals as well as creating a larger professional network.

In April of 2007, I attended the 2nd National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration. During the week, I attended many talks on topics that I was unfamiliar with like adaptive management as well as subjects about which I was fairly knowledgeable such as urban ecosystems. There were also presenters available each evening to discuss specific topics of importance in different offices or research currently being developed by the academic sector. All in all, I felt the conference was good a experience which opened my eyes as to how different federal agencies tackle environmental problems and restoration projects. I also made contact with some truly fascinating people working in non-profits, other governmental agencies, and the private sector.

As valuable an experience as the NCER was for me, I decided that it was my last conference for the year and instead chose to focus my energy and travel funds on site visits to the regional offices of the Restoration Center. Conferences can only teach so much about any given topic; being in the field at a real restoration project shows how theories and ideas are applied and how effective techniques really are.
Another important facet of the Knauss experience is the ability to be able to work on academic projects along with our host office responsibilities. In fact, the Knauss administrators and most of the hosts stress that school work comes first in the case of Fellows who did not finish their programs before starting the Fellowship. For the class of 2007, approximately one-half of the Fellows are in the midst of thesis or dissertation work, so the ability to take time to work on writing is critical to staying on schedule for graduation. The Ohio Sea Grant Program Director, Dr. Jeffery Reutter, highly recommended that I graduate during my Knauss tenure. At the end of the Fellowship, many job opportunities would open up, and it would be to my benefit to have already finished my schooling at that point.

**Special Events**
Along with travel opportunities, the NSGO holds events around the city within different agencies specifically for Knauss Fellows. One such event, NOAA 101, is held every year to further educate the Fellows on the inner workings of NOAA as well as give them the chance to meet with NOAA leadership. Non-profit organizations also hold luncheons and receptions in the hope of both informing Fellows about each organization’s vision and mission as well as gaining a stronger foothold within the agencies and offices represented by each class. The Nicholas Institute, a non-profit ocean advocacy group affiliated with Duke University, held a legal briefing for the Fellows and gave the class a chance to voice their opinions on current ocean legislation, visions for the ocean’s future, and what can be done to achieve their ocean-related political and scientific goals.

Fellows were invited to this year’s Association for Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) “Party for the Planet” on April 18, 2007– one of the most memorable events I attended during my Washington D.C. tenure. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi hosted the event, and Jack Hanna brought an entourage of “animal ambassadors” to draw attention to issues such as climate change and poaching. A large contingency of 2007 Fellows were on hand, and we rubbed elbows with staffers and Congressional members alike. Political affiliation and inter-agency rivalries were left at the door as we all marveled at the beautiful animals and were inspired by Jack Hanna’s words.
Class Trip
The Fellowship has also given me the chance to hone my leadership skills. Each year, the Fellows take a week-long trip to a coastal destination where they meet with an agency’s local office, participate in restoration activities, and generally learn more about the specific location’s coastal and marine environmental issues. The class takes an active part not only in deciding the trip’s destination but also the setting the itinerary and dealing with the less glamorous details such as lodging and transportation. However, rather than have all 44 Fellows intimately involved in the administrative portion of the planning, a trip committee was formed to streamline the process.

I was honored to have been chosen, after spearheading the first round of organizational tasks, to chair the committee this year. Mostly my duties involved scheduling and managing the committee meetings, creating the relevant documents such as spreadsheets tracking voting results, and being the point of contact between the committee and the rest of the class. The committee’s first meeting outlined the timeline for important deadlines such as voting on the dates of the trip, setting up the process for soliciting proposals for destinations, and voting on the ultimate trip destination. As the chair, I considered being the point of contact between the committee and the rest of the class as my most important duty. It was important to have open and timely communication with everyone involved for the process to be successful. I would compile all decisions, requests, and general news from the committee in emails to the class, and in turn any replies, concerns, and issues from class members would come to my inbox.

There were three major tasks that I took the lead on. First, we had to vote as a class on the week of the trip. Since the Legislative Fellows have recess during the month of August, the trip is restricted to those weeks alone. The committee decided to give class members the option of ranking which week they preferred, and I compiled the ranks and tallied the votes. Once we decided on the last week of August, it was time to work on a destination. Again, the entire committee took part in deciding on the process, but ultimately it was my job to draft the solicitation for proposals, answer any questions from class members, compile the proposals, and send them out for a vote. Finally, we voted for the destination in two rounds – once to narrow the field down to the top three and a vote on the final choice. For both votes, I asked the class to
rank their preferences, and the destination with the lowest score (top preference was given a ranking of 1 and the rankings for each destination was summed) won the round.

Unofficially, my most important job was that of firefighter. Seemingly small issues would erupt into a huge problem in the hands of a tiny group of people, and suddenly all reason would fly out of the window. The biggest example of this type of situation was what I have dubbed the Labor Day fire drill. (In the office, queries and any communication requiring a response from Congressional members are called fire drills due to the “drop everything and respond now” nature of the activity.) As a class, we voted not once but twice on the last week of August as the best time for the trip. However, three to four Fellows realized after the voting that the trip would end on Labor Day weekend. Through both open (i.e. using the listserv) and backdoor (i.e. amongst themselves and addressed to me specifically) communication, they agitated more of the class to the point of fighting, nasty emails, and a dispute over the original votes. For days, the insanity continued despite the committee’s best attempts to calm the situation, so I finally took our case to the Knauss director. He agreed that it was not the committee’s job to hold everyone’s hands and that the democratic process had been followed to the letter. The last week of August stood as the trip time much to the relief of the committee and members of the class who had already scheduled work and school related trips during other weeks in August.

In spite of the fire drill and other smaller bumps along the way, the class managed to come together and voted the Oregon coast as our destination, and the committee continued to work behind the scenes setting up the itinerary, lining up speakers, and obtaining lodging & transportation – all within the budget set at $1500 per Fellow. However, after the final vote on Oregon came through, my office responsibilities demanded all of my work hours, which between April and June often exceeded the usual 40 hour week. I made the decision to step down from my position as chair at this point, and a sub-committee of five people completed all the major tasks in putting the trip together.

After all the hard work, I opted not to take the trip in favor of a field work opportunity with the Restoration Center’s Northeast regional office. While I felt the field work taught me valuable skills and, in my opinion, increased my marketability with regards to job searching, I missed
being able to spend time with my friends and catching up on how the Fellowship was progressing for everyone.
Restoration Center: Damage Assessment, Remediation and Restoration Program

Background
The 1989 Exxon-Valdez oil spill demonstrated NOAA’s need to improve its ability to respond to catastrophic events, and in 1992 the precursor to the Damage Assessment, Remediation, and Restoration Program (DARRP) was officially created to provide “permanent expertise within NOAA to assess and restore natural resources injured” (darrp.noaa.gov) through long-term releases of hazardous materials, catastrophic spills, and ship groundings/accidents. Through the DARRP, NOAA works with other federal agencies, the responsible parties, and other stakeholders to “implement remedial actions that protect NOAA trust resources” (DARRP Brochure). Since its inception, the program has recovered over $437 million from responsible parties to fund these actions.

NOAA’s DARRP uses two processes to carry out its natural resources trustee responsibilities. The first step occurs at the incident site where clean-up agencies work with the responsible parties to stop the spread of contamination and, whenever possible, integrate immediate restoration with clean-up activities to expedite the recovery of natural resources. However these clean-ups alone are not enough to restore natural resources or address the loss of use of the damaged resources by the public.

NOAA and the other stakeholders work together to develop and carry out further restoration projects through the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process. First, a preliminary assessment is conducted to determine if in fact natural resources have been damaged and, if so, the severity and extent of the injuries. Economic and scientific studies are then performed to diagnose the injuries and any loss of services to the community, quantify them, and create a restoration plan to compensate for those injuries and lost services. This step may take years to complete in order to ensure the results, among other reasons, can withstand the scrutiny of the court of law. Finally, the restoration plan is implemented utilizing funds recovered through settlements or litigation.
The strength and efficiency of the program lies in the collaborative nature of most of the settlements. Responsible parties are encouraged to be active partners in the remediation and restoration process; they have the chance to resolve their liability in a cost-effective and practical manner and present a positive face to the situation for the public.

Three NOAA offices come together to form the DARRP: the Assessment and Restoration Division (ARD) within NOS identifies what resources/services have been damaged or lost because of an event; the Office of General Counsel for Natural Resources (GCNR) provides legal support and pursues litigation, when necessary, of the parties responsible for damages and resource loss; and the Restoration Center (RC) coordinates, implements and monitors all DARRP restoration projects and manages restoration funds.

**DARRP within the RC**

At the headquarters level, the RC is responsible for many of the administrative duties for the DARRP. Three members of the RC staff are dedicated solely to the DARRP work including record keeping for each case, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance, data management, yearly reporting, and financial tracking. Along with the DARRP team, the financial team of the office works on the accounting and payroll aspects of the program. Unlike other NOAA programs, the DARRP staff are reimbursed by the responsible party for their time through hourly and task-specific billing through each case; this system reflects the litigious nature of the work involved.

The regional staff are involved on a more hands-on level. Ideally, the RC prefers to have representation with each incident from the very beginning. The clean up process is often too narrowly focused on removing the contamination from the site and ignores the resource restoration aspects. By having RC involved with the clean up planning, the process becomes more complex in the short-term but ultimately saves time and effort in the long-term insomuch as beginning the restoration of the area in question.

The RC plays an active role in the NRDA process as expert consultants on studies and many times leading the research and processing the data. Naturally, once the studies have been
completed, the RC also participates in the creation and follow-through of the restoration plan. This may include working with other agencies and responsible parties to determine the extent of the restoration, sitting in various committees at the local level to plan and choose proposals, and monitoring the actual on-the-ground projects. Settlements can generate multiple restoration projects over time, and headquarters is in charge of managing the entire process and acting as the point of contact between the field staff and the DARRP program chiefs.

The DARRP Hill Event – Healing Our Coasts, Protecting Our Future

Background

2007 marked the DARRP’s 15th anniversary, and my work with the program almost completely centered on a May 23rd outreach campaign targeting Congress and their staff – the Hill Event. As a federal program, the DARRP requires a minimum level of Congressional funding outside of settlements. Past budget cuts had resulted in decreases to the DARRP’s base budget; the Hill Event was conducted to educate the Congress on the importance of DARRP. Representative Steny Hoyer of Maryland’s 5th Districted hosted the event at the Rayburn Building, one of the House buildings on Capitol Hill.

The Hill Event strategy basically consisted of a two to four hour informational breakfast reception with educational materials, regional & “Tools of the Trade” displays, and a handful of speakers including supportive Congressional staff, participating partners from industry, and NGO’s. We were honored to have Senator Maria Cantwell speak on the program’s behalf and were pleasantly surprised by an unannounced visit by Representative Vernon Ehlers of Michigan. While many members of Congress were invited, only two responded to the RSVP, and we were not expecting any other members to attend.

After the speakers were finished, guests could help themselves to breakfast refreshments, which were sponsored by partner NGOs, and discuss the program with the many DARRP representatives on hand. Each regional display was manned by one member of the RC regional office and one member of the ARD regional office; they fielded any questions and generally talked about the DARRP projects in their regions. Other representatives circulated about the room talking with the guests and being generally available for questions and comments.
Planning the Event

Of the three that compose the DARRP, the RC is the most experienced with outreach and event planning, so partners looked to the RC to take the lead on the Hill Event. The main planning committee consisted of John Collins and Juli Anna McNutt from the RC, Michael Jarvis and Kristin Rusello from ARD, and Ann Berger from GCNR. The committee had been working for six months on all aspects of the event from logistics to outreach materials to budgets by the time I joined the office. When it was made clear that they could happily use an extra set of hands, my supervisor agreed to allow me dedicate some of my time to DARRP. Courtney Webster and Craig Woolcott also joined the committee at the same time.

Regional staff and additional members of the headquarters offices were also solicited to work on various aspects of the event alongside the planning committee. For example, Vicki Loe and Milena Viljoen from the Pacific region were the graphic designers in charge of creating the brochure. Staff from every region were a part of writing and editing and educational materials as well as providing photographs and materials for “Tools of the Trade” displays.

My biggest planning-related responsibility was taking part in hiring an outside company to coordinate the logistics of the Hill Event. As a federal agency, NOAA cannot contract for any outside services that cost more than $3000 without first going through the competitive bidding process. We solicited three different event production companies for their concepts and designs based on our budget, and in the end we chose the Joan Carol Design & Exhibit Group. The RC had actually worked with the company in the past, so the Joan Carol group was quite familiar with our budgetary constraints as well as the protocol for handling events on the Hill.

In the solicitation process, I was the point of contact for the event production companies. I also participated in the meetings with each company as the note-taker assisted John to make sure all of our major questions and issues were addressed. For example it was very important for the production company to be familiar with the security process for delivering the Hill Event supplies to the Rayburn Building.
Once we contracted the Joan Carol group, it continued to be my responsibility to be the point of contact between our consultant, Ruth Jaquith, and the rest of the DARRP planning team. I was the conduit for information between the office and the Joan Carol Group. As the event drew closer, we continued to refine the room layout, for example, and negotiate what products Joan Carol would be responsible for. In the end, it was decided that they would print and laminate our three regional posters and two DARRP banners, but we were responsible for the design. On the day of the event, Joan Carol provided delivery of all materials and set-up and tear-down of the room.

*Educational Materials and Speaker Documents*

My very first duty was to assist in gathering project data from the regional offices and compiling the program’s accomplishments over the past fifteen years. The data included the number of acres or stream miles restored, any endangered or threatened species protected through habitat restoration, and the number of public use structures, such as piers, restored for local communities. Eventually the list of accomplishments was used in the Hill Event brochure and the individual state fact sheets.

The brochure, a 28-page booklet, contained all of the basic information about the DARRP as well as case studies of specific projects from the Program’s three regions (Northeast and Great Lakes, Southeast and Puerto Rico, and the Pacific). The compiled data, maps and site pictures, and quotes from stakeholders all came together to tell the story of the program’s first 15 years. By the time I joined the planning committee in late February, the majority of the brochure’s pictures had been chosen and most of the text written. I participated in some of the final updates and re-writes to portions of the text as well as the general discussions about the brochure’s design. Mostly I helped to edit for grammar and a little bit of content if passages needed to be cut down to fit the space. I also voted on disputed pictures and participated on discussions about which pictures would work best for each section.

The state fact sheets were designed to have the same general information as the brochure except in a much more condensed format and highlighting accomplishments specific to the states. In this way, Congressional staffers could come in and easily determine what had been done in their
state, therefore receiving all the necessary information even if they did not have time to stop and talk to the DARRP representatives.

The “Tools of the Trade” displays featured various tools used during clean up and restoration projects. Some of the items included Hazmat suits and gear, a NOAA hard hat, Geotextile and eco-logs (used to absorb contaminants on the water’s surface), and guides to different ecosystems. We also exhibited various paraphernalia like oil samples and fish advisory materials to highlight both causes of and effects from injury events.

Along with the educational materials, I was responsible for compiling a handful of documents for the speakers. The most important of these documents was the briefing packet for Scott Rayder, Chief of Staff for NOAA and the emcee for the Hill Event. Normally the RC’s outreach coordinator, Stephanie Hunt, would develop the packet, but she was already working on so many different projects and could not cover this task. The briefing packet contained the background information for the event including the morning’s schedule, the list of participants, and a biography on each of the speakers. The most difficult component of the packet for me to work on was Scott Rayder’s talking points for the morning. While I was already quite familiar with the programmatic information and the speakers’ bios, I had never worked on talking points before and had to learn about tailoring a short speech to the audience and writing brief yet compelling introductions for each speaker.

**Future with DARRP**

As of September 2007, the DARRP was developing a new strategic plan and an outreach plan for the program based on the comments and lessons learned from the Hill Event. My role with the DARRP was to support the RC staff as necessary. For the remainder of my Fellowship, there was discussion on bringing me aboard to assist with testing the new Damage Assessment and Restoration Revolving Fund Tracking System (DARRTS).
Restoration Center: Community-based Restoration Program

Background

The Community-based Restoration Program (CRP) is arguably the shining star of the Restoration Center. The program works on a grass-roots level to restore and enhance coastal and Great Lakes habitats by funding partnerships with national organizations such as The Nature Conservancy, American Rivers, and the Fish America Foundation as well as directly solicited projects. Since 1996, the CRP has funded over one thousands two hundred projects in 27 states, Canada, and the Caribbean for over $50 million dollars. As a result over 24,000 habitat acres have been restored, over one hundred stream blockages have been removed, and nine hundred streams miles have been opened for fish passage; these projects utilized more than 100,000 volunteers over the years.

The vast majority of work in the CRP centers on awarding and managing grants; both headquarters and the regions share this one fundamental job even if the specific tasks differ. As with DARRP, CRP headquarters staff deal with the administrative end of grants and serve as grant managers. Each federal program officer (FPO) must undergo a three day certification program in order to be able to work on grants within a federal agency. I attended Management Concept Incorporated’s (MCI) “Introduction to Grants and Cooperative Agreements for Federal Personnel” course in March thus enabling me to work with grants within the CRP. Through the course, I gained a basic understanding of the award assistance process from pre-award to close out. NOAA also held its own one day workshop to familiarize the FPOs with agency-specific protocol and resources.

The MCI program outlined the federal grants process and introduced the pertinent laws and regulations that all program officers must know. Since the program is meant for all federal employees, I only learned the basics including managing the paperwork, important federal deadlines, and the life process of a grant. The NOAA workshop helped newly certified NOAA FPO’s to learn about Grants Online, which will be explained in detail later in the chapter, and the agency-specific process and timelines each office must adhere to.
The regional staff serve as the technical monitors, working with the grantees to implement on-the-ground proposals, fulfill National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance responsibilities, data management, and any project-related issues. In the case of partnerships, each sub-awarded project is treated like a regular individual grant and receives a technical monitor.

**The CRP Grants Process**

*Federal Funding Opportunities and CRP Initiatives*

Each year, federal agencies publish announcements known as federal funding opportunities (FFO) about all grants available through their various programs. FFOs can be found in the Federal Register and, since 2002, through the government’s grant information website Grants.gov. Each announcement describes the funding program, solicits potential projects, and gives the basic information applicants need such as deadlines and how to submit proposals. Typically announcements are published for NOAA during June and December each year.

The CRP published three FFOs for fiscal year 2007 (FY07). The Community-based Habitat Restoration Project grants program, known as CRP projects within the office, is the original initiative that gave birth to the CRP and has the broadest solicitation of the three announcements. As stated in the FFO, “projects funded through the CRP have strong on-the-ground habitat restoration components that provide educational and social benefits for people and their communities in addition to long-term ecological habitat improvements for NOAA trust resources,” (CRP FFO). Project grants are awarded for two years, but for management purposes, grants can be extended at no cost to NOAA in order to complete on-the-ground activities or the paperwork attached to each project such as progress reports. Aside from singular projects, the CRP FFO also solicits partnerships between the CRP and non-federal agencies. Partnership agreements last for three years, with funding negotiated each year based on the final Congressional budget mark, but the sub-awards for projects act like individual grants and are awarded for up to two years.

In 2005, the Marine Debris Program within NOS was launched to address the issue of marine debris and derelict fishing gear. The Community-based Marine Debris Prevention and Removal
grants program solicits projects focused on marine debris and derelict fishing gear removal and prevention that also adhere to the CRP’s dedication to providing education and social benefits for local communities. These grants are typically awarded for 18 months.

The Open Rivers Initiative (ORI) was created in 2005; as the name suggests, the program focuses on projects that remove barriers to fish dispersal and migration. Ideally, this means the total removal of the barrier, but sometimes this is not feasible such as the case of small towns using a low head dam to retain water for community consumption or open bridges being far too expensive a replacement for small culverts. In these and similar situations, organizations put forth proposals to aid in fish passage using bottomless culverts with natural stream features within to replace the undersized culverts, for instance. Like CRP grants, ORI funds are awarded for two years.

For FY08, a fourth initiative was added addressing the lack of CRP involvement in the Great Lakes. For its first year, the Great Lakes Habitat Restoration Program focused on establishing regional partnerships rather than funding individual projects.

My responsibilities as an FPO touched all of these initiatives. As of September, for the FY07 grants I was the FPO for two partnership awards, two CRP, three Marine Debris, and two ORI project awards. I also inherited and managed ten projects that were awarded in past years that were still ongoing. For the Great Lakes Program, I served as the competition manager, which meant I was the FPO to receive the applications and process them according to the CRP protocol.

The Selection Process
Proposal due dates for each FFO are staggered between August and October. Each FFO generates dozens of proposals, but there are only a handful of FPOs to process them and a finite pool of regional staff for the review process, which is why staggered due dates are necessary. Once proposals come in, they are evaluated against a minimum requirements checklist which determines if each proposal is even eligible for consideration. The checklist is used to look at whether the project or partnership meets minimum requirements set by NOAA and the CRP and whether the paperwork is filled out correctly.
Proposals that fulfill the minimum requirements undergo a review process that includes at least three reviewers, but more typically seven to ten, consisting of a mix of headquarters and regional staff. FPOs read proposals from all over the country while, generally, regional staff only review proposals from their region. In 2007, the CRP started utilizing mixed-region reviews with regional staff reviewed proposals from different regions.

The majority of applicants work with regional staff before submitting the applications, which gives the regions a greater familiarity with each project than headquarters can achieve. There are positive and negative aspects with these cases. On one hand, regions can bring information about projects to the discussion that may not be clear in the written proposals. On the other hand, this system potentially gives an unintentional advantage to applicants who contact regional staff over applicants who do not. There is an ongoing debate within the CRP about the fairness of outside-of-proposal information in regards to the selection process.

The reviewers read and comment on each proposal then score them using the CRP score sheet. Proposals are scored based on five main criteria: importance and applicability; technical/scientific merit; the overall qualifications of the applicant(s); project costs; and outreach, education, and community involvement. The scores are then compiled and a rank proposal order developed. Proposals are then chosen based on their ranking and the amount of funding available. In some cases, projects can be passed over in favor of proposals ranked below them. For instance when a funding partner is planning to fund the same project in their own selection process and the project does not require funding from both sources. When I joined the RC in February 2007, the review process had already ended and the top projects identified, and the office – along with the whole country – was simply awaiting the passing of the budget to finalize the choices. In the meantime, the headquarters staff met often for office “fire drills.” Chris Doley, the RC Division Chief, would give us an estimated final dollar amount to be used for grants, and the staff would then generate a list of projects that would be funded along with recommended funding amounts. Mostly I sat back and observed the proceedings; during this time I took the opportunity to absorb as much as I could about the priorities of the office, each region, and how decisions on funding are made.
Once proposals are chosen, an FPO and a technical monitor are assigned to each project based on expertise, geographical preferences for FPOs, and geographical areas for regional staff. As a management team, they discuss each project and its highlights, weaknesses, and budgets. Together they then contact the applicant, usually via conference call, to negotiate the scope of the project and potential funding amounts. Rarely do projects truly require the full amount that applicants request. The CRP strives to promote the support necessary as many worthy projects as possible. During the negotiations, CRP staff can gauge what level of funding keeps the project viable – basically what is the true budgetary need for the applicant to allow the project to continue at approximately the same scope as delineated in the proposal.

I participated in negotiations with each of my FY07 grants and led all but two of the conference calls. It was my responsibility to keep the conversation following the agenda and to respond to the grantees’ questions and concerns. Typically the biggest issues that needed to be addressed were reducing the budgets and changing the paperwork to reflect the new budget, potentially changed work plan, and any other adjustments.

The negotiation stage is also the time when questionable activities can either be adjusted or even removed from a proposal. For example, when I negotiated a Marine Debris proposal, both the technical monitor and I communicated our extreme discomfort with an objective that included divers working in less than optimum diving conditions. Despite the plans for a safety protocol, the liability issues presented too great a risk to NOAA. In the end, the objective was replaced with a plan for the applicant to work with the Northwest Straits Commission to create a detailed protocol for divers to retrieve marine debris within the applicant’s region. The grantees fully understood our concerns, and the discussions never became contentious.

Once projects have been negotiated, the FPO works closely with the applicant to ensure that the necessary changes are made to the paperwork. Surprisingly this was the most difficult step in the grants process for me because of the vast number of documents involved. Changing any dates or monetary amounts equated to changing at least one item on every single piece of paper attached to the application. However, it was important to make sure that every date and funding amount
matched as well as having the scope of the project clearly delineated in each application. Each grant, after all, is a binding agreement between NOAA and the applicant.

Grants Online
NOAA utilizes an online processing and administrative system, Grants Online, to manage all NOAA grants through their life cycles. Grantees must also create accounts within the system in order to be able to perform tasks such as submitting progress reports and accessing old paperwork.

As the FPO, it was my responsibility to upload all of the revised paperwork into the system and finalize the application file before sending it through to the grants specialist and legal department. This includes submitting the official procurement request and attaching the signed NEPA memo documenting the project’s environmental compliance. At this stage, the grants specialist analyzes all of the paperwork and information entered into the system to make sure the proposed budget is realistic and the costs allowable under the law. Once the specialist and the legal department sign off on the project, the file then goes to the financial department who obligates the funds, establishes grantee accounts, and other related items. Once the reviewers have approved the budget and ensured that the RC has the money in its account to fund each project, the award is signed and finalized. As of September, all of my nine grants have been awarded.

Managing the Grant
Once a grantee countersigns the award, it is time to begin the project. The FPO is responsible for creating an entry in the database for each award s/he manages in the Restoration Center Database (RCDB). The database helps the RC programs track project-related data that are then used each year for the office’s performance measure reports. I was trained on the RCDB and data entry in early August in order to be able to enter all of my projects before the end of the fiscal year as the reports are typically due within weeks afterwards.

Every six months, the grantees are required to submit a project progress report and financial report. Luckily, we are not responsible for obtaining or renewing the financial report though the
grantee still utilizes Grants Online to submit the necessary forms to the financial office. Once a grantee submits the progress report, the FPO sends it out to the technical monitor for review. Ninety days after a grant closes, a final comprehensive report is submitted and put through the same review process. The FPO is then responsible for closing out the file on Grants Online as well as the RCDB. As of September, I did not have any grants close.

Managing Partnerships

Managing partnerships versus individual grants works almost in the same way, but there are a few important differences. Individual grants only have a lifetime of two years, but partnerships last for three. Also, each partnership generates its own set of project proposals which must go through a modified selection process.

Choosing sub-awards for each partnership is a two-way street with the specific partner. In April 2007, the Nature Conservancy (TNC) closed its solicitation for proposals to be funded under their partnership with the RC; twenty-four applications were submitted. As the FPO, I separated the proposals based on the RC’s regional boundaries and sent copies to each region for review. In this case, it was far more important for me to receive the regional staff’s comments rather than their scores; during the selection process with TNC, our scores would not matter as much as our outlook on each proposal. TNC held their own reviews, and in the event that we disagreed about the merits of any projects, I wanted detailed information as to the reasons why. I also required each region to rank the projects in order of importance; once again, in the event of disputes with TNC, I wanted to know which proposals to really fight for and which I could allow to slide.

While I ended up with a rank order of projects based on scores, it was more important to ensure geographical equity in the selection of proposals. Historically, TNC aims to have a reasonably even number of projects in each region. To this end, I decided to take the top three most important projects per region as the basis for what I would bring to the selection call as the RC’s preferred proposals. I sorted the twelve projects based on score, and the remaining twelve created the bottom half of the ranks. Luckily, TNC’s rankings very closely matched the RC’s, and all of our preferred proposals received funding.
At this point, the sub-awards are treated just like any other grant: a technical monitor is assigned, NEPA compliance must be documented, and an RCDB record must be created. TNC, as well as all other partners, must submit a progress report for each project every six months. It is the FPO’s responsibility to send copies of each report to the technical monitors.

Future with CRP
As of September 2007, the Great Lakes Program FFO had closed, and the headquarters staff were processing the applications and finalizing the review process. The remaining FFO’s closed in the Fall, and the remainder of my Fellowship would be spent on reviewing applications and participating in the selection process.

Site Visits
One important role performed by the technical monitors is to visit each project site to evaluate its progress and document the process through photographs or videos. Occasionally, an FPO will make the trip to sites in order to become more familiar with the type of restoration work occurring, especially if the FPO’s expertise does not lie with that particular system. This also gives an FPO the chance to “get out in the field” and out of the cube. While it may seem like a junket to some, I contend that it is important to keep that connection to the on-the-ground work lest one gets too bogged down in the paperwork and loses sight of the purpose of it all.

As mentioned before, I was lucky enough to have money through the Fellowship dedicated for travel, and I mostly utilized the funds for site visits. For a week in mid-August, I was in Puerto Rico touring past and currently ongoing project sites in Rincon, San Juan, and Jobos Bay as well as potential future sites. We also visited with local organizations, including the Puerto Rico Sea Grant, to discuss the available funding opportunities within the RC. For the most part, my role during these visits was that of passive observer. I had never been on-site before, so I watched Daphne Macfarlan, the regional staffer who led the visits, and learned about how to talk to grantees and what kinds of questions to ask regarding ongoing projects. I also appointed myself as the official photographer for the trip and documented the visits for the RC’s photo bank.
During the last week of August, I was fortunate enough to participate in scientific monitoring around the Merrimack Village Dam (MVD) in Merrimack, New Hampshire. When I approached the Northeast region with the idea of site visits, I was instead invited by Matt Collins to do actual field work! The dam was scheduled for removal in the summer of 2008, and the Gulf of Maine Council River Restoration Steering Committee took the opportunity to test their protocol for monitoring dam removal. While removal projects are becoming more commonplace around the country, there is no accepted standardized methodology for monitoring the effects of removal on the surrounding community, and the Steering Committee looked to fill the need for the Gulf of Maine Watershed.

I spent Monday and Tuesday working in one of the stream cross-section teams. As outlined in the protocol, we measured the elevation of points along a horizontal transect set on permanent monuments on the banks of the stream. Generally we recorded elevation for every 2m along the tape, but we would also take a reading if the geomorphology along the transect changed significantly. For example we recorded elevation on each bank top, water’s edge, and within the thalweg. Monday I served as the data recorder and assisted in setting up the auto-level on the bank, which also meant clearing any vegetation that may be in the way of the sight. Tuesday my responsibility was the survey rod and walking along the transect line.

Wednesday and Thursday were spent on the vegetation surveys. For both days, I was part of the tree survey team, which on Thursday morning only consisted of myself, and we worked on transects which were located near but not exactly on the same lines as the cross-sections. Tree survey protocol called for the surveyor to measure the DBH of each tree with a diameter greater than 5in within a 9m radius of the tape. A survey area was delineated every 25m along the tape. In the event that a transect was not at least 18m, I surveyed behind the monument and beyond the end of the transect as necessary.

These site visits have been two of the most valuable learning experiences for me during my time with the RC. Having never met with regional staff before and having no prior knowledge or experience with their day-to-day roles, these two weeks served as clinics on the roles of regional
staff and how to evaluate general restoration techniques, specific applications, and even the applicants themselves.

**Restoration Portal**

One of the non-grants related components in the RC is the Restoration Portal, a website designed to be a one-stop shop for “information on restoration techniques, NOAA restoration programs, projects, activities, and references,” (habitat.noaa.gov). My first major RC task was to assist in creating the “Statutes, Regulations, and Permits” special topic. Through communication with the regions as well as our own research, we compiled a list of websites for each state that will hopefully help guide the restoration professional through permitting process. Once the pages were loaded onto the site, I assisted with quality control to ensure the pages were correctly set up with regard to fonts, spacing, and other details. I was also tasked to try each link and uncover any broken ones.

My biggest Portal task was to write the coral chapter for the “Habitat Types” section; this equated to a 15-20 page report. As of September, the coral committee had tentatively approved my outline, and I began to write the introductory chapter as well as continued to research the specific chapters required for the Portal.

Aside from my own chapter, I am also part of the editing team for the Pacific Riverine and Submerged Aquatic Vegetation, or SAV, chapters. The process involves not only editing for content and grammar but also ensuring that the format matches the existing template set in the Portal. Another issue that came up was the modification of existing terms in the Portal glossary to fit the chapters being written. It was up to me to compile the changes, discuss the potential new definitions with the original authors, and ultimately to choose which definitions would be more appropriate for the site. As of September, the Riverine chapter was almost ready to be uploaded and only awaited pictures. The new terms were still under review by the Portal supervisor.
Conclusion

My IES Experience

The Class Work

I took a significant amount of natural science courses, but graduating with a BA in psychology did not lead to obtaining a job in the environmental field. I feel that that IES prepared me well for my internship as well as for future positions. The core curriculum of the program provided me with a solid foundation upon which to build my environmental career. The Methodology and Measurements courses gave me more experience in the field and with technical writing. Also, Methodology honed my analytical skills through the problem analyses assignments we completed through out the year.

One valuable tool I plan to use throughout my entire career is the Willeke Wheel. While many problem-solving methodologies exist, the Wheel brings all the important aspects together in a tool that can be utilized in many different situations from restoring your local beach front to creating a public awareness campaign on marine debris. We were trained almost daily on the steps of the Wheel, and I believe my problem-solving skills have already helped me considerably in my internship. I often was unfamiliar with the habitats and activities detailed in proposals that I had to review during my tenure in the RC. However, by applying the Wheel to each proposal, I was able to not only rate the proposals but was also able to actively participate in discussing each one’s merits and weaknesses.

Aside from the skill set I gained from my courses, I also obtained useful information about what the important current issues are for environmentalists and what opportunities are open in the career search. The orientation field trips gave me a great chance to see professionals in action as well as ask any questions about their jobs. The Principles and Applications course also introduced me to issues and career options I may not have had a chance to learn about in-depth otherwise.

Beyond the core curriculum, the program’s flexibility and various areas of concentration allowed me to focus on my interests and take more courses to address any perceived weaknesses. My
field courses increased my knowledge on tropical environments and gave me a habitat upon which to (hopefully) focus my career. My various geography courses gave me the ability to analyze landscapes on paper and in the field, an important skill that I can use in any habitat or region. Finally my ecology classes strengthened my natural science background and gave me further experience with field work and technical writing.

Public Service Projects
The PSP was, in my opinion, the single most valuable class/project I participated in during my tenure at Miami. I learned about the professional issues and boundaries, including small budgets and understaffed offices, that face environmental professionals working at the local level. This background knowledge helped in working with grant applicants and being empathetic to their needs while still being able to meet my own deadlines. For example, the deadlines for paperwork revisions for accepted application coincided with the beginning of field season. Many applicants needed to be out working on their projects for days at a time. In order to accommodate their schedules, I would often stay extra hours after work or even call in from home in the evenings to discuss the paperwork that they would need. Most calls would be followed up with a detailed email with notes from each discussion; this was especially useful for applicants who might have called from the field and were not equipped to take detailed notes of their own.

Working with real clients also gave me important communication skills. Oftentimes my team’s client, the Clermont County Office of Environmental Quality, could only meet via conference call for a short period of time. It forced us to learn how to be descriptive without the aid of visuals as well as how to impart the greatest amount of information in a coherent way on a short timeline. I also learned how to differentiate between information that could be imparted via email versus issues that required actual conversation, which was a valuable asset when it came to juggling multiple applicants with varied and changing problems.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the PSP gave me the opportunity to be an environmental professional before actually taking on a full-time job. Basically it was a good test run that helped me decide whether the environmental route was really the road I wanted to take. My cohort’s
projects gave me a good idea of what to expect on the local community-level and opened my eyes to the kinds of career opportunities that are available.

**My Fellowship Experience**

*Knauss*

The Knauss Fellowship was a great experience overall. Meeting and making friends with people from all over the country and who had different educational backgrounds and came together for a common goal was amazing. Professionally, I learned many things about the different views and approaches that can be taken towards an issue like coastal management; though IES had prepared me quite well to think in an interdisciplinary way, it was still eye-opening to be part of a discussion on, for example, managing fisheries, with an economist, a biologist, a lawyer, and a Hill staffer. On a more personal level it reinforced my ideas, based on my beliefs and what I learned through IES, that environmental professionals really must look at the problems in front of us through many different eyes instead of focusing on one viewpoint.

The opportunities afforded to me through the Fellowship made for a truly amazing year. Between meeting with NOAA leadership, participating in the many informative receptions available to us, and of course meeting Jack Hanna, I do not think this was a year that I can ever hope to top. Aside from that, the network that I became a part of reaches across agencies and international boundaries; I am sure to always have a colleague wherever I may end up.

*The Restoration Center*

Working in the Restoration Center was a series of dichotomies. On one hand, it was really exciting to be a part of so many different projects across the country and to have a chance to talk to experts in different fields. On the other hand, being a bureaucratic paper pusher was not exactly what I had in mind whenever I thought about my career. Everyday my impetus for work was to help communities restore their local ecosystems; meanwhile I sat in my gray cubicle in a high-rise building in the middle of a growing urban sprawl.

That being said, it was definitely a valuable learning experience. Despite the negatives associated with office politics, learning to deal with different personalities and various personal
agendas really forced me to build upon my communication skills. Most importantly, having the chance to play a role in assisting restoration projects around the country was meaningful, and at the end of every day I was content with what I was truly trying to accomplish.

My goals through the Fellowship were to learn about the marine policy decision-making process and to understand how existing policy affects on-the-ground work of federal and state agencies as well as non-governmental organizations. While I did not have the opportunity to work directly with marine policy creation, the projects and issues with which I worked were definitely affected by existing policy and could affect the decision making process in the future. For example, the Merrimack Village Dam pre-removal monitoring may help set regional policy for dam removal in the Gulf of Maine watershed. The RC’s work forces lawmakers to consider the monetary value of restored ecosystems every year when Congress considers the office’s budget.

Through my Fellowship and the RC, I also discovered that, contrary to what I originally believed about myself, I enjoy working on public outreach projects. I look fondly back at my experience with the DARRP Hill Event products and would like the opportunity to participate in similar activities. Also, both the Hill Event and being a part of the class trip committee really brought out my strong organizational skills, and I found that I truly enjoyed the planning process. As I progress of my career path, I plan on developing my organizational skills even further and seeking out opportunities to participate in outreach and planning activities.
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Appendix A: DARRP Hill Event Documents

- DARRP Brochure
- Southeast/Gulf Region Poster
- Great Lakes Fact Sheet
- Scott Rayder Briefing Packet
Healing our Coasts
Protecting our Future

15 Years of Protection and Restoration of the Nation’s Coastal Resources

NOAA Damage Assessment, Remediation, and Restoration Program
The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) works with other agencies, industry, and communities to protect and restore coastal and marine resources harmed by oil spills, releases of hazardous substances, and vessels that have run aground.

NOAA’s Damage Assessment, Remediation, and Restoration Program (DARRP)
Threats to Our Nation’s Coasts

Each year, oil and toxic chemicals from ships, pipelines, and hazardous waste sites contaminate our nation’s coastal waters. These pollutants harm our marine resources and our economic well-being and degrade quality of life for coastal communities. Ships also run aground on coral reefs and sea-grass beds, harming valuable habitat.

Oil spills kill fish and other wildlife, close beaches, and destroy coastal habitat.

Oil is one of the most obvious environmental pollutants. Hundreds of thousands of gallons of oil are spilled into our coastal waters each year. Local economies that rely on these resources for commercial fishing and tourism can be hit hard.

Hazardous waste releases contaminate seafood, coastal wetlands, groundwater, and sediments.

Industries have historically been located along waterfronts to ease the transport of goods. Unfortunately, this industrial development contaminated many coastal areas, although the effects are not always obvious. Pollutants such as toxic metals, pesticides, PCBs, and other harmful substances can persist in the environment for decades, and may pose threats to fish, wildlife, and people for many years.

Ship groundings immediately injure or destroy critical coral reef and sea-grass habitat.

Ship groundings of all sizes crush and destroy reef and sea-grass habitat, and the cumulative effects can be devastating and difficult to reverse.
Threats to Our Nation's Coasts

Dead fish
Americans Value Their Coasts

America’s coasts and Great Lakes — including beaches, rocky shorelines, bays, and estuaries — are economically and socially critical to the nation.

People are drawn to the coasts for the pleasure they bring; coastal residents and visitors alike cherish the scent of sea breezes, the sound of foghorns, and the sensation of mud between their toes as they dig for clams.

Our ocean shores are lined with productive wetlands and beaches, providing nurseries for fish, nesting areas for birds, and recreation for people. Our urban coastal areas feature bustling ports and harbors vital to all Americans, no matter where they live. The shoes on your feet, the gas in your car, and the seafood on your plate travel through a coastal port on their way to you.

Coastal Resources Laws

America’s environmental laws outline a framework for the clean up of contamination and the restoration of affected resources.

In 1980, the Superfund Act authorized the Federal government to clean up America’s hazardous waste sites, and in 1990, the Oil Pollution Act provided specific authority to address oil spills. The National Marine Sanctuaries Act amendments of 1988 gave NOAA the authority to address physical injuries and other harm to sanctuary resources. These laws provide incentives to protect resources and require those responsible for an oil spill or hazardous substance release to clean them up. Those responsible are also required to actively address any harm that has been done by restoring both the injured resources and the services they provide.

More than half of Americans now call coastal counties home.
Protecting and Restoring Our Nation’s Coastal Resources

Trustees are government officials who act on behalf of the public when there is injury, destruction, loss, or threat to a natural resource as a result of a hazardous substance release, oil spill, or ship grounding.

NOAA’s DARRP carries out its natural resource trustee responsibilities in two ways:

**Protective Cleanups at Hazardous Waste Sites:** The essential first step in protecting and restoring our environment is to stop the spread of contamination. Working with clean-up agencies, NOAA recommends control of ongoing sources and cleanup actions, and when possible, integrates cleanup and restoration to speed the recovery of natural resources.

**Natural Resource Damage Assessments (NRDA):** To restore coastal resources harmed by incidents, NOAA works cooperatively with federal, state, and tribal co-trustees, and those responsible to develop and carry out restoration projects. NOAA experts work to:

- Determine the amount of harm to natural resources and the degree to which the public has lost the use of those resources;
- Develop and evaluate restoration options;
- Work with the public to select restoration options to implement; and
- Oversee or implement restoration projects and monitor their progress.
NOAA’s Damage Assessment, Remediation, and Restoration Program is actively working on 314 cases in the United States and its territories, including Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands. Seven additional sites in the Pacific Islands are not pictured on the maps above.
Mispillion River, Delaware

“What starts as a little spark turns into a big fire if you keep fanning it.”

Bill Pike, a retired union construction electrician, grew up near the Mispillion River in Delaware. His mother’s family has lived on a nearby farm since they emigrated from Eastern Europe at the beginning of the 20th century.

For the last 40 years, Bill has hunted and trapped along the river, and fished for rockfish, striped bass, and white sea perch. He has seen the quality of the environment decline over the years from overuse and development. His father, who came to America from Ireland in 1920, taught him that when you take from the environment, you must put something back.

Now that he is older, he feels it is time to “take action to keep the environment wild for future generations to enjoy the way I did when I was young.” He is leaving his 50-acre riverfront property in conservation status as part of the settlement for the DuPont Newport Superfund site. Bill’s dream is that his project — to create fish spawning ponds — will spread.

“I’m not doing this to receive accolades. I want other people to see what we are doing here and say, ‘I can do that too.’ The next thing you know, the whole river will be involved.” [See p. 14 for description of DuPont Newport case.]

Biloxi, Mississippi

“Without the cleanup at Keesler, contamination would have been spread much further.”

The Reverend James Black founded the Faith Tabernacle of Praise in Biloxi, Mississippi, 18 years ago. Born in the hospital at nearby Keesler Air Force Base (his father served in the military), he returned to the area after college and a tour in Vietnam to become a driver of the budding environmental justice movement.

He learned that military toxins created after World War II had contaminated aquatic life in the beautiful Back Bay adjacent to Keesler. Reverend Black has served as the co-chair of the Keesler AFB Restoration Advisory Board since its inception. He believes that the cleanup will protect the environment and benefit area residents, many of whom are people of color and disadvantaged status.

“Though there was early mistrust between the government and the community, Keesler managers evolved into an open minded group.” In spite of successes at Keesler, Reverend Black believes we need a more systematic and formal approach to environmental justice to ensure that low income and disadvantaged stakeholders are protected and treated fairly.

Hurricane Katrina devastated the local area in 2005. “Without the cleanup at Keesler, contamination would have been spread much further. We need more information about the role wetlands play in protecting us from the effects of hurricanes.” [See p. 18 for description of Keesler AFB case.]
DARRP Accomplishments

Through the cleanup process, NOAA has successfully protected natural resources at more than 500 waste sites. At the end of 2006, 179 natural resource damage assessment cases had been settled. These settlements generated more than $437 million to protect or restore thousands of acres of habitat and return valuable resources and services to the public.

NOAA’s early and effective involvement at waste sites, oil spills, and ship groundings helps maintain clean, healthy coasts for the benefit of future generations. NOAA also provides valuable technical assistance to other federal and state agencies, and is leading the way in evaluating injuries for many as yet unresolved incidents.

NOAA’s DARRP strengthens the ways in which remedial agencies, co-trustees, and all parties carry out their respective responsibilities.

NOAA leads by:

- Working with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop protective measures;
- Developing innovative approaches and techniques for restoration; and
- Encouraging all parties to cooperate when an incident occurs.

After 15 years of success, however, much remains to be done. In 2007 and beyond, NOAA will build on past experiences and work with its partners and others to identify new ways to protect and restore injured natural resources.
Some of the most heavily industrialized cities in the United States are located in coastal areas of the Northeast and Great Lakes. Intense use of rivers and coasts results in large numbers of oil spills and hazardous waste sites that impact ports, wetlands, and beaches.

The Northeast and Great Lakes region is home to extensive estuaries and fishing grounds that support important species, such as lobster and game fish. These habitats sustain both commercial and recreational fishing industries. Because the region is so heavily urbanized, undeveloped areas are highly valued. Beaches and harbors provide recreational opportunities and enhance local economies.

Throughout the Northeast and Great Lakes region, NOAA and its co-trustees have reached settlements for:

- 14 oil spills; and
- 34 hazardous-material releases.

These settlements have resulted in 176 protection and restoration projects, including:

- Restoration and/or protection of 2,000 acres of marine habitats and 1,500 acres of freshwater and terrestrial habitats in the marine states;
- Protection or improvement of habitat for more than 7,000 nesting pairs of birds (including some threatened and endangered species);
- Restoration and/or protection of more than 14,000 acres of habitat in the Great Lakes; and
- Seeding of 25 million shellfish in coastal waters.
“This partnership between Rhode Island’s fishermen and marine biologists has been a tremendous success. Restoring the lobster population represents part of a larger effort to restore our coastal habitat. We have worked closely with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to increase our shellfish population, protect sensitive wetlands, and allow piping plovers to flourish.”

Rhode Island Governor Donald Carcieri
New York Harbor, New York and New Jersey

The Arthur Kill waterway, which separates Staten Island, New York from New Jersey, is a major shipping corridor and an important center for the petrochemical industry. The area is home to refineries, storage terminals, and thousands of acres of tidal wetlands and the fish and wildlife that depend on them.

In January 1990, a pipeline running beneath the Arthur Kill ruptured, spilling approximately 560,000 gallons of home heating oil into the river. Fish, crabs, clams, mussels, invertebrates, and birds were killed or injured, and more than 100 acres of salt marsh were oiled. Using settlement funds from the spill, NOAA and its co-trustees purchased 200 acres of wetlands and forested floodplain for permanent protection. Forty-six acres of degraded wetlands have been restored (right), with an additional 77 acres of restoration planned.

This wetland restoration established innovative techniques for the recovery of oil-impacted marshes that are commonly used today. A large volunteer and education component provided opportunities for local residents, school groups, and community groups to get involved, and led to a successful college internship program. Community members volunteered thousands of hours to the restoration.

“When it comes to public compensation for environmental damage, no project has had a stronger impact nationally than the Arthur Kill Oil Spill Restoration, which set new standards for government cooperation, scientific rigor, and long-term success.”

Deborah Marton, Executive Director, Design Trust for Public Space, NYC
Beginning in 1939, an area near Hempstead Harbor off of Long Island Sound was used to store petroleum and later, hazardous wastes. Over the years, contaminants entered the soil, groundwater, and sediments, harming nearby mudflats and wetlands — habitats that provide important foraging, spawning, and nursery habitat for striped bass, bluefish, flounder, and shellfish.

NOAA worked closely with the EPA to clean up and contain the contamination and monitor the area. Trustees and those responsible installed a new and more effective bulkhead to prevent the spread of contaminants and implemented a local wetland restoration project. Settlement funds were combined with funds from NOAA’s Community-based Restoration Program to restore salt marsh and coastal upland habitats at Bar Beach Lagoon, located across the harbor from the site. Community volunteers planted more than 6,000 marsh and coastal upland plants at the site (right and below).
The DuPont site in Newport, Delaware covers approximately 120 acres on the north and south banks of the Christina River, a tributary of the Delaware River (left). In the early 1900s, DuPont metal wastes from plant operations were placed in a landfill on-site, which contaminated soil, groundwater, and nearby river and marsh sediments. In 1990, the area was designated as a Superfund site.

NOAA and its co-trustees worked cooperatively with DuPont and other partners to integrate restoration activities during the cleanup. DuPont agreed to fund restoration measures at the site itself, to purchase a conservation easement, and to restore the nearby 56-acre Pike Property located in the Delaware River estuary (below).

By cooperating on this project, DuPont and the trustees restored local wetland habitats to support diverse fish, bird, and riverbed communities.

“The cooperative approach undertaken by DuPont, NOAA, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and the State of Delaware demonstrated its value by allowing all parties to streamline the assessment process, thus reaching a settlement more efficiently, and being able to undertake appropriate ecological restoration in a timely manner.”

Ralph G. Stahl, Jr., Ph.D.
Principal Consultant, DuPont
Patuxent River, Maryland

In April 2000, 140,000 gallons of fuel oil from a ruptured pipeline spilled into the Patuxent River, a tributary of the Chesapeake Bay, affecting approximately 40 miles of shoreline. NOAA initiated a natural resources damage assessment to determine which resources were affected, and to what extent. The spill limited the public’s use of the river, and injured wetlands, beaches, riverbed communities, fish and shellfish, diamondback terrapins, ruddy ducks, and other birds.

Through cooperative work with those responsible, NOAA and its co-trustees restored the injured natural resources. Restoration projects included creating wetland (right and below) and beach habitat, and establishing an oyster reef sanctuary in the Patuxent River. The settlement also funded projects to improve boat access to the river, upgrade a local boardwalk, provide new canoes at a river education center, and construct a kayak/canoe launch for people with disabilities.

“By creating oyster reefs and new habitat for fish and wildlife, and providing new recreational access to the river, [the Chalk Point Restoration Plan] will help remediate the environmental and economic harm of the spill.”

Retired U.S. Senator Paul Sarbanes (Maryland)
Southeast and Gulf Region

Healthy coastal marshes and barrier islands buffer the effects of storm surge, preventing flooding and erosion. When wetlands and other coastal habitats are lost, the region’s extensive oil and gas infrastructure is increasingly threatened by storms.

Pollution from oil and other contaminant releases destroys habitat and impacts fisheries and tourism. Vessel groundings in marine sanctuaries also take a cumulative toll on fragile coral reefs and sea-grass beds.

Throughout the Southeast and Gulf region, NOAA and its co-trustees have reached settlements for:

- 15 oil spills;
- 11 hazardous releases; and
- 87 large and small vessel groundings.

These settlements resulted in 68 restoration projects, including:

- Restoration and/or protection of 3,300 acres of marine habitats and 750 acres of freshwater and terrestrial habitats;
- Restoration of 12,000 coral colonies; and
- Construction of more than 20 projects to enhance the public’s enjoyment of natural resources, including fishing piers and boat launches.

From the vast coastal wetlands of Louisiana to the winding estuaries of North Carolina and the coral reefs of Florida, the Southeast and Gulf region supports some of the most biologically diverse habitats in the nation. Abundant, healthy coastal natural resources are essential to the region’s fishing industry and to tourism and recreation.
Mississippi River, Louisiana

As the longest and largest river in North America, the Mississippi River provides important ecological habitats, among them the coastal marshes that serve as nurseries and nesting grounds to many fish, mammal, and bird species. In November 2000, the river was severely threatened as the ship M/V Westchester lost control and ran aground, spilling nearly 546,000 gallons of oil.

Several thousand acres of surface waters, shoreline, and marsh habitats were exposed to the crude oil. NOAA experts determined the extent of the injury and how much restoration would be needed to compensate the public.

As part of the settlement, 20 acres of marsh (right and below) on a state wildlife refuge were restored. To compensate for lost recreational use of the river during the incident, a boat dock was constructed at a nearby reservoir and recreation amenities were improved in local public areas.
NOAA partners with the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) to clean up contaminated military facilities and restore injured resources such as crabs (left).

From 1950 to 1965, a landfill at Keesler Air Force Base was used to dispose of a variety of chemicals that eventually contaminated the soil and nearby groundwater. A team of experts, including NOAA staff, worked with DoD to clean up and restore the site. For the past 10 years, NOAA has provided critical experience to the team, ensuring that wetland restoration was integrated into the cleanup process.

In 2005, Keesler Air Force Base was awarded the Secretary of Defense Environmental Award as the Department’s top installation for environmental restoration. In accepting the award, Keesler’s Base Commander acknowledged the importance of partnering with other stakeholders early in the process, conducting site-specific ecological risk assessments, and working closely with NOAA and other trustees to expedite cleanup.

“Keesler Air Force Base addressed ecological risk assessment issues that have stumped other Department of Defense facilities and teams throughout the country.”

Robert Pope,
EPA Remedial Project Manager, Keesler Air Force Base
On August 10, 1993, three ships collided near the entrance of Tampa Bay, Florida, spilling over 32,000 gallons of jet fuel, diesel, and gasoline, and about 330,000 gallons of heavy fuel oil. Despite emergency cleanup efforts, the oil fouled 13 miles of beaches, killing and injuring birds, sea turtles, mangrove habitat, and other natural resources, and preventing beach use in the Tampa Bay area.

Through the Tampa Bay restoration settlement, NOAA and its co-trustees funded more than 20 projects, including the restoration of wetlands (left), oyster reefs, and beaches, as well as the construction of a new fishing pier and boardwalk.
Coral reefs, some of the oldest and most diverse ecosystems on the planet, are threatened daily by human activities. In July 1997, the 325-foot container ship *Fortuna Reefer* ran aground on a coral reef surrounding Mona Island, Puerto Rico. The grounding and subsequent response efforts injured almost seven acres of submerged habitat, mostly coral (left), and posed a substantial threat of an oil spill.

NOAA and its co-trustees quickly reached a $1.25 million restoration settlement with the those responsible and began emergency restoration of the corals. Broken corals were removed from sandy areas where they were smothering, and were refastened to their bases with non-corrosive stainless-steel wire and nails so that they could reattach naturally (left, below).

Additional restoration included installing a light tower and mooring buoys to prevent future vessel groundings inside Mona Island’s fringing reef and to prevent anchor damage to sea grass and corals.
In January 1994, the tank barge *Morris J. Berman* drifted aground near San Juan, Puerto Rico, after its tow line broke from the tug. The grounding ruptured seven of the barge’s nine holding tanks and resulted in a spill of approximately 800,000 gallons of fuel oil.

Both the vessel grounding and subsequent efforts to remove the vessel injured seagrass beds, coral reefs, and a variety of organisms that depend on these habitats, such as brittle stars (see photo). The spill affected 1,100 square miles of surface waters along the north coast of Puerto Rico and 169 miles of shoreline, including the San Juan National Historic Site. The incident closed beaches and affected tourism at the height of the tourist season.

NOAA and its co-trustees are using the restoration settlement to fund several projects, including the acquisition of a 270-acre coastal parcel (right) that will be managed as a natural reserve. Additional projects include seagrass restoration and an artificial reef, as well as a variety of improvements to the San Juan National Historic Site to compensate for lost enjoyment of the area during the spill.
Pacific Region

Chemical contamination on this coast has endangered key fish species, such as salmon. Contamination also results in fish consumption advisories and long-term adverse impacts on other wildlife populations. Oil spills have closed beaches and injured coastal and marine habitats and wildlife.

Throughout the Pacific region, NOAA and its co-trustees have reached settlements for:

- 11 oil spills;
- 30 hazardous releases; and
- One vessel grounding.

These settlements resulted in 80 restoration projects, including:

- Restoration and/or protection of 1,600 acres of marine habitats and 8,000 acres of freshwater and terrestrial habitats;
- Establishment of 20 bird projects and restoration of habitat for up to 550 nesting pairs;
- Removal of 1,000 tons of marine debris; and
- Implementation of 13 public awareness campaigns to increase the public’s knowledge of natural resources in the region.

Many people who live in the Pacific coastal states and island territories define themselves through their relationship to the environment. Coastal uses in the region range from natural resource extraction and industrial development to recreational enjoyment and subsistence fishing. American Indian tribes and Pacific Islanders maintain their cultural and historic connections to the land and sea, and many of them rely on healthy fish stocks to survive.
Decades of mining activity at Blackbird Mine severely contaminated water and sediments in Panther Creek (below, right), a tributary of Idaho’s Salmon River. High levels of heavy metals such as copper, cobalt, and arsenic leaked into surface waters and sediments, posing risks to people and largely eliminating fish — including the Snake River Chinook salmon (below), listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act — from the creek.

NOAA and its co-trustees developed a cost-effective program to restore injured resources and to compensate the public for losses. NOAA also provided cleanup recommendations to prevent future harm by establishing water-quality criteria for the creek. Restoration activities include improving water quality, creating additional Chinook salmon and steelhead trout habitat, and reintroducing Chinook salmon to the area.

“For over half a century, contamination from Blackbird Mine has resulted in the elimination of the Chinook salmon and degraded the environment. However, today’s settlement – founded in a federal and state partnership and with great cooperation from [those responsible] – marks a time to rebuild.”

Lois Schiffer
Former Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice
Whatcom Creek is a 3.5-mile-long coastal stream that runs through a city park, residential neighborhoods, and urban industrial areas before emptying into Bellingham Bay in northern Puget Sound. In June 1999, a pipeline ruptured and discharged approximately 236,000 gallons of gasoline into Hannah and Whatcom creeks. As the gasoline moved down Whatcom Creek, the fumes ignited and caused the tragic deaths of three people. Surface water was contaminated, and vegetation and organisms were destroyed all along the creek banks.

NOAA and its co-trustees worked with the City of Bellingham and those responsible to replant 40,000 trees in the local watershed, and acquired 12 acres of land to expand the park. NOAA also restored the Whatcom Creek stream bed (left) to improve spawning habitat for salmon, and constructed two additional salmon wetland projects.

“...the pipeline rupture and fire ... caused significant damage to a stream, public park and the community’s sense of well being. NOAA’s leadership ... produced a reasonable settlement agreement in a timely manner.”

Clare Fogelsong, Environmental Resources Manager, City of Bellingham
Commencement Bay, Washington

As the harbor for Tacoma, Washington, Commencement Bay and its eight waterways are home to dozens of industrial and commercial operations, including chemical manufacturing companies, oil refineries, and food processing plants. The area is also home to diverse marine species, including Chinook, coho, and chum salmon; steelhead trout; flatfish; and numerous bird species.

For decades, hazardous substances released through storm drains from area industries contaminated Commencement Bay, its waterways and sediments. In October 1991, NOAA and its co-trustees began a damage assessment and restoration planning process. NOAA conducted studies of injuries to natural resources resulting from exposure to hazardous substances, entered into settlement agreements with willing parties, and planned and carried out projects to restore injured resources such as wetlands and salmon habitat (right and below).

The trustees are currently engaged in settlement negotiations with most of the remaining responsible parties at the site. NOAA continues to provide recommendations to ensure that the site is cleaned up to prevent future harm to the marine environment.

“

This agreement demonstrates what can be accomplished when we direct our energies to meet the basic purpose of the law — restoring natural resources.”

David McEntee, Simpson Tacoma Kraft Company
From the late 1940s to the early 1970s, the Montrose Chemical Corporation and other industries in the Los Angeles area released millions of pounds of DDTs and PCBs into the ocean waters off of Southern California. Although this practice stopped in the 1970s, the chemicals still contaminate sediments, water, and living organisms of the southern California marine environment (left, top), including the Channel Islands.

DDTs can cause birds to lay abnormally thin-shelled eggs that break easily, a factor that contributed to the decline and, in some cases, the disappearance of several species of birds throughout the Channel Islands. Human health risks associated with high levels of DDTs and PCBs in certain species of fish also led to fish consumption advisories and to a commercial catch ban for white croaker.

While the EPA continues to explore cleanup and remediation strategies, NOAA and its co-trustees conduct restoration projects for bald eagles, peregrine falcons, seabirds, fish, and recreational uses. Together, EPA and the trustees surveyed contaminant levels in fish, and ran an outreach campaign to educate the public about safe fish consumption.

In 2006, NOAA and its co-trustees celebrated a milestone success in bald eagle restoration efforts when bald eagles reproduced successfully on their own for the first time in 50 years in the Channel Islands (left, bottom).
Oahu and Kauai, Hawaii

In August 1998, a hose failure at a Tesoro Corporation mooring facility near Oahu spilled an estimated 420 gallons of oil into the ocean. Cleanup operations were conducted immediately following the spill; but two weeks later, tarballs and dead oiled birds began to wash ashore on the eastern shore of Kauai.

Chemical analysis linked the tarballs and oiled birds collected from Kauai with the oil spilled from the refinery on Oahu. Based on this analysis, an additional 4,500 gallons may have been spilled. The oil spill affected seabirds (right), Hawaiian monk seals (right), invertebrates, algal communities, opihi (a Hawaiian shellfish delicacy), subsistence activities, beaches, and recreation.

Restoration activities included removing fishing nets, cleaning beaches, and controlling predators to foster an increase in seabird populations.
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Each year, oil and toxic chemicals from ships, pipelines, and hazardous waste sites contaminate our nation’s coastal waters. These pollutants harm our marine resources and our economic well-being. Ships also run aground on coral reefs and sea-grass beds, harming valuable habitat.

America’s coasts and Great Lakes — including beaches, rocky shorelines, bays, and estuaries — are economically and socially critical to the nation.

NOAA’s Damage Assessment, Remediation, and Restoration Program works cooperatively with partners to protect and restore coastal resources that have been injured by oil and hazardous material releases or vessel groundings.

Through the cleanup process, NOAA has successfully protected natural resources at more than 500 waste sites. At the end of 2006, 179 natural resource damage assessment cases had been settled. These settlements generated more than $437 million to protect or restore many thousands of acres of habitat and return other resources and services to the public.

In 2007 and beyond, NOAA will build on past experiences and work with its partners and others to identify new ways to protect and restore injured natural resources.
Tampa Bay Oil Spill, FL

Additional Activities
- Fort Lauderdale Oil Spill, Turtle-friendly lighting enforcement project, FL
- Mulberry Phosphate Acid Spill, FL
- Calcasieu River Waste Site, LA
- Louisiana Regional Restoration Planning Program, LA
- Westchester Oil Spill, South Pass Crevasse Splay Marsh Creation, LA
- Albemarle Sound Waste Site, NC
- Berman Oil Spill, San Miguel Parcel Land Acquisition, PR
- Macalloy Waste Site, SC
- Lavaca Bay Waste Site, Aransas National Wildlife Refuge Marsh Creation, TX
Protecting and Restoring Natural Resources in the Great Lakes

Issues

- The Great Lakes are a premier national aquatic resource, containing approximately 90% of the U.S. supply of fresh water. Coastal areas and wetlands support numerous salmonid, trout, and eel fisheries. Beluga whales and other marine mammals in the Saint Lawrence Estuary are also important natural resources.
- The U.S. and Canada identified 43 Areas of Concern with severe environmental degradation including sediment and water contamination by hazardous substances (such as PCBs and PAHs), invasive species, and impaired fish and benthic communities.
- Discharges from several Superfund sites contaminated sediments which threaten natural resources and impede safe navigation and transportation along hundreds of miles of navigable waters.

What we do

NOAA's Damage Assessment, Remediation, and Restoration Program (DARRP) acts as a trustee for natural resources on behalf of the public. DARRP collaborates with federal, state, and tribal entities and also works with cleanup agencies (such as EPA), local organizations, the public, and those responsible for the incident to:

- protect coastal and marine natural resources;
- respond to discharges of oil and hazardous substances;
- assess risks and injuries to natural resources; and
- restore injured natural resources and related socioeconomic benefits.

How we do it

DARRP acts as a trustee for natural resources to:

- work cooperatively with those responsible for the incident;
- develop innovative approaches and techniques for remediation and restoration;
- work with the public to select restoration options to compensate for injuries to natural resources; and
- design and implement or oversee natural resource restoration projects and monitor their success.

DARRP Accomplishments

- Restoration and/or protection of more than 7,000 acres of wetland, upland and aquatic fish habitat, and preservation of more than 7,500 acres of wetland and upland habitat in states of Michigan, Wisconsin and Ohio.
- Settlements resulting in more than 65 protection and restoration projects.
- Cleanup actions promoting recovery of coastal resources and communities at 12 hazardous waste sites.
Historic and ongoing case highlights

- Kalamazoo River, MI – Provided technical and legal assistance to develop integrated remedial and restoration strategies, minimize risk, and enhance habitat recovery as part of the mediation process. A landmark agreement was reached and a more comprehensive assessment and protective remedy will be implemented.

- Cannelton Industries, Sault Sainte Marie, MI – Provided extensive technical assistance to EPA by designing and developing a long-term biological monitoring program to verify the effectiveness of site cleanup actions; recommending the adopted mitigation measures to minimize potential recontamination and increase recovery.

- Fields Brook, Ashtabula, OH – Worked with co-trustees to achieve settlement for cleanup of contaminated floodplains/wetlands and to conduct wetland restoration; continuing work with EPA to ensure that the selected remedy is adequately protective.

- Waukegan Harbor, Lake Michigan, IL – Ensuring that the Great Lakes Legacy Act project provides protection for fishery resources and will restore, preserve, and promote safe navigation and maritime commerce (working with EPA and city).

- Fox River/Green Bay, Wisconsin and Michigan – Worked with co-trustees to coordinate a cooperative effort to clean up and restore the Fox River; provided extensive assistance to EPA for effective cleanup and monitoring of PCB-contaminated sediment; and participated in planning for thousands of acres of wetland restoration (e.g., Wisconsin: 4,788 acres and Michigan: 1,500 acres).

For further information about DARRP, please visit
http://www.darrp.noaa.gov
FACE SHEET
Scott Rayder
Chief of Staff for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Event: Healing Our Coasts, Protecting Our Future: 15 Years of Protection and Restoration of the Nation’s Coastal Resources

Date/Time: Wednesday, May 23, 2007; 9:00AM

Location: Rayburn B369

Purpose: To raise awareness of NOAA’s Damage Assessment, Remediation and Restoration Program and to discuss projects around the country.

Message to convey: 1) The need for DARRP: number of spills and waste sites, adverse impacts to environment and economy;
2) Capabilities and proven track record (success stories): number of settlements, dollars collected, restoration completed, innovations and technical assistance;
3) Our cooperative model: cooperative assessments with partners; and
4) Future initiatives: more efficiency, better collaboration, etc.

Other Speakers: Senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA), Representative Jim Saxton (R-NJ), Ralph Stahl (DuPont Corporation), Glen Spain (Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Associations), Jim Connolly (Anacostia Watershed Society), other Congressional members TBD

Group/Audience/Guests: Congressional members and staffers, DARRP stakeholders, federal agency partners, NOAA staff. See background material for complete list.

Participation History: NOAA has never held an event on Capitol Hill to promote DARRP. In the past, similar events have been held for NOAA’s Community-based Restoration Program and Scott Rayder participated in one of those events last year at the Capitol Building.

Dress: Business

Contacts: Chris Doley (NOAA Restoration Center) Office: 301-713-0174
Cell: 301-346-5918
Rob Ricker (NOAA Office of Response and Restoration) Office: 301-713-3038
Cell: 240-462-6473
Stephanie Hunt (NOAA Restoration Center) Office: 301-713-0174
Cell: 202-368-8783
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
Scott Rayder
Chief of Staff, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Healing Our Coasts, Protecting Our Future: 15 Years of Protection and Restoration of the Nation’s Coastal Resources
Wednesday, May 23, 2007

Format/Agenda:
A formal speaking program will occur during the first one hour of the event. Following the speaking program, the format will change to an open house. The speaker schedule is fluid, and speakers need to be flexible as to timing and order. Senator Cantwell and Representative Saxton will speak as they arrive as will other members who attend the event.

9:00 AM – Scott Rayder, Welcome and opening comments
9:10 AM – Scott Rayder, introduce Cantwell
9:11 AM – Senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA)
9:20 AM – Scott Rayder, introduce Glen Spain
9:21 AM – Glen Spain, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Associations
9:30 AM – Scott Rayder, introduce Saxton
9:31 AM – Representative James “Jim” Saxton (R-NJ)
9:35 AM – Scott Rayder, introduce Ralph Stahl
9:36 AM – Ralph Stahl, DuPont Corporation
9:40 AM – Scott Rayder, introduce Jim Connolly
9:41 AM – James “Jim” Connolly, Anacostia Watershed Society
9:45 AM – Scott Rayder, close
9:45 to 10:30 AM – Open house where members of Congress and their staff can speak with invited stakeholders as well as NOAA staff about DARRP achievements and activities. Members of Congress will speak as they arrive. Three regional displays with NOAA-designed posters will draw attention to specific projects within each region, and “tools of the trade” exhibits will provide an opportunity for members to see some restoration techniques first-hand.

Event Participants:
Ron Weddell, Alcoa Incorporated
Robin Rorick, American Petroleum Institute (contributor)
Jim Connolly, Anacostia Watershed Society, Maryland
Kathy Verrue-Slater, California Department of Fish and Game
Mike Ammann, Chevron Corporation (contributor)
Frank M. DeLuise, Department of the Interior
Roger Helm, Department of the Interior
Randall Luthi, Department of the Interior
Deborah Marton, Design Trust for Public Space, New York
Ralph Stahl, DuPont Corporation (contributor)
David Chaters, Environmental Protection Agency
Karolien Debuisschere, Louisiana Office of the Governor
Steven Bosak, Restore America’s Estuaries
Dr. Henry Virts, Retired Secretary of Agriculture, Maryland
Vicky Peters, National Association of Attorneys General, Colorado
Roberta Elias, Natural Resources Defense Council
Steve Sanford, New York Department of Environmental Conservation
Jonathan Benner, Protection and Indemnity Club
Harold E. Mesirow, Protection and Indemnity Club
Glen Spain, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Associations (contributor)
William Sullivan, Puyallup Tribe, Washington
Erika Feller, The Nature Conservancy (contributor)

Congressional Co-Hosts:
Senator Cantwell (WA)
Representative Saxton (NJ)

Congressional RSVPs to date:
Staff from Sen. Sununu (NH)
Staff from Sen. Boxer (CA)

Program Background Information:
NOAA’s Damage Assessment, Remediation and Restoration Program (DARRP) collaborates to protect and restore coastal and marine resources that are threatened or injured by oil spills, releases of hazardous substances, and vessel groundings. The program encourages responsible parties to participate in cooperative damage assessment and restoration planning activities. By focusing on restoration early in the process, NOAA integrates risk and injury assessments with cleanup and restoration planning. Through the program, NOAA has worked cooperatively with remedial agencies, responsible parties, and teams of state, tribal, and federal co-trustees to implement remedial actions that protect NOAA trust resources.

In its 15-year history, NOAA has recovered more than $437 million through settlements with responsible parties, for the protection and restoration of coastal resources, including anadromous fish, marine mammals, wetlands, reefs, and other coastal habitats.

This event will bring together DARRP stakeholders from around the country to showcase the accomplishments of NOAA’s DARRP. Congress members and stakeholders will speak throughout the morning, along with an open house when members of Congress and their staff can come and speak with DARRP supervisors and stakeholders about local DARRP achievements and activities. Three regional displays with NOAA-designed posters will draw attention to specific projects within each region, and “tools of the trade” exhibits will provide an opportunity for members to see some restoration techniques first-hand.
Nationwide Program Results
- Recovered over $437 million for the protection and restoration of coastal resources.
- Participated in over 320 protection and restoration projects.
- Over 31,100 acres of habitat protected or restored.
- 25 million shellfish seeded.
- 1000 tons of marine debris removed.

Press Plan
A press release will be distributed on the day of the event but this event is unlikely to draw media attention.

Speaker Biographies

James F. Connolly
James F. Connolly is the Executive Director of the Anacostia Watershed Society, a local, non-profit environmental organization that is working to restore the Anacostia River to a swimmable and fishable condition. He started working with AWS in 1992 as Program Manager, with responsibility for coordinating and implementing the various volunteer programs and environmental education initiatives that the Society sponsors. Appointed Executive Director in 1996, Jim works very closely with AWS President Robert Boone, charting the direction of the organization, as well as continuing the organization’s restoration, education and advocacy efforts. Jim coordinates programs and AWS initiatives with the staff members, and ensures that the daily workings of the organization run smoothly and effectively.

Jim has led hundreds of cleanups, tree plantings, storm drain stenciling and canoe tours of the Anacostia River for the general public, and knows the Anacostia River very well. He is the Past President of the Capital Rowing Club, a community rowing club based on the Anacostia River in Washington, DC, and has been rowing on the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers for over sixteen years.

Jim received a bachelor of arts from Colby College.

Glen Spain
Glen Spain, J.D., has for the last 15 years served as the Northwest Regional Director for the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA), the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the west coast, and he is both founder and Program Director of its affiliated organization, the Institute for Fisheries Resources IFR. Coming originally from Arizona ranching country, among other things he has been a small-scale farmer and timberland owner, as well as an environmental lawyer for 18 years before joining PCFFA staff full time in 1992. He has been involved for more than 30 years in many west coast and national ocean conservation issues, and currently directs IFR/PCFFA's Pacific Salmon Protection Program. His expertise is in forestry/fishery interactions, marine resource protection and sustainable resource management. He also directs PCFFA's litigation program, currently focused on salmon protections and restoration throughout the west coast, and in particular in the Klamath and
Columbia River Basins. Representing the interests of thousands of community-based family fishermen, many of them salmon fishermen, PCFFA has been at the forefront for over 30 years of most of the salmon restoration and clean water issues on the west coast.

**Ralph G. Stahl, Jr., Ph.D., D.A.B.T.**
**DuPont Company**

A native of Houston, Texas, Dr. Stahl received his B.S. in Marine Biology from Texas A&M University (cum laude) in 1976, his M.S. in Biology from Texas A&M University in 1980 and his Ph.D. in Environmental Science and Toxicology from the University of Texas School of Public Health in 1982. After receiving his Ph.D., he was a Senior Postdoctoral Fellow in the Dept. of Pathology at the University of Washington in Seattle where he investigated the impact of genetic toxins on biological systems. Ralph joined the DuPont Company in 1984 and in the intervening years has held both technical and management positions in the research and internal consulting arenas. His research over the last 24 years has focused primarily on evaluating the effects of chemical stressors on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Since 1993 Dr. Stahl has been responsible for leading DuPont's corporate efforts in ecological risk assessment and natural resource damage assessments for site remediation.

He has been involved with oceanographic studies in the Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea, biological and ecological assessments at contaminated sites in the US, Europe and South America, and numerous toxicological studies with mammals, birds and aquatic organisms. He has been selected by US EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, SERDP, National Institutes of Environmental Health Sciences, National Academy of Science, the Water Environment Research Foundation, NOAA, State of Washington, State of Texas and others to national or state peer review panels on ecological risk assessment, endocrine disruption in wildlife, or natural resource injury determination.

Dr. Stahl is a member of the US EPA’s Science Advisory Board (Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis, Ecological Effects Subcommittee), the Department of Interior’s FACA Panel on Natural Resource Damages, and is active in the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC), serving on the Ecological Risk Assessment Advisory Group. He is board certified in General Toxicology and is a Diplomat of the American Board of Toxicology. He has authored over 30 peer-reviewed publications on topics in environmental toxicology, ecological risk assessment, and risk management. He recently edited two books and is currently co-editing a third book stemming from a SETAC Education Foundation-sponsored workshop on the valuation of ecological resources.

Dr. Stahl currently resides in Wilmington, Delaware, where in his spare time he enjoys tying flies, fly fishing and watching his teenage son play soccer.

**Member Biographies**
**Jim Saxton [R-New Jersey, 3rd District]**

Began Service: 1984

Committee Assignments

Committee on Armed Services

  Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces, Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities
Committee on Natural Resources
    Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans
Joint Economic Committee, Ranking Minority Member

Maria Cantwell [D-Washington]
Began Service: 2001

Committee Assignments
Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation
    Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security
    Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Insurance, and Automotive Safety
    Subcommittee on Interstate Commerce, Trade, and Tourism
    Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, Chairman
    Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Innovation
    Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
    Subcommittee on Energy
    Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests
    Subcommittee on Water and Power
Committee on Finance
    Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure
    Subcommittee on Health Care
    Subcommittee on Taxation, IRS Oversight, and Long-Term Growth

Committee on Indian Affairs  This committee has no subcommittees
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship  This committee has no subcommittees
9:00 AM Scott Rayder

Good morning and welcome everyone. I'm Scott Rayder, Chief of Staff for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It’s a great pleasure to be here today with some of our most outstanding restoration partners to celebrate the NOAA Damage Assessment, Remediation and Restorations Program’s 15th anniversary. Many of you traveled a long way to be here and I thank you for making the trip for this event.

More than 20 partners from all around the country have come here to share their restoration success stories and to celebrate the many accomplishments of NOAA’s Damage Assessment, Remediation and Restoration Program, or DARRP.

Each year, oil and toxic chemicals from ships, pipelines, and hazardous waste sites contaminate our nation’s coastal waters. NOAA works on behalf of the public to restore our coastal environment and marine resources after these terrible accidents. In DARRP’s 15-year history, NOAA has:

- Settled more than 100 major pollution cases,
- Protected natural resources at more than 500 hazardous waste sites, and
- Generated over $437 million to restore thousands of acres of wetlands, seagrass, coral, and shellfish habitat.

Part of DARRP’s success is due to successful collaboration with other agencies, industry, and conservation groups. These cooperative partnerships allow us to work more quickly and cost effectively to restore natural resources for the public.

After 15 years, however, much work remains. NOAA will build on past experiences and continue to work cooperatively with our partners to identify new and innovative ways to protect the environment from harm and restore those natural resources that have been injured.

One way we can strengthen DARRP is though NOAA’s proposed Coral Reef Ecosystem Conservation Amendments Act of 2007. The Act provides NOAA with expanded authorities to respond to vessel groundings on vulnerable coral reef habitats. Currently NOAA only has authorities to respond to groundings inside of National Marine Sanctuaries or if there is an eminent threat of an oil spill. These new authorities would allow us to respond to vessel groundings outside of Sanctuaries where a vast majority of the groundings occur.
To give you a sense of this threat, so far this year, more than 10 vessels have grounded in Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands alone. We currently have no authority to respond to these cases. We look forward to working with Congress on this bill to ensure that NOAA has all of the tools necessary to respond to the growing threat of vessel groundings.

Before closing, I would like to acknowledge Senator Cantwell and Representative Saxton who co-hosted today’s celebration. Also, I would like to express my gratitude to Representative Hoyer and his staff for all of their help in planning this event. These distinguished members of Congress have been strong supporters of natural resource programs and good friends of NOAA and the environmental community. Congressional support is absolutely essential to sustaining NOAA’s programs, and I thank the many members of Congress and their staff who continue to support these efforts in our budget.

9:10 AM Scott Rayder to introduce Cantwell

Now, it is my great pleasure to introduce Senator Maria Cantwell. Senator Cantwell has served the state of Washington since 2001 and is a strong advocate for habitat protection, most notably the restoration of Puget Sound. She supports programs like DARRP and in 2005, she introduced the Oil Pollution Prevention and Response Act to reduce the risk of a catastrophic oil spill and improve responses should a spill occur. Senator Cantwell, I’d like to thank you again for sponsoring this event and I would like to thank your staff members for their help in planning this day.

9:11 – 9:20 AM Senator Cantwell

9:20 AM Scott Rayder to introduce Glen Spain

Thank you Senator Cantwell.

At this time I'd like to introduce Glen Spain. For the last 15 years, Glen has served as the Northwest Regional Director for the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the west coast. He is both founder and Program Director of its affiliated organization, the Institute for Fisheries Resources.

9:21 – 9:25 AM Glen Spain

9:25 AM Society Scott Rayder introduce Representative Saxton

Thank you, Mr. Spain.

It is with great pleasure that I now introduce Representative Jim Saxton from the 3rd district of New Jersey. Representative Saxton has served his district for 13 years and is an outspoken advocate for the conservation of our natural resources. Earlier this month, he was awarded top honors on conservation issues among all Republicans in the U.S.
Congress. NOAA has been active in New Jersey and in 1997, DARRP funds were used for an education and interpretive center at Island Beach State Park in New Jersey’s 3rd district. Representative Saxton, I’d like to thank you again for sponsoring this event and I would like to thank your staff members for their help in planning this day.

9:26 – 9:35 AM Representative Saxton

9:35 AM – Scott Rayder to introduce Ralph Stahl, DuPont Corporation
  o Thank you Representative Saxton. I would like to now introduce Dr. Ralph Stahl.

  o Dr. Stahl joined the DuPont Corporation in 1984 and has been responsible for leading DuPont's corporate efforts in ecological risk assessment and natural resource damage assessments for site remediation.

9:36 – 9:40 AM Ralph Stahl

9:40 AM Scott Rayder introduce Jim Connolly, Anacostia Watershed
  o Thank you, Dr. Stahl. Next, I would like to introduce Mr. Jim Connolly.

  o Jim is the Executive Director of the Anacostia Watershed Society, a local, non-profit environmental organization that is working to restore the Anacostia River to a swimmable and fishable condition.

9:41 – 9:45 AM Jim Connolly

9:45 AM Scott Rayder to close
  o Thank you, Mr. Connolly.

  o Special thanks go to the:

    o American Petroleum Institute,
    o the Chevron Corporation,
    o the DuPont Corporation,
    o The Nature Conservancy,
    o and the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Associations for contributing refreshments for this event.

  o We now have some time set aside for you to explore the exhibits around the room. We have partners from several different states represented at this event, and this is a great opportunity for you all to learn about the DARRP projects in your communities.
Appendix B: CRP Documents

- The Nature Conservancy Partnership Application
- CRP Proposal Score Sheet
# Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

**Version 02**

**1. Type of Submission:**
- Preapplication
- Application
- Changed/Corrected Application

**2. Type of Application:**
- New
- Continuation
- Revision

**3. Date Received:** 09/25/2006

**4. Applicant Identifier:**

**5a. Federal Entity Identifier:**

**Sb. Federal Award Identifier:**

**State Use Only:**

**6. Date Received by State:**

**7. State Application Identifier:**

### 8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

**a. Legal Name:** The Nature Conservancy

**b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN):** 53-0242652

**c. Organizational DUNS:** 072656630

**Street1:** 245 N. Fairfax Drive

**Street2:**

**City:** Arlington

**County:** Arlington

**State:** VA: Virginia

**Province:**

**Country:** USA: UNITED STATES

**Zip / Postal Code:** 22203-1606

**Department Name:** Global Marine Initiative

**Division Name:** Conservation Strategies Group

### 9. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

**Prefix:**

**First Name:** Lynn

**Middle Name:** M.

**Last Name:** McKenna

**Suffix:**

**Title:** Grants Specialist

**Organizational Affiliation:** The Nature Conservancy

**Telephone Number:** (724) 935-3305

**Fax Number:** (724) 935-3218

**Email:** mckenna@tnc.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:</td>
<td>M: Nonprofit with 501C3 IRS Status (Other than Institution of Higher Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:</td>
<td>11.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFDA Title:</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Title:</td>
<td>FY2007 Community-based Habitat Restoration Partnership Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Competition Identification Number:</td>
<td>2045732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):</td>
<td>Nationwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Descriptive Title of Applicant’s Project:</td>
<td>Proposed three-year renewal of the National Partnership between the NOAA Community-Based Restoration Program and The Nature Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

16. Congressional Districts Of:
   * a. Applicant
   * b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

17. Proposed Project:
   * a. Start Date: 05/01/2007
   * b. End Date: 04/30/2010

18. Estimated Funding ($):
   * a. Federal
   * b. Applicant
   * c. State
   * d. Local
   * e. Other
   * f. Program Income
   * g. TOTAL

   4,500,000.00
   4,463,545.00
   0.00
   0.00
   1,161,455.00
   0.00
   10,125,000.00

19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?
   o a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on __________.
   o b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
   o c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation.)
   o Yes
   o No

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications** and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

   ** I AGREE

   ** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:

Prefix:  
* First Name: Lynn
Middle Name: M.
* Last Name: McKenna
Suffix:  
* Title: Grants Specialist
* Telephone Number: (724) 935-3305  
Fax Number: (724) 935-3218
* Email: lmckenna@tnc.org
* Signature of Authorized Representative: Lynn McKenna
* Date Signed: 09/25/2006

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424 (Revised 10/2005)
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102
### SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program Function or Activity (a)</th>
<th>Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)</th>
<th>Estimated Unobligated Funds</th>
<th>New or Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal (c)</td>
<td>Non-Federal (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NOAA-Year 1</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TNC Match - Year 1</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$931,445.00</td>
<td>$931,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner inkind match - Year 1</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$318,555.00</td>
<td>$318,555.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,250,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Object Class Categories</th>
<th>GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Total (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) NOAA-Year 1</td>
<td>(2) TNC Match - Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Personnel</td>
<td>$169,309.00</td>
<td>$157,642.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$67,724.00</td>
<td>$63,057.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Travel</td>
<td>$22,872.00</td>
<td>$23,867.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Equipment</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Supplies</td>
<td>$122,864.00</td>
<td>$68,824.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Contractual</td>
<td>$496,005.00</td>
<td>$269,666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Construction</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other</td>
<td>$10,115.00</td>
<td>$73,214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h)</td>
<td>$888,889.00</td>
<td>$666,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Indirect Charges</td>
<td>$111,111.00</td>
<td>$275,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j)</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$931,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program Income</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard From 424A (Rev. 7-97)
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102
### SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Other Sources</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. NOAA-Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TNC Match - Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$931,445.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$931,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Partner inkind match - Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$318,555.00</td>
<td>$318,555.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)</td>
<td>$931,445.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$318,555.00</td>
<td>$1,250,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Federal</td>
<td>$1,250,000.00</td>
<td>$312,500.00</td>
<td>$312,500.00</td>
<td>$312,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)</td>
<td>$2,250,000.00</td>
<td>$562,500.00</td>
<td>$562,500.00</td>
<td>$562,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Future Funding Periods (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Grant Program</td>
<td>(b) First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NOAA</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. TNC Match</td>
<td>$1,535,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Partner inkind match</td>
<td>$340,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16-19)</td>
<td>$3,375,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION

22. Indirect Charges: Fed $111,111; non-Fed $275,175  
23. Remarks: TNC's current approved indirect cost rate is 25% - however we propose to waive half of the indirect cost recovery (12.5%) on Federal funds and include the waived portion (remaining 12.5%) as part of TNC's match obligation.
## SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program Function or Activity</th>
<th>Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)</th>
<th>Estimated Unobligated Funds</th>
<th>New or Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal (c)</td>
<td>Non-Federal (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NOAA - Year 2</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TNC Match - Year 2</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner inkind match - Year 2</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program, Function or Activity</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>Total (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Personnel</td>
<td>$255,750</td>
<td>$286,821</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$542,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>102,300</td>
<td>114,728</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>217,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Travel</td>
<td>34,308</td>
<td>44,543</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>78,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Supplies</td>
<td>184,296</td>
<td>94,255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>278,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Contractual</td>
<td>741,506</td>
<td>444,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,186,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other</td>
<td>15,173</td>
<td>109,820</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>464,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h)</td>
<td>1,333,333</td>
<td>1,094,667</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,768,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Indirect Charges</td>
<td>166,667</td>
<td>440,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. TOTALS (sum of 6i-6j)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,535,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program Income</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Grant Program</th>
<th>(b) Applicant</th>
<th>(c) State</th>
<th>(d) Other Sources</th>
<th>(e) TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. NOAA - Year 2</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TNC Match - Year 2</td>
<td>1,535,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Partner inkind match - Year 2</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)</td>
<td>$1,535,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total for 1st Year</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Federal</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Non-Federal</td>
<td>1,875,000</td>
<td>468,750</td>
<td>468,750</td>
<td>468,750</td>
<td>468,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)</td>
<td>$3,375,000</td>
<td>$843,750</td>
<td>$843,750</td>
<td>$843,750</td>
<td>$843,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Grant Program</th>
<th>(b) First</th>
<th>(c) Second</th>
<th>(d) Third</th>
<th>(e) Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. NOAA</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. TNC Match</td>
<td>1,997,100</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Partner</td>
<td>502,900</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16-19)</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION


22. Indirect Charges: Fed $166,667; non-Fed $440,333

23. Remarks:

TNC's current approved indirect cost rate is 25% - however we propose to waive half of the indirect cost recovery (12.5%) on Federal funds and include the waived portion (remaining 12.5%) as part of TNC's match obligation. Indirect costs are not calculated on partner, third party in-kind match.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program Function or Activity (a)</th>
<th>Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)</th>
<th>Estimated Unobligated Funds</th>
<th>New or Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal (c)</td>
<td>Non-Federal (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NOAA - Year 3</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TNC Match - Year 3</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner inkind match - Year 3</td>
<td>11.463</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. 

5. Totals                               |                                               | $            | $               | $2,000,000  | $2,500,000      | $4,500,000 |

SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>Total (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Personnel</td>
<td>$342,192</td>
<td>$402,428</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$744,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>136,877</td>
<td>160,971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Travel</td>
<td>45,744</td>
<td>54,403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Supplies</td>
<td>245,727</td>
<td>116,340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Contractual</td>
<td>987,007</td>
<td>539,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other</td>
<td>20,231</td>
<td>146,427</td>
<td>502,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>669,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h)</td>
<td>1,777,778</td>
<td>1,419,902</td>
<td>502,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,700,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Indirect Charges</td>
<td>222,222</td>
<td>577,198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. TOTALS (sum of 6i-6j)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,997,100</td>
<td>$502,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Program Income                    | $     | $     | $     | $     | $     |
### SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Grant Program</th>
<th>(b) Applicant</th>
<th>(c) State</th>
<th>(d) Other Sources</th>
<th>(e) TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. NOAA - Year 3</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TNC Match - Year 3</td>
<td>1,997,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,997,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Partner inkind match - Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>502,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>502,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)</td>
<td>$ 1,997,100</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 502,900</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total for 1st Year</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Federal</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Non-Federal</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)</td>
<td>$ 4,500,000</td>
<td>$ 1,125,000</td>
<td>$ 1,125,000</td>
<td>$ 1,125,000</td>
<td>$ 1,125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Grant Program</td>
<td>(b) First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16-19)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION


22. Indirect Charges: Fed $222,222; non-Fed $577,198

23. Remarks:
   TNC’s current approved indirect cost rate is 25% - however we propose to waive half of the indirect cost recovery (12.5%) on Federal funds and include the waived portion (remaining 12.5%) as part of TNC’s match obligation. Indirect costs are not calculated on partner, third-party in-kind match.
NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM’s Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).


14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm-blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

* SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL

Lynn McKenna

* TITLE

Grants Specialist

* APPLICANT ORGANIZATION

The Nature Conservancy

* DATE SUBMITTED

09-25-2006
Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature on this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 15 CFR Part 28, 'New Restrictions on Lobbying.' The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Commerce determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

**LOBBYING**

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 15 CFR Part 28, for persons entering into a grant, cooperative agreement or contract over $100,000 or a loan or loan guarantee over $150,000 as defined at 15 CFR Part 28, Sections 28.105 and 28.110, the applicant certifies that to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

1. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, 'Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,' in accordance with its instructions.

3. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure occurring on or before October 23, 1996, and of not less than $11,000 and not more than $110,000 for each such failure occurring after October 23, 1996.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

In any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, 'Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,' in accordance with its instructions.

Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure occurring on or before October 23, 1996, and of not less than $11,000 and not more than $110,000 for each such failure occurring after October 23, 1996.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above applicable certification.
PROPOSED THREE-YEAR RENEWAL OF THE NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN

THE NOAA COMMUNITY-BASED RESTORATION PROGRAM

AND

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

PROJECT SUMMARY

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) is seeking to renew its successful and ongoing National Partnership with NOAA’s Community-based Restoration Program. The Nature Conservancy’s ongoing Partnership has grown significantly in scope and impact over the past six years as part of NOAA’s Community-based Restoration Program, and we have leveraged NOAA funding and granted 58 awards to support restoration projects in 17 coastal states. These projects have addressed numerous habitats and ecosystems, garnered the support of an impressive array of partners and elevated the profile of restoration as an important conservation strategy for marine conservation at TNC and within the communities in which we work. The Nature Conservancy’s work in marine conservation overall continues to gain momentum, both nationally and internationally, and our ongoing National Partnership with NOAA has played an important role in catalyzing this work throughout the organization.

This proposal would renew and expand our National Partnership with NOAA to:

- Increase the number, scale and effectiveness of marine habitat restoration projects nationwide;
- Better connect projects across regions, state programs and organizational partners;
- Continue to leverage our joint efforts by providing direct match for project implementation through TNC’s Global Marine Initiative.
In this renewed National Partnership, we will continue to emphasize the need for restoration of nursery habitats and ecosystem engineers (e.g., shellfish), and will use TNC’s ecoregional assessments and site-based priority-setting approaches to guide restoration action to the most critical sites for biodiversity conservation. We will sharpen the focus on projects that deliver key ecosystem services (e.g., hazard mitigation, erosion control, nutrient cycling) and, in doing so, will use restoration as a vehicle for advancing ecosystem-based management of coastal systems, a priority shared by NOAA and TNC. We will continue our collaborative approach to soliciting, reviewing and selecting projects with NOAA that has resulted in implementation of strong projects through our two previous Partnerships.

The Nature Conservancy’s capacity for conducting marine restoration work has increased dramatically in the past six years, and the organization is now entering a new phase of work that will dramatically increase its focus on marine conservation and restoration, both in the United States and abroad. The geographic reach, science-based approach and emphasis on partnerships will continue to make TNC a strong partner for the NOAA Community-based Restoration Program, and a renewed National Partnership will continue to foster the momentum for marine conservation within TNC. TNC will provide a minimum of 1.25:1 match for NOAA funds in this Partnership, and proposes the following levels of funding in the next three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOAA Funds</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC and Project Match</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$5,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Partnership Funding</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$3,375,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$10,125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the tangible results seen so far in our work together, we look forward to a new three-year national partnership between NOAA CRP and TNC to propel our restoration efforts to a new level of success.
PROJECT NARRATIVE

Living marine resources such as fish, mammals, invertebrates, turtles, and their habitats are vital to the ecology and economy of the United States. The condition of many of these species and their habitats has declined precipitously both in the U.S. and abroad\(^1\). Efforts to restore and manage these natural resources tend to be conducted piecemeal rather than with a broader vision, and halting declines in near shore ecosystems will require better strategies for prioritizing where to spend limited time, money, and effort\(^2\). This renewed National Partnership will continue to catalyze marine conservation work throughout TNC, highlight the role of restoration as a key strategy for improving and then maintaining vital near shore ecosystems, and galvanize action with numerous partners through a strong science-based approach to setting priorities and implementing projects.

The Nature Conservancy has developed the vision, scope and expertise to make a significant impact on the health of highly threatened coastal and marine species and habitats. Through this renewed Partnership, TNC and NOAA will jointly focus our efforts (1) at sites in regions where we have completed marine ecoregional assessments to take advantage of the priorities and partnerships that have developed in these regions; (2) in restoring native shellfish ecosystems nationwide where we have significant on-the-ground experience and can amplify results through our Shellfish Restoration Network; and (3) on continued support to the best and most innovative restoration projects in any system nationwide, particularly for restoring key


nursery habitats, ecosystem engineers\(^3\), and projects designed to restore and measure ecosystem services (e.g., erosion control and hazard mitigation, nutrient cycling);

This proposal for expanded collaboration with NOAA will target resources on areas where we have established a robust vision and capacity for integrated action to restore coastal diversity and will provide critical start-up funding for new restoration efforts nationwide.

**TNC Structure and Approach**

The Nature Conservancy is an international, non-profit organization dedicated to preserving the plants, animals, and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. TNC has close to one million individual members, a wide variety of corporate partnerships, and programs in every U.S. state and in 28 nations.

Since 1950, TNC has maintained a strong focus on terrestrial conservation, and has helped to conserve more than 117 million acres of critical land and terrestrial habitats worldwide. Over the past decade, TNC has recognized the gap created in its mission by not focusing on important freshwater and marine species and habitats, and has greatly expanded its efforts in freshwater and marine conservation using the sound science, strong public and private partnerships, an ecosystem approach, and community-based conservation that has proven effective throughout its 55 year history of working on the land. To advance TNC’s work and help fulfill its mission in marine and coastal ecosystems, a *Global Marine Initiative* (GMI) was formed in 2002. The GMI, along with the staff capacity and partnerships fostered by our state field offices, works to ensure that TNC is equipped to conserve marine and coastal biodiversity in the long-term and at a global scale.

The Nature Conservancy has been leading advances in the identification of regional priority sites for terrestrial conservation and restoration action through our ecoregional planning process. In creating ecoregional plans, we work with partners to identify the most efficient ways to meet our joint conservation, restoration, and management missions. Likewise, TNC and partners have been developing ecoregional assessments for the U.S. coast and beyond, and are identifying new methodologies to integrate regional assessments from land to sea⁴.

The Nature Conservancy has substantially increased its focus on coastal restoration, and is pioneering new approaches for restoration of submerged lands and other marine habitats. For example, we developed and are implementing new tools for the leasing, ownership, and restoration of submerged lands that are aimed primarily at community-based partnerships to restore shellfish ecosystems⁵ and nursery habitats⁶. The Nature Conservancy also led an international team of scientists from NOAA Fisheries, Sea Grant, academia, and NGOs in a two year study to identify methods for better prioritizing where to spend limited time, money and effort in the research, conservation, and restoration of nursery habitats⁷. Most recently, TNC published with NOAA a practitioner’s guide to shellfish restoration, with recommendations based on outcomes and lessons learned from shellfish restoration efforts across the nation⁸.

Overall, TNC’s capacity as a marine conservation organization continues to increase, with marine conservation project sites in 21 countries and 22 U.S. states supported by more than 100 full time staff dedicated to marine conservation work, including many new positions in the U.S. at the state and regional level. As such, TNC is emerging as a global leader in marine conservation and seeks to expand its ability to address global challenges. Accordingly, a renewed National Partnership is an excellent mechanism for maximizing the strategic impact of both NOAA and TNC.

**The Nature Conservancy’s Global Mission**

The Nature Conservancy has recently adopted an ambitious goal that will drive much of the organization’s work over the next ten years:

*By 2015, The Nature Conservancy will work with others to ensure the effective conservation of places that represent at least 10% of every Major Habitat Type on Earth.*

This global goal underscores TNC’s commitment to advancing marine conservation as a fundamental part of its mission. It is also spurring the development of new and expanded programs within the organization and helping to create new or enhance existing partnerships. The Nature Conservancy is finalizing a comprehensive and collaborative habitat assessment that will articulate explicit outcome and activity objectives for each Major Habitat Type, and identify key strategies to abate threats (e.g., habitat restoration). To advance its conservation work on marine systems in the near term, TNC will focus its efforts on ‘inshore’ areas (coastal rivers, bays and estuaries) and continental shelves out to a depth of 200 meters (Fig. 1). Near shore temperate environments are among the most degraded and least protected on earth, particularly in the Northern Hemisphere\(^9\). However, estuaries and coastal ecosystems in the U.S., while

---

\(^9\) See footnotes 1 & 2
degraded, are still in relatively good condition in comparison with other areas of the world such as Europe and China\textsuperscript{10}. This provides a strong basis for developing restoration strategies to improve the overall health of U.S. coastal waters, and to then export these approaches elsewhere to ensure the conservation of marine biodiversity both domestically and abroad.

The Nature Conservancy has identified marine habitat restoration as a priority in all of TNC’s U.S. regions, a reflection both of the significance of the threats (e.g., habitat loss) to near shore marine ecosystems and to the positive impact that our previous National Partnerships have had on galvanizing TNC’s staff to use restoration as a strategy for addressing these threats.

\textbf{National Partnership Progress to Date}

The Nature Conservancy’s approach in the current and proposed Partnership has the following elements of success that would carry forward into our renewed National Partnership:

\textbf{Funding excellent restoration projects:} Since 2001, a total of 58 awards have been made to support projects in 17 coastal U.S. states through two previous Partnerships (Table I; see also Appendix B). When completed, we expect these projects to generate approximately $4,381,276 in cash match and in-kind support, leveraging $3,280,506 in NOAA funds for greater than 1.3:1 match. Many of the projects supported through the previous two Partnerships involved physical restoration of salt marshes, seagrasses, riparian and floodplain habitats, coral reefs and shellfish reefs. Other projects have restored hydrological connectivity and provided fish passage through removal of dams and other in-stream restrictions. Still others have addressed the threat of invasive species by developing mechanisms for their removal and the subsequent restoration of native species and ecosystems. Projects have increasingly targeted multiple species or

synergistic impacts across ecosystems (e.g., restoring shellfish reefs adjacent to seagrass beds),
which reflects the increasing emphasis that TNC is placing on ecosystem-based management.

**TABLE I.** Restoration projects supported through two National Partnerships between The Nature Conservancy and NOAA’s Community-based Restoration Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HABITAT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER of PROJECTS</th>
<th>STATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riparian / Floodplain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CA, MS, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-stream / Fish Passage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>AK, CA, CT, OR, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellfish (oyster reefs, soft clams, scallops, blue mussels)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>CA, FL, LA, MS, NC, NH, OR, TX, VA, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Marsh / Intertidal Mudflat</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CA, MA, ME, OR, TX, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Reef</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FL, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea grasses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach and Dune Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECTS FUNDED (2001 – 2006)</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 U.S. States</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prioritizing restoration projects through conservation planning:** A hallmark of TNC’s strong science-based approach is a strong emphasis on quantitative approaches for prioritizing sites for conservation and restoration. Marine ecoregional assessments are used to help identify the places, species (e.g., rare, threatened or endangered species) and ecosystems (e.g., seagrasses, shellfish, salt marshes) that are the most critical for conserving biodiversity on an ecoregional scale. All of the completed assessments are available online and we encourage their use as a tool for prioritizing sites and guiding development of individual restoration projects. At the individual site or project level, TNC staff and partners develop Conservation Action Plans through expert-driven workshops and analyses of data describing local species distribution and threats. NOAA staff are frequently involved with these planning activities, which ensures that there is a consistent match between priorities of both organizations.

---
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High staff qualifications and administrative resources: The Nature Conservancy brings to its National Partnership a high level of professional support from science to project management to develop projects that are sound and innovative. TNC’s GMI staff regularly publishes in peer-reviewed literature on topics such as nursery habitats, estuarine and coastal restoration methodology, leasing of submerged lands, marine policy, and coastal management. The project staff has access to administrative support in accounting, law, science, communications, and media at all levels: site, state, regional, and national (Appendix A).

Emphasizing technical and scientific merit: The Nature Conservancy’s programs and conservation work are strongly science-based and stable. We emphasize the use of quantitative monitoring protocols for documenting project outcomes and, accordingly, all of the projects supported through our current National Partnership meet or exceed NOAA’s Minimum Monitoring Guidelines. This emphasis on quantitative success measures has (1) facilitated collaborations with external scientists who provide assistance on project design and implementation of quantitative monitoring plans, and (2) been a foundation for new partnerships with research and academic institutions around the U.S. (See Appendix C).

Sharing of Knowledge: TNC believes strongly in communicating results to staff and partners at the site and national level through peer-reviewed publications (cited throughout), learning networks, and presentations at national and international conferences and symposia.

Community Involvement, Outreach, & Education: The community is directly involved in our projects through hands on training and implementation through volunteer assistance. The Nature Conservancy has media and outreach expertise at both the national and state level that is used to build public awareness and support locally, regionally, and nationally through media alerts and direct engagement of media outlets. Our projects are frequently highlighted in local
and regional media coverage. The GMI staff works closely with project staff to ensure that the National Partnership is recognized through media outreach, and provide communications support through the creation and distribution of fact sheets, newsletters, electronic updates, and web pages that showcase projects (e.g., “Where we work” pages on TNC’s web site).

A National Shellfish Restoration Network: One emphasis of the National Partnership has been the restoration of native bivalve shellfish ecosystems. In 2004, TNC initiated a *Shellfish Restoration Network* as a collaboration among practitioners, scientists, managers and others to define and publicize the scope, scale, and impacts of the loss of native shellfish; define best practices in shellfish restoration and monitoring; and to provide the scientific, management, and private support to take restoration to a scale at which it will have meaningful impact. A practitioners’ guide was published jointly by TNC and NOAA in 2006 to highlight project design elements and is being widely distributed by both organizations and through the National Sea Grant network. In two years, the Network has increased the exchange of information among practitioners within and outside TNC, increased the level of collaboration among partners, and generated increased demand for restoration funding for shellfish projects nationwide.

Leveraging Outcomes from Restoration Projects: In addition to generating tangible on-the-ground results at project sites, TNC leverages projects to advance complementary strategies and to achieve large-scale conservation results. For example, a new Conservation Leasing Program for submerged lands was developed in Washington State to ensure that TNC and other conservation organizations could have longer-term access and management oversight of restoration sites. This policy helps to protect restoration investments and enable longer-term monitoring and adaptive management. Importantly, the new leasing program recognizes

---

12 [http://www.nature.org/wherewework/northamerica/states/florida/preserves/art16204.html](http://www.nature.org/wherewework/northamerica/states/florida/preserves/art16204.html)
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conservation as a ‘use’ of submerged lands equal to commercial and extractive uses of submerged lands in Washington state, an important distinction for promoting restoration and conservation work in a key ecosystem like Puget Sound. A National Partnership project to restore Olympia oysters in Puget Sound is serving as a pilot for the new state leasing policy, and we are using other restoration projects to catalyze the development of conservation leasing policies in other states.

Realistic projects costs and budgets: Budgets for projects we support are realistic, sufficiently detailed, and well tracked with greater than 1:1 match, thus leveraging federal dollars. Our second partnership pledged 1.25:1 match and many projects that are currently supported provide more than 1.5:1 match at the project level.

**RENEWING OUR NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP**

The Nature Conservancy proposes to renew and expand our National Partnership to increase tangible restoration efforts nationwide, better connect projects across regions and ecosystems, and leverage our joint efforts further with direct match from TNC’s Global Marine Initiative. The next phase of our National Partnership will be devoted to taking restoration to larger scales in areas where we have developed the vision and expertise to make a significant impact on the health of coastal and marine species and habitats. In order to have a coordinated impact on restoration we will have a significant focus on geographic regions and ecosystems where we have developed clear priorities and capacity for success in restoration.

In the next three years, we will focus our efforts (1) on support to projects in areas with completed marine regional plans, where TNC has marine restoration capacity and can leverage individual projects into larger conservation outcomes; (2) on restoring shellfish ecosystems
nationwide where we have significant on-the-ground experience and can help to amplify innovative restoration strategies through our Shellfish Restoration Network; and (3) in continued support to the best and most innovative restoration projects in any system nationwide, particularly for delivery of ecosystem services and restoration of nursery habitats.

Goals and Objectives

**Long-term Goal:** Restore and sustain NOAA trust resources over the long-term.

**Short-term Objective:** Establish a nationwide series of 8-16 innovative restoration projects per year that measurably improve NOAA trust species and habitats.

**Long-term Goal:** Leverage the impact of individual restoration projects through information exchange and better coordination across projects.

**Short Term Objective:** Explicitly link projects within priority sites identified within ecoregional assessments, through site visits and through enhanced communication among project staff.

**Short Term Objective:** Improve shellfish restoration efforts nation wide, enhance learning and synergy among projects through TNC’s national Shellfish Restoration Network.

**Short Term Objective:** Catalyze projects aimed at the restoration of nursery habitats that follow guidelines developed by TNC and NOAA.

**Long-term Goal:** Leverage far greater financial support for restoration.

**Short-term Objective:** Nationally, our goal is to raise 25% or more of all NOAA granted funds as additional match for the NOAA CRP-TNC partnership.

**AREAS OF EMPHASIS**

(1) **Using Regional Assessments to Target Restoration Efforts:** Our vision for coastal restoration is directed by our large-scale marine ecoregional assessments, which identify key on-the-ground priority sites and biodiversity targets for conservation action by TNC and partners. Our marine and coastal ecoregional assessments identify conservation areas that, if restored and protected, would conserve the full range of biodiversity in each ecoregion. By engaging multiple stakeholders in their development, these assessments help to establish a comprehensive view of natural resource management and enable the multiple stakeholders involved to target actions more effectively.
The Conservancy has developed ecoregional assessments that identify restoration as a key strategy in the Puget Sound (Fig. 2), Chesapeake Bay, northern Gulf of Mexico, Floridian, Northern California, Cook Inlet Alaska, and Carolinian ecoregions\textsuperscript{14}. An assessment is under development for the U.S. northeast region as well. Within these regions, we engage partners in site-based planning and develop partnerships for implementation of restoration and conservation work. As an example, in Washington State, TNC has negotiated an MOU with the WA Department of Natural Resources and WA Department of Fish and Wildlife to further develop and implement the joint priorities identified in the Puget Sound plan. Recently, this plan was a catalyst for a multi-year $3 million private grant to The Conservancy and other regional partners to form the \textit{Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines}. The \textit{Alliance} will expand shoreline restoration to a dramatically larger scale and lay the groundwork for what will ultimately be a multi-billion dollar campaign to restore and protect Puget Sound. As part of a renewed National Partnership, we will continue to fund projects at sites that are clearly connected to such larger visions for achieving restoration and conservation throughout an entire ecoregion.

\textbf{(2) Restoring Native Shellfish Ecosystems:} Shellfish are considered ecosystem engineers\textsuperscript{15} and are key drivers of water quality in coastal bays and estuaries\textsuperscript{16}. They are also one of the most imperiled of all ecosystems because they have been directly exploited for centuries and are subject to many other stresses such as poor water quality and physical habitat loss via dredging or sedimentation\textsuperscript{17}. As a result, native bivalve shellfish populations have declined precipitously in the U.S., along with the fisheries, structured habitat, and the ecosystem services they once provided. We have only recently come to realize the tremendous importance of native bivalve

\textsuperscript{14} All plans are available at Conserve Online: \url{http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/MECA}


shellfish in controlling the very fabric of life in temperate estuaries. In addition to providing food and essential fish habitat to many recreationally and commercially important species, bivalve shellfish act as ecosystem engineers that control key estuarine factors from currents to water quality\textsuperscript{18}.

Our continued efforts on native shellfish will help to restore the natural capital that has been lost and the valuable ecosystem services once provided by native shellfish. We will use the momentum gained in previous Partnerships and our Shellfish Restoration Network to expand the scale and ecological impact of shellfish projects in key locations around the U.S., and to engage new partners both within and outside the U.S. In doing so, we will amplify the work supported by our Partnership and enable this work to become more global in scale and impact.

(3) Catalyzing Innovation and Capacity in Restoration: We will continue to fund new and innovative restoration projects outside of the ecoregions and ecosystems identified above. In the first two National Partnerships, the seed money that our partnership provided to a wide range of projects was an important catalyst for growing our state programs and focusing our effort more confidently. We will continue to fund new, high-priority restoration projects nationwide with the expectations that we will see these efforts grow much like they did during our previous National Partnerships.

**LEVERAGING THE IMPACTS OF OUR RESTORATION PROJECTS:** The Nature Conservancy will provide additional cash match to this National Partnership through the Global Marine Initiative to better leverage actions locally, regionally, and nationally. In addition to supporting central programs, we will work to raise additional funds to contribute directly to project implementation.


costs, as we did in our previous National Partnership. We will also continue to support activities that leverage our restoration actions overall, such as the Shellfish Restoration Network, and other activities aimed at elevating and increasing the effectiveness of restoration and leveraging new resources.

**PROJECT IDENTIFICATION, SELECTION, AND EVALUATION:** We propose to follow the same successful approach used in the previous two National Partnerships to identify and select priority projects. A Request for Proposals (RFP) developed and agreed upon by TNC and NOAA is distributed widely to TNC staff and NOAA local representatives across the U.S. The RFP is also posted on NOAA and TNC’s web sites, and disseminated to the wider restoration community. TNC’s Global Marine Initiative and NOAA staff field inquiries and provide advice to strengthen proposals and ensure that they meet the RFP criteria. Each proposal – limited to five pages in length - must include a project description, work plan, and budget that addresses the specific minimum qualifications required of any project that receives NOAA CRP funding. A detailed list of selection criteria is shown in our RFP for 2006 (Appendix D).

The GMI and NOAA staff will consult on all proposals received and accept, reject or require revision as needed on proposals through a collaborative review process. When reviewing proposals for the proposed partnership, we will look for the best projects nationwide. Preference is given to projects containing essential fish habitat (EFH) and areas identified as Habitat Areas of Particular Concern; areas identified as critical habitat for federally or state listed anadromous, estuarine, and marine species; important habitat for marine mammals and turtles; watersheds or other such areas under special management by state coastal management programs; and, other important commercial or recreational marine fish habitat.
In support of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000, TNC will work towards monitoring and evaluation of all restoration projects funded under the partnership. TNC and NOAA will work together to determine monitoring parameters and success targets based on the NOAA Restoration Center *Minimum Project Evaluation Requirements* and TNC’s Measures of Success.

**NEPA COMPLIANCE:** The Nature Conservancy will require that all proposals for projects requiring permits and consultations will list: all necessary permits required to undertake the project, appropriate contact information for each permitting agency, and documentation of all permits already secured for the project. Proposals for individual projects will provide enough detail for NOAA to make a NEPA determination and funds will not be released to successful applicants until NOAA completes the necessary NEPA documentation. We will encourage applicants to consult with NOAA as early as possible to obtain guidance on the level and scope of information needed by NOAA to comply with NEPA, and will direct potential applicants to information at the NOAA NEPA website ([http://www.nepa.noaa.gov](http://www.nepa.noaa.gov)) and the Council on Environmental Quality ([http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ceq/toc_ceq.htm](http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ceq/toc_ceq.htm)). In addition to providing specific information that will serve as the basis for any required impact analyses, applicants may also be requested to assist NOAA in drafting an environmental assessment, if NOAA determines an assessment is required. Applicants may also be required to cooperate with NOAA in identifying and implementing feasible measures to reduce or avoid identified adverse environmental impacts of their proposal. The failure to do so shall be grounds for the denial of an application.

**OUTREACH:** Within TNC, we will promote the National Partnership and annual RFPs through presentations to field office staff, direct e-mails to TNC marine programs, and postings on the Conservancy-wide staff newsletter “@TNC”, and various distribution lists (e.g., Government
Grapevine, Grants Network). We will distribute the RFP to TNC leadership at state and regional levels, as well as to relevant 3rd party restoration NGOs. External to TNC, we will continue to promote the National Partnership through presentations at national conferences and symposia, through published fact sheets (Appendix E), and through Nature Conservancy magazine, TNC’s membership publication\(^\text{19}\). We will publicize winning proposals via joint press releases and through media alerts at the project level, and work with TNC Government Relations to ensure that Congressional representatives can help to make awards known in their districts.

**FUNDING:** The objective of the partnership is to provide support to projects that leverage other funds and contributions from the public and private sector to implement habitat restoration that benefits living marine resources. To this end, participating projects are expected to demonstrate a minimum of 1:1 cash or in-kind, non-federal match. The Nature Conservancy anticipates that it will provide additional cash match for a total funding of 1.25:1 or higher and we are approaching donors on a routine basis for this proposed Partnership.

**ANTICIPATED PARTNERS AND SOURCES OF MATCHING FUNDS:** The Nature Conservancy works with a variety of public and private partners internationally, nationally, regionally, and locally. A listing of partners from the first two National Partnerships is included as Appendix C, and we expect to foster a similar breadth of partners in this renewed National Partnership. The Nature Conservancy receives funding from many sources including individual donors, foundations, and corporate supporters, and we have prepared solicitations aimed at dramatically increasing sources of private funding for marine restoration over the next three years.

\(^{19}\) For example, see Spring 2005 [http://www.nature.org/magazine/spring2005/](http://www.nature.org/magazine/spring2005/)
Our three-year Partnership budget is guided by our experience in budgeting and managing community-based restoration projects through two previous National Partnerships. We averaged each budget category across all previous Partnership projects to derive a relative distribution of Partnership expenses in each category, and then used that distribution to estimate each budget category in this proposed Partnership. Although it is impossible to know with certainty what the project budgets will actually look like in future proposed projects, we believe that this method provides a reasonable basis for estimating costs in each category.

We expect to support between eight and sixteen projects per year with individual awards likely to range from $25,000 to $250,000 through a competitive and open proposal process. Projects are expected to demonstrate a minimum of 1:1 cash or in-kind match on the NOAA portion of each award. TNC’s Global Marine Initiative has contributed national cash match for project implementation in the past, and we will continue to provide national cash match for implementation of projects. The exact percentage of national match available for project implementation may vary between years depending on success of national fundraising efforts. The total match on NOAA funds across this multi-year partnership will be 1.25:1 or higher. Although this match is indicated for each year, similar to availability of NOAA funding, the total match amount may vary from year to year (and project by project) based on the success of private fundraising efforts. The balance of TNC’s national cash match will be used to support national project leadership and coordination of activities indicated in the proposal. These national activities will involve personnel/fringe and travel costs as cited below.

**Personnel and Fringe Benefits.** A full-time NOAA Partnership Coordinator within the Global Marine Initiative will be supported 100% by NOAA funds. The Restoration Program Director will also be supported 25% by NOAA funds and 25% by Global Marine Initiative funds as match. We expect NOAA costs associated with these two positions to be approx. $96,540 for the first year of the partnership. The Coordinator will assist the Restoration Program Director in managing the individual projects supported through Partnership, coordinate national communication and outreach efforts, and help project staff with development and implementation of communication and outreach plans. The Restoration Program Director will remain on point for the Partnership overall, will ensure that reporting requirements of the partnership are fully met in a timely manner, and provide direction as needed to the Partnership Coordinator. The Director will also support the Partnership through technical advice to sites, national fundraising, development of collaborations that maximize the Partnership’s impact, and through regular communication with NOAA’s Restoration Center.

This budget category also includes the anticipated staff time (i.e., project manager and any associated field staff) to implement subawarded projects. The percent of staff time required by field staff varies widely depending upon the nature of the project. Historically, the subawarded projects have budgeted approximately 25% of their awarded NOAA funds and 20% of their match contribution to Personnel and Fringe Benefits. Fringe benefits are calculated at 40% for full-time regular employees and at 12% for short-term employees. This rate is evaluated and subject to change on a yearly basis. At the individual project level, we estimate NOAA’s total personnel and fringe costs to be $140,493 and TNC to contribute approx. $220,699 in field staff time as well as Global Marine Initiative staff time as match in FY2007.
Travel. This category involves mostly local travel at field sites to conduct work at the project level. Because the travel will be to sites selected through the competitive grants process, we cannot specify the specific destinations for travel. It also includes some travel related to Partnership coordination by national staff, including site visits to projects supported under the partnership and to present results at conferences and other events, and to work with NOAA RC and other staff on improving cohesion through activities like the Shellfish Restoration Network. Travel costs for FY2007 are estimated at $22,872 in NOAA funds and $23,867 in non-Federal funds.

Supplies. Historically, past restoration projects have needed supplies such as aerial photographs, monitoring supplies, purchase of shellfish and oyster reef construction material, marsh plants, sand and rock as fill for intertidal marsh creation, hardware and software, and other field and office supplies. Projects under this partnership will require similar items including, but not limited to, those listed above. Supplies needed by the national program staff include materials used in meetings and workshops, field supplies for site visits and office supplies. Costs of supplies for FY2007 are estimated at $122,864 for NOAA and $68,824 in non-Federal funds.

Contractual. Historically, this line item has been used to award funding to projects that are external to TNC in the form of an official Subaward, or to subcontract out components of projects that, due to the specialized nature of the work, is best conducted external to TNC (e.g., construction activities, certain monitoring tasks or laboratory analyses, etc.). In previous awards, projects have used this money to contract with universities, local state agencies and other non-profit organizations. The contractual costs are typically matched 1:1 by project sites, or funded through additional match provided through the Global Marine Initiative. Contractual costs are estimated at approximately $496,005 for NOAA and $269,666 in non-Federal funds in FY2007.

Other. Historically, this category has included a significant amount of activity from community-based volunteers and in-kind match from partners. The Other category has been budgeted to cover participant support costs, volunteer services (as match) and associated volunteer expenses, as well as meeting expenses, postage/freight, printing, photocopying, licenses or other fees, and other miscellaneous program and project-related expenses. Based on our experience over the past 6 years, we estimate approximately $10,115 in NOAA funds and $73,214 in non-Federal match direct costs in this category. As noted, many projects selected for funding will likely capture in-kind match contributed by their partners in the form of personnel time, travel, donated supplies, etc. We estimate that these Partner in-kind contributions will add an additional $318,555 in FY2007.

Indirect costs. Under this renewed National Partnership, The Conservancy proposes to continue to waive half of our indirect cost recovery on funds provided by NOAA. Although our current approved indirect cost rate is 25 percent, our proposed budget for the funds contributed by NOAA assumes an indirect cost recovery rate of 12.5 percent. TNC will capture the waived portion as match to reflect the total administrative costs for the organization. Indirect costs on TNC’s direct costs for the project shall be calculated at our full rate of 25 percent and will be reflected as match (See Appendix F). TNC’s indirect cost rate is evaluated and subject to change on a yearly basis. We will notify NOAA promptly of any change in TNC’s indirect cost rate that may affect this project and will not increase this rate without NOAA’s written approval.
Our three-year Partnership budget is guided by our experience in budgeting and managing community-based restoration projects through two previous National Partnerships. We averaged each budget category across all previous Partnership projects to derive a relative distribution of Partnership expenses in each category, and then used that distribution to estimate each budget category in this proposed Partnership. Although it is impossible to know with certainty what the project budgets will actually look like in future proposed projects, we believe that this method provides a reasonable basis for estimating costs in each category.

We expect to support between eight and sixteen projects per year with individual awards likely to range from $25,000 to $250,000 through a competitive and open proposal process. Projects are expected to demonstrate a minimum of 1:1 cash or in-kind match on the NOAA portion of each award. TNC’s Global Marine Initiative has contributed national cash match for project implementation in the past, and we will continue to provide national cash match for implementation of projects. The exact percentage of national match available for project implementation may vary between years depending on success of national fundraising efforts. The total match on NOAA funds across this multi-year partnership will be 1.25:1 or higher. Although this match is indicated for each year, similar to availability of NOAA funding, the total match amount may vary from year to year (and project by project) based on the success of private fundraising efforts. The balance of TNC’s national cash match will be used to support national project leadership and coordination of activities indicated in the proposal. These national activities will involve personnel/fringe and travel costs as cited below.

**Personnel and Fringe Benefits.** A full-time NOAA Partnership Coordinator within the Global Marine Initiative will be supported 100% by NOAA funds. The Restoration Program Director will also be supported 25% by NOAA funds and 25% by Global Marine Initiative funds as match. We expect NOAA costs associated with these two positions to be approx. $99,436 for the second year of the partnership. The Coordinator will assist the Restoration Program Director in managing the individual projects supported through Partnership, coordinate national communication and outreach efforts, and help project staff with development and implementation of communication and outreach plans. The Restoration Program Director will remain on point for the Partnership overall, will ensure that reporting requirements of the partnership are fully met in a timely manner, and provide direction as needed to the Partnership Coordinator. The Director will also support the Partnership through technical advice to sites, national fundraising, development of collaborations that maximize the Partnership’s impact, and through regular communication with NOAA’s Restoration Center.

This budget category also includes the anticipated staff time (i.e., project manager and any associated field staff) to implement subawarded projects. The percent of staff time required by field staff varies widely depending upon the nature of the project. Historically, the subawarded projects have budgeted approximately 25% of their awarded NOAA funds and 20% of their match contribution to Personnel and Fringe Benefits. Fringe benefits are calculated at 40% for full-time regular employees and at 12% for short-term employees. This rate is evaluated and subject to change on a yearly basis. At the individual project level, we estimate NOAA’s total personnel and fringe costs to be $258,614 and TNC to contribute approx. $401,549 in field staff time as well as Global Marine Initiative staff time as match in FY2008.
Travel. This category involves mostly local travel at field sites to conduct work at the project level. Because the travel will be to sites selected through the competitive grants process, we cannot specify the specific destinations for travel. It also includes some travel related to Partnership coordination by national staff, including site visits to projects supported under the partnership and to present results at conferences and other events, and to work with NOAA RC and other staff on improving cohesion through activities like the Shellfish Restoration Network. Travel costs for FY2008 are estimated at $34,308 in NOAA funds and $44,543 in non-Federal funds.

Supplies. Historically, past restoration projects have needed supplies such as aerial photographs, monitoring supplies, purchase of shellfish and oyster reef construction material, marsh plants, sand and rock as fill for intertidal marsh creation, hardware and software, and other field and office supplies. Projects under this partnership will require similar items including, but not limited to, those listed above. Supplies needed by the national program staff include materials used in meetings and workshops, field supplies for site visits and office supplies. Costs of supplies for FY2008 are estimated at $184,296 for NOAA and $94,255 in non-Federal funds.

Contractual. Historically, this line item has been used to award funding to projects that are external to TNC in the form of an official Subaward, or to subcontract out components of projects that, due to the specialized nature of the work, is best conducted external to TNC (e.g., construction activities, certain monitoring tasks or laboratory analyses, etc.). In previous awards, projects have used this money to contract with universities, local state agencies and other non-profit organizations. The contractual costs are typically matched by project sites, or funded through additional match provided through the Global Marine Initiative. Contractual costs are estimated at approximately $741,506 for NOAA and $444,500 in non-Federal funds in FY2008.

Other. Historically, this category has included a significant amount of activity from community-based volunteers and in-kind match from partners. The Other category has been budgeted to cover participant support costs, volunteer services (as match) and associated volunteer expenses, as well as meeting expenses, postage/freight, printing, photocopying, licenses or other fees, and other miscellaneous program and project-related expenses. Based on our experience over the past 6 years, we estimate approximately $15,173 in NOAA funds and $109,820 in non-Federal match direct costs in this category. As noted, many projects selected for funding will likely capture in-kind match contributed by their partners in the form of personnel time, travel, donated supplies, etc. We estimate that these Partner in-kind contributions will add an additional $340,000 in FY2008.

Indirect costs. Under this renewed National Partnership, The Conservancy proposes to continue to waive half of our indirect cost recovery on funds provided by NOAA. Although our current approved indirect cost rate is 25 percent, our proposed budget for the funds contributed by NOAA assumes an indirect cost recovery rate of 12.5 percent. TNC will capture the waived portion as match to reflect the total administrative costs for the organization. Indirect costs on TNC’s direct costs for the project shall be calculated at our full rate of 25 percent and will be reflected as match (See Appendix F). TNC’s indirect cost rate is evaluated and subject to change on a yearly basis. We will notify NOAA promptly of any change in TNC’s indirect cost rate that may affect this project and will not increase this rate without NOAA’s written approval.
Our three-year Partnership budget is guided by our experience in budgeting and managing community-based restoration projects through two previous National Partnerships. We averaged each budget category across all previous Partnership projects to derive a relative distribution of Partnership expenses in each category, and then used that distribution to estimate each budget category in this proposed Partnership. Although it is impossible to know with certainty what the project budgets will actually look like in future proposed projects, we believe that this method provides a reasonable basis for estimating costs in each category.

We expect to support between eight and sixteen projects per year with individual awards likely to range from $25,000 to $250,000 through a competitive and open proposal process. Projects are expected to demonstrate a minimum of 1:1 cash or in-kind match on the NOAA portion of each award. TNC’s Global Marine Initiative has contributed national cash match for project implementation in the past, and we will continue to provide national cash match for implementation of projects. The exact percentage of national match available for project implementation may vary between years depending on success of national fundraising efforts. The total match on NOAA funds across this multi-year partnership will be 1.25:1 or higher. Although this match is indicated for each year, similar to availability of NOAA funding, the total match amount may vary from year to year (and project by project) based on the success of private fundraising efforts. The balance of TNC’s national cash match will be used to support national project leadership and coordination of activities indicated in the proposal. These national activities will involve personnel fringe and travel costs as cited below.

**Personnel and Fringe Benefits.** A full-time NOAA Partnership Coordinator within the Global Marine Initiative will be supported 100% by NOAA funds. The Restoration Program Director will also be supported 25% by NOAA funds and 25% by Global Marine Initiative funds as match. We expect NOAA costs associated with these two positions to be approx. $102,419 for the third year of the partnership. The Coordinator will assist the Restoration Program Director in managing the individual projects supported through Partnership, coordinate national communication and outreach efforts, and help project staff with development and implementation of communication and outreach plans. The Restoration Program Director will remain on point for the Partnership overall, will ensure that reporting requirements of the partnership are fully met in a timely manner, and provide direction as needed to the Partnership Coordinator. The Director will also support the Partnership through technical advice to sites, national fundraising, development of collaborations that maximize the Partnership’s impact, and through regular communication with NOAA’s Restoration Center.

This budget category also includes the anticipated staff time (i.e., project manager and any associated field staff) to implement subawarded projects. The percent of staff time required by field staff varies widely depending upon the nature of the project. Historically, the subawarded projects have budgeted approximately 25% of their awarded NOAA funds and 20% of their match contribution to Personnel and Fringe Benefits. Fringe benefits are calculated at 40% for full-time regular employees and at 12% for short-term employees. This rate is evaluated and subject to change on a yearly basis. At the individual project level, we estimate NOAA’s total personnel and fringe costs to be $376,650 and TNC to contribute approx. $563,400 in field staff time as well as Global Marine Initiative staff time as match in FY2009.
Travel. This category involves mostly local travel at field sites to conduct work at the project level. Because the travel will be to sites selected through the competitive grants process, we cannot specify the specific destinations for travel. It also includes some travel related to Partnership coordination by national staff, including site visits to projects supported under the partnership and to present results at conferences and other events, and to work with NOAA RC and other staff on improving cohesion through activities like the Shellfish Restoration Network. Travel costs for FY2009 are estimated at $45,744 in NOAA funds and $54,403 in non-Federal funds.

Supplies. Historically, past restoration projects have needed supplies such as aerial photographs, monitoring supplies, purchase of shellfish and oyster reef construction material, marsh plants, sand and rock as fill for intertidal marsh creation, hardware and software, and other field and office supplies. Projects under this partnership will require similar items including, but not limited to, those listed above. Supplies needed by the national program staff include materials used in meetings and workshops, field supplies for site visits and office supplies. Costs of supplies for FY2009 are estimated at $245,727 for NOAA and $116,340 in non-Federal funds.

Contractual. Historically, this line item has been used to award funding to projects that are external to TNC in the form of an official Subaward, or to subcontract out components of projects that, due to the specialized nature of the work, is best conducted external to TNC (e.g., construction activities, certain monitoring tasks or laboratory analyses, etc.). In previous awards, projects have used this money to contract with universities, local state agencies and other non-profit organizations. The contractual costs are typically matched by project sites, or funded through additional match provided through the Global Marine Initiative. Contractual costs are estimated at approximately $987,007 for NOAA and $539,333 in non-Federal funds in FY2009.

Other. Historically, this category has included a significant amount of activity from community-based volunteers and in-kind match from partners. The Other category has been budgeted to cover participant support costs, volunteer services (as match) and associated volunteer expenses, as well as meeting expenses, postage/freight, printing, photocopying, licenses or other fees, and other miscellaneous program and project-related expenses. Based on our experience over the past 6 years, we estimate approximately $20,231 in NOAA funds and $146,427 in non-Federal match direct costs in this category. As noted, many projects selected for funding will likely capture in-kind match contributed by their partners in the form of personnel time, travel, donated supplies, etc. We estimate that these Partner in-kind contributions will add an additional $502,900 in FY2009.

Indirect costs. Under this renewed National Partnership, The Conservancy proposes to continue to waive half of our indirect cost recovery on funds provided by NOAA. Although our current approved indirect cost rate is 25 percent, our proposed budget for the funds contributed by NOAA assumes an indirect cost recovery rate of 12.5 percent. TNC will capture the waived portion as match to reflect the total administrative costs for the organization. Indirect costs on TNC’s direct costs for the project shall be calculated at our full rate of 25 percent and will be reflected as match (See Appendix F). TNC’s indirect cost rate is evaluated and subject to change on a yearly basis. We will notify NOAA promptly of any change in TNC’s indirect cost rate that may affect this project and will not increase this rate without NOAA’s written approval.
## FY 2007 Community-based Restoration Program
### Project Proposal Evaluation Worksheet

**Project Title:**

**Project Number:**

### CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance and Applicability of Proposal</th>
<th>(20 points)</th>
<th><strong>SCORE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** How great is the potential of the project to restore, protect, conserve or enhance habitat for NOAA trust resources, resulting in direct ecological benefits or otherwise maximizing benefits for living marine resources? For monitoring proposals, how great is the potential of the project to comprehensively evaluate the restoration success of a previously completed CRP project? (0-5 pts) ___  
0-no trust resources are present  2.5- typical benefit to one or few species  5-extraordinary benefit to multiple species with an ecosystem-based approach | subtotal |          |
| **2.** When considered in the context of the local environment, how significant is project in its area of impact or amount of restored habitat? I.e. small projects in urban areas could score the same or more points than larger projects in more intact areas. For monitoring of previously funded CRP projects, to what extent do monitoring results have the potential to further advance restoration methods or techniques for implementation of similar projects? (0-5 pts) ___  
0-negligible area of impact in context of local environment  2.5- typical area of impact in context of local environment  5-extraordinary area of impact in context of local environment | |          |
| **3.** To what extent is the project expected to deliver specific, tangible results that tie back to relevant Habitat Program performance measures (e.g. acres, stream miles, volunteer hours, etc.)? For monitoring proposals, what is the adequacy of monitoring parameters and targets? (0-5 pts) ___  
0-no performance measures result  2.5- typical results  5-extraordinary results | |          |
| **4.** To what extent is the project a regional/local priority based on specific fish population recovery planning goals or on publicly vetted restoration plans, watershed assessments, or other priority setting planning documents? (0-5 pts) ___  
0-project type or specific project not identified in planning document  2.5- project type in planning document  5-specific project highly ranked in planning document | |          |
### Technical/Scientific Merit (30 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent does the proposal completely describe the restoration objective (or for monitoring, the monitoring objective) and provide sufficiently detailed project information so that NOAA’s NEPA analysis can be completed and OTG activities can begin soon after the project’s start date? (0-5 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent has the applicant described a realistic implementation plan achievable within 24 months, including the ability to yield minimum monitoring data? (0-5 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate the project’s technical soundness and the potential of the proposed techniques to achieve project goals/objectives both on an ecological and community-stewardship level. (0-5 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what degree has an effective mechanism to evaluate project success been proposed that includes an appropriate, clearly stated goal and at least one structural and one functional monitoring parameter as required by the CRP? (0-5 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In order to confirm lasting benefits to trust resources, evaluate to what degree the landowner has provided assurance of support and dedication to protecting the project for its useful life (letter of support, conservation easement, or significant financial investment). For monitoring, has the landowner provided permission to conduct monitoring on their property. (0-5 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To gauge the likelihood of long-term success, evaluate the degree to which the applicant has chosen the most self-sustaining restoration technique that accomplishes the project’s goals. For projects requiring maintenance to assure success/proper function, evaluate the adequacy of the long-term operation and/or maintenance plan. For monitoring proposals, evaluate the degree to which the project addresses a critical issue of success, failure or adaptive management as identified or supported by the local community, landowner or Habitat Restoration Program. (0-5 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Technical/Scientific Merit** (30 points)

   - **1.** To what extent does the proposal completely describe the restoration objective (or for monitoring, the monitoring objective) and provide sufficiently detailed project information so that NOAA’s NEPA analysis can be completed and OTG activities can begin soon after the project’s start date? (0-5 pts)
     - 0-negligible detail provided, restoration objectives unclear
     - 2.5-typical detail provided, objectives clear, limited follow-up needed for NEPA
     - 5-proposal provides all needed information to understand project and complete environmental analyses

   - **2.** To what extent has the applicant described a realistic implementation plan achievable within 24 months, including the ability to yield minimum monitoring data? (0-5 pts)
     - 0-plan unrealistic, no monitoring
     - 2.5-plan realistic, baseline monitoring results within award period, post-construction monitoring results likely in future
     - 5-plan realistic and high likelihood that project will be completed as planned, baseline and post-construction monitoring results likely within award period

   - **3.** Evaluate the project’s technical soundness and the potential of the proposed techniques to achieve project goals/objectives both on an ecological and community-stewardship level. (0-5 pts)
     - 0-project unsound
     - 2.5-typical confidence in ability to achieve goals with techniques proposed
     - 5-complete confidence in ability to achieve goals based on techniques proposed and presented designs, extraordinary community stewardship plan

   - **4.** To what degree has an effective mechanism to evaluate project success been proposed that includes an appropriate, clearly stated goal and at least one structural and one functional monitoring parameter as required by the CRP? (0-5 pts)
     - 0-no monitoring plan
     - 2.5-structural and functional parameters will be monitored
     - 5-research quality data expected

   - **5.** In order to confirm lasting benefits to trust resources, evaluate to what degree the landowner has provided assurance of support and dedication to protecting the project for its useful life (letter of support, conservation easement, or significant financial investment). For monitoring, has the landowner provided permission to conduct monitoring on their property. (0-5 pts)
     - 0-no permission stated
     - 2.5-assurance letter from landowner/manager or proposed by owner/manager
     - 5-permanent protection for project

   - **6.** To gauge the likelihood of long-term success, evaluate the degree to which the applicant has chosen the most self-sustaining restoration technique that accomplishes the project’s goals. For projects requiring maintenance to assure success/proper function, evaluate the adequacy of the long-term operation and/or maintenance plan. For monitoring proposals, evaluate the degree to which the project addresses a critical issue of success, failure or adaptive management as identified or supported by the local community, landowner or Habitat Restoration Program. (0-5 pts)
     - 0-not self-sustaining, no maintenance plan
     - 2.5-not self-sustaining but has maintenance plan
     - 5-completely self-sustaining without needing maintenance
### Overall Qualifications of Applicants  (10 points)  subtotal

1. To what degree does the applicant appear to have the proven or potential capacity to conduct the scope and scale of the proposed project, as evidenced by project leaders with appropriate qualifications and technical experience or access to necessary technical expertise?  (Based on proposal documentation such as resumes and contractor experience.)  (0-5 pts) ___
   - 0-no restoration experience and no access to technical assistance
   - 2.5-adequate restoration experience and/or access to good technical assistance
   - 5-experts in the field

2. To what degree does the applicant have the necessary resources and administrative capabilities to successfully manage the proposed project?  (0-5 pts) ___
   - 0-no grant/financial management experience
   - 2.5-some grant/financial management experience
   - 5-extensive federal grants experience

### Project Costs  (20 points)  subtotal

1. To what extent is the proposed budget realistic, based on the applicant’s stated objectives and time frame?  Evaluate the degree of budget detail with respect to breakdown and justification of both federal and non-federal shares by SF-424A object class (where appropriate).  If funds are requested for partial support of a project, has a budget for the entire project been provided, allowing reviewers to make an informed determination of a project’s cost-benefit ratio?  (0-5 pts) ___
   - 0-no detailed budget narrative or unrealistic
   - 2.5-realistic narrative provided, follows SF-424A object classes (where appropriate)
   - 5-extraordinarily detailed, well justified, follows SF-424A object classes (where appropriate)

2. To what extent is the proposed budget cost-effective, shown by directing the majority of funds, including funds for salaries, to on-the-ground restoration (or monitoring of a previously funded CRP restoration) and actual project implementation, compared to the percentage used for general program support including administration, overhead and non-essential travel?  (0-5 pts) ___
   - 0-not cost-effective and all for program management
   - 2.5-cost-effective and majority for proposed project
   - 5-extraordinarily cost-effective and all for project implementation

3. Does the proposed match meet the suggested 1:1 level or is there a high degree of overall leverage of NOAA funds anticipated, and is any part of the contribution confirmed?  (0-5 pts) ___
   - 0-no match or leverage proposed
   - 2.5-1:1 match
   - 5-well over 1:1 confirmed match and leverage including significant cash match

4. To what degree has the proponent demonstrated a strong need for NOAA funds or support (i.e. would it be difficult to complete the project without NOAA support)?  (0-5 pts) ___
   - 0-project highly likely to receive all funds and NOAA support not important
   - 2.5-project needs funds, but timing not critical, NOAA support somewhat important
   - 5-funding critical to avoid delay or cancellation of project, and NOAA support important
Outreach, Education and Community Involvement  (20 points)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How great is the potential of the project to foster long-term stewardship and generate a community conservation ethic through citizen involvement, such as hands-on participation in restoration or science-based monitoring activities undertaken by volunteers or work crews? (0-5 pts)</td>
<td>0-no volunteers/youth corps participating 2.5-typical quality/quantity volunteer time for project type 5-extraordinary citizen involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent does the project involve public outreach, and seek to disseminate information on project goals, results, project partners and the sources of funding and other support provided, or otherwise compliment or encourage other local restoration or conservation activities? (0-5 pts)</td>
<td>0-no outreach strategy 2.5-sound outreach strategy 5-extraordinary outreach strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent does the project have significant community support as demonstrated by a diversity of active, contributing partners and/or sponsorship? (0-5 pts)</td>
<td>0-no demonstrated partners 2.5-some contributing partners 5-extraordinary diversity of contributing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How great is the show of support for the project, as demonstrated by letters from partners, local entities, state and local governments, or members of Congress? (0-5 pts)</td>
<td>0-no support letters 2.5-some support letters 5-extraordinary support from all sectors shown through letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Comments:

TOTAL SCORE:  
(out of 100 possible points)

* Your opinion below is for the purpose of regional discussions only. YOUR SCORE DETERMINES THE RANKING OF THIS PROPOSAL, AND SHOULD REFLECT THE RECOMMENDATION BELOW.

- [ ] Yes, I recommend this project for funding consideration.  
- [ ] No, I DO NOT recommend this project for funding at this time.

Reviewer Signature: ___________________________  Date: ________________  
Reviewer Name: _______________________________