PEASE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

55 International Drive, Portsmouth NH 03801

May 7, 2024

The Honorable Ken Weyler, Chairman
Fiscal Committee of the General Court and

His Excellency, Governor Christopher T. Sununu
And the Honorable Council
State House
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

## REQUESTED ACTION

Pursuant to RSA 14:30-a VI, authorize the Pease Development Authority-Division of Ports and Harbors ("the Division") to accept and expend American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) State Fiscal Recovery Funds (SFRF) in the amount of $516,105 to fund costs associated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the "CORPS") Section 107 Feasibility Study (the "Study") to determine a long-term solution to the higher frequency of maintenance dredging in the Hampton/Seabrook Harbor, which adversely affects all commercial maritime activities operating in the harbor, effective upon Fiscal Committee and Governor and Council approval through June 30, 2025. 100% Federal Funds.

This is an allowable use of ARPA SFRF funds under Section 602 (c)(1)(C) for provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue.

**This item is contingent upon final written authorization from the Governor's Office for Emergency Relief and Recovery upon ARPA SFRF being available for reallocation and a determination of appropriate expenditure category.**

Funds are to be budgeted in FY2024 as follows:

| 03-13-013-130510-28XX0000[1] ARPA HARBOR DREDGING STUDY | | FY2024 | FY2024 | FY2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CLASS | ACCOUNT | CURRENT MODIFIED BUDGET | BUDGET REQUEST | REVISED BUDGET |
| **EXPENDITURES** | | | | |
| 040 – Indirect Costs | 500800 | $0 | $2,500 | $2,500 |
| 041 – Audit Fund Set Aside | 500801 | $0 | $514 | $514 |
| 103 – Contracts for Op Svcs | 502664 | $0 | $513,091 | $513,091 |
| **TOTAL EXPENSES:** | | **$0** | **$516,105** | **$516,105** |
| **SOURCE OF FUNDS** | | | | |
| 000 – Federal Funds | 400338 | $0 | $516,105 | $516,105 |
| **TOTAL REVENUE:** | | **$0** | **$516,105** | **$516,105** |

[1] All direct program costs will be accounted for using activity 00FRF602GS1303A, and all administrative and indirect costs will be accounted for using activity 00FRF602GS1303Z. Accounting classifications may be subject to technical changes at the discretion of the Department of Administrative Services' Division of Accounting Services.

## EXPLANATION

In accordance with RSA 12-G:42, XIV and RSA 12-G:45, the Division is designated by the State of New Hampshire as the Sponsor of Federal Navigation Projects ("FNP") with the CORPS in tidal waters of the State, which requires the State to share a portion of the cost of any FNP's located in the State tidal waters. The project under Section 107 is to study the feasibility and best method to stabilize the middle ground in Seabrook Harbor, thereby lessening the frequency of maintenance dredging in the harbor. The Blackwater River spills into the harbor and cuts into the middle ground, migrating sand and material to the site of the cut. The goal is to stop that migration so that the Blackwater River no longer erodes the middle ground.

A copy of the DRAFT Project Management Plan (PMP) is attached with the cost estimate for the study is shown on page 15:

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal: | $ 616,105.00 |
| Sponsor: | $ 516,105.00 |
| TOTAL | $1,132,210.00 |

The following are examples of the commercial vessel operations adversely affected by the waterway conditions:

**Seabrook** *
- 86 commercial use moorings
- Yankee Fishermen's Cooperative
- 7 charter boat operations

*Recreational boating data not included

**Hampton** *
- 53 commercial use moorings
- 16 charter boat operations
- 70 commercial pier use permits at the State Pier

Funds are being budgeted in the classes listed below as follows:

Class 040 – Indirect Costs to recover, per by RSA 21-I:75, a proportional share of the outside funding source to alleviate agency indirect costs.

Class 041 – Audit Fund Set Aside to comply with RSA 124:16 that requires all agencies that receive federal funds to set aside a percentage (0.1%) of the federal revenue amount received to pay for financial and compliance audits.

Class 103 – Costs for a study to determine the feasibility of reducing Hampton/Seabrook Harbor maintenance dredging

In accepting ARPA SFRF funds, the Division agrees to work collaboratively with the Governor's Office for Emergency Relief and Recovery to ensure accurate and timely reporting to U.S. Department of Treasury on the use of the funds.

If Federal Funds become unavailable, General Funds will not be requested to support this program.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul E. Brean
Executive Director

## Program Description

The Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) is comprised of various authorities that have been delegated by Congress to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to assist States, local Governments and, in some cases, major non-profit organizations with projects of limited scope and cost. Cost limitations are unique to each individual authority. Investigations conducted under the Continuing Authorities Programs may proceed from feasibility studies through construction without the need for Congressional authorization provided that the project meets the requirements of the individual program authority. Projects with a Federal cost less than $1 million can proceed directly to the design phase without the completion of a feasibility report but still requires a decision document.

a) Traditional Continuing Authority Programs:
- **Emergency Stream Bank & Shoreline Protection (Section 14):** Authority to provide emergency protection to public or non-profit public facilities, and/or services, such as highways and bridges that are threatened due to erosion.
- **Coastal Storm Risk Management – Formerly Shore Protection, Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction (Section 103):** Investigations conducted under this authority are to determine methods of protecting public facilities that have been threatened by beach erosion and coastal flooding.
- **Navigation (Section 107):** Projects are conducted under this authority to assist in meeting the commercial navigation needs of states and local communities.
- **Mitigation of Shoreline Erosion Caused by Federal Navigation Projects (Section 111):** Authority to address erosion resulting from constructed Federal Navigation projects.
- **Flood Damage Reduction (Section 205):** Authority to assist states and local communities in identifying flooding problems, and to formulate and construct alternatives to reduce flood damages.
- **Snagging and Clearing (Section 208):** Emergency authority to reduce flood damage potential by identifying and removing obstructions that contribute to flooding by causing higher flood stages in the floodways.

b) Environmental Restoration Continuing Authority Programs:
- **Section 204 - Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material:** Authorizes projects for the protection, restoration, and creation of aquatic and ecologically related habitats, including wetlands, in connection with dredging of authorized Federal navigation project
- **Section 206 - Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration**: Authorizes USACE to carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration projects that will improve the quality of the environment, are in the public interest, and are cost-effective. Authority allows major non-profit entities to serve as the non-Federal sponsor.
- **Section 1135 – Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment:** Authorizes modifications to water resources projects constructed by USACE for the

improvement of the environment. Authority allows major non-profit entities to serve as the non-Federal sponsor.

**Continuing Authority Program Summary:**

| Authority | Types of Projects | Cost Sharing | Federal Project Limitation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Section 14 | Emergency Stream Bank & Shoreline Protection | 65/35 | $10 million |
| Section 103 | Coastal Storm Risk Management | 65/35 | $10 million |
| Section 107 | Navigation | *Varies, based on design depth | $10 million |
| Section 111 | Mitigation of Shoreline Erosion Caused by Federal Navigation Projects | *Shared in same proportion as project causing damage | $12.5 million |
| Section 204 | Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material | 65/35 | $10 million |
| Section 205 | Flood Damage Reduction | 65/35 | $10 million |
| Section 206 | Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration | 65/35 | $10 million |
| Section 208 | Snagging and Clearing | 65/35 | $500,000 |
| Section 1135 | Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment | 75/25 | $10 million |

**Roles and Responsibilities**

- **Programs and Project Management Division (PPMD) – Programs** is responsible for the program management of the CAP authorities and for the coordination of all funding activities with North Atlantic Division (NAD) staff. PPMD - Programs staff will maintain the District's CAP database and will coordinate changes with NAD and Headquarters staff.
- **Planning/Project Managers – Plan Formulation Branch** is responsible for the execution of the CAP program including coordination with NAD staff on technical and policy matters. The planners/project managers are responsible for the scope, budget and schedule for the project and to ensure that the work meets the expectations of the non-Federal sponsor consistent with ER 1105-2-100 and other applicable Corps regulations and guidelines. The project manager also acts as the technical lead in Engineering and directs all technical investigations associated with the project from the initial investigations through project construction. Agency Technical Review of CAP decision documents shall be led and conducted by staff outside the home district. Planning Branch staff not assigned to the subject project may only serve as the Independent Technical Review team leaders on the Design and Implementation (DI) phase of CAP projects.
- **Plan Formulation Branch - Economists** are responsible to complete the economic analysis of the project consistent with ER 1105-2-100 and other applicable Corps regulations and guidelines. The economics section chief is responsible for evaluating the requirements of the individual projects and for assigning individuals best suited to meet these requirements. The section chief is responsible for coordinating with other Corps offices to secure staff capabilities not available at New England District (NAE) or to recommend the use of Architect-Engineer (A/E) or professional services contractors for all or portions of the assigned work.

- **Environmental Branch** is responsible to complete the cultural and environmental analysis of the project consistent with 40 CFR Part 230, ER 1105-2-100, and other applicable regulations and guidelines. The Environmental Branch chief is responsible for evaluating the requirements of the individual projects and for assigning individuals best suited to meet these requirements. The branch chief is responsible for coordinating with other Corps offices to secure staff capabilities not available at NAE or to recommend the use of professional services contractors for all or portions of the assigned work. Environmental Branch staff are also responsible to ensure that the projects are evaluated and constructed in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other Federal and state laws and statutes. Environmental Branch staff are responsible to ensure that any agreed upon environmental/cultural requirements are properly included in the project's plans and specifications and implemented during construction. Environmental Branch is accountable to ensure that all work is completed within established schedules and budgets. Environmental Branch staff are also assigned to Independent Technical Review teams (Design and Implementation (DI) phase only) and shall certify that the work is accomplished consistent with the District's overall Quality Control Plan and the specific quality control plan for each individual project.
- **Engineering Division (Engineering Branches)** is responsible for the engineering and other technical analysis required during the project. The Engineering Branch chiefs are responsible for evaluating the requirements of the individual projects and for assigning individuals best suited to meet these requirements. The branch chiefs are responsible for coordinating with other Corps offices to secure staff capabilities not available at NAE or to recommend the use of A/E or professional services contractors for all or portions of the work. Engineering staff is responsible for the technical adequacy of the technical work and to ensure that the work is accomplished consistent with Corps and other applicable regulations and guidelines. Engineering staff are responsible for the Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental and Sustainability (BCOES) review of project plans & specifications. Engineering chiefs are accountable to ensure that all work is completed within established schedules and budgets. Engineering staff can also be assigned to Independent Technical Review (ITR) teams (DI phase only) and shall certify that the work is accomplished consistent with the District's Quality Control (DQC) Plan and the specific quality control plan for each individual project.
- **Real Estate Division** prepares real estate plans required for all decision documents. Real Estate staff also work with the other PDT members to identify real estate interests required for the project. Real Estate staff also works with the non-Federal sponsor's representatives to ensure that the real estate acquisition is performed consistent with Corps regulations. Real Estate staff are also assigned to Independent Technical Review teams (DI phase only) and shall certify that the work is accomplished consistent with the DQC Plan and the specific quality control plan for each individual project.
- **Construction**provides Supervision and Administration (S&A) of the construction contract and provides construction-related input to plans and specifications preparation. Construction shall be included on the BCOES review of all CAP Project plans & specifications. Construction is responsible for quality assurance of the construction contract and to assure a quality project is constructed on time and within the established budget. Construction staff will coordinate with the Planning Project Manager on all issues that affect cost, scope and budget to ensure these issues are addressed within USACE and with the non-Federal sponsor.

- **Contracting Division** will provide timely execution of the necessary contacts/delivery orders in direct support of the project requirements.
- **Office of Counsel** provides necessary legal reviews of all decision documents, Environmental Assessments (EAs), cost sharing agreements including Feasibiltiy Cost Share Agreement (FCSA) and Project Partnership Agremeent (PPA), and final construction contract packages. The Office of Counsel staff will coordinate all necessary FCSA and PPA deviations with NAD staff to insure timely resolution. The Office of Counsel staff provide legal certifications for all documents forwarded to NAD for approval.

**Project Milestones and Schedules**

Project Milestones for CAP projects are established by HQUSACE (1105-2-100) and NAD and are documented in NAD's "Continuing Authorities Program Management Plan" updated April 2003. The Project Manager will maintain project budgets, schedules and milestones in P2. Project information will be updated by the Project Manager to reflect changes to the project budgets and schedules. PDT members are responsible to inform the Project Manager as soon as possible regarding issues or changes in work priorities that could impact individual project schedules.

**Project Scope and Budget**

The Project Delivery Team (using the attached Generic Statement of Work) will develop project scopes of work and budgets for CAP projects. The Project Manager is responsible for completing the Project Information portion of the work statement. This PMP will be provided to each PDT member to document his or her understanding of what needs to be accomplished for the current phase of the project. This initial draft will be the basis for negotiating the scope and budget for the effort. Approval of the negotiated scope and budget is the responsibility of the individual PDT member following established Branch SOPs. The PDT member is responsible to notify the Project Manager as soon as possible of any issue impacting project schedule, scope, and budget.

**Project Quality Control**

Each CAP project is required to have a Review Plan that describes the District Quality Control (DQC) and Agency Technical Review (ATR) processes Certification of DQC and ATR must be submitted to NAD for approval of the decision document. Independent Technical Review teams for the DI phase of CAP projects can be comprised of staff from the performing district, however, each resource provider (working with the PM) is responsible to insure that assigned members are fully independent and have the capability to perform the required review. Particular attention should be paid to risk factors identified in the project's Review Plan. Resource providers should work with the project managers to develop the appropriate review approach when adequate review staff is not available at NAE.

**Communication Strategy**

The Project Manager/Planner is responsible for all communication within USACE and with the non-Federal sponsor. Project Delivery Team meetings will be held quarterly, at a minimum at the discretion of the PM. The non-Federal sponsor is a PDT member and will be invited to attend project PDT meetings. The Project Manager will hold separate meetings with the non-Federal sponsor, and others, to insure that all stakeholders are updated on the progress of the project. The project manager will keep the non-Federal sponsor updated on all changes that could impact project costs and schedules. The Evaluation Branch team member, working closely with the

Project Manager, is responsible for coordination with Federal and state resource agencies as required under NEPA and other applicable Federal laws and regulations. Planning Branch will coordinate with Headquarters USACE and NAD staff on all decision document, PPA, policy and technical issues. PPMD – Programs will coordinate with Headquarters USACE and NAD staff on all funding issues.

**Acquisition Strategy**

Feasibility and design work required for CAP projects is traditionally done with in-house staff. Contracted efforts in support of in-house efforts such as borings, field data collection and survey work are typically accomplished using available indefinite delivery contracts. Occasionally, A/E and/or Professional Services contactors will be used to perform engineering and other analysis. Where in-house capability is exceeded, other Corps staff or contractors will be used to develop decision documents and plans and specification. These activities will be coordinated with Contracting Division and the E/P A/E coordinator.

CAP projects in the DI phase will have a formal acquisition strategy meeting to discuss options for construction. Appropriate PDT members (possibly even including the non-Federal sponsor) will attend these acquisition strategy meetings. The District Small Business Coordinator will identify potential 8(a) and HUB zone small business firms potentially capable of performing the work. The PDT will have an opportunity to meet with the potential small business firm to make a final determination. As agreed to with the Small Business Administration representative, the non-Federal sponsor has the final say in the use of a small business firm.

**Project Closeout and Termination**

Projects constructed by USACE will be closed-out in accordance with the executed PPA following the completion of all project construction and the preparation of an operation and maintenance manual. Project close out may be delayed where environmental monitoring is required. The non-Federal sponsor will be notified in writing for all projects terminated prior to the construction. Cost shared projects will be closed-out in accordance with the FCSA or PPA. Congressional offices will be notified on all projects where a Congressional member has expressed an interest.

**Statement of Work**

**Hampton Seabrook Harbor**
**Hampton and Seabrook, New Hampshire**
**Section 107 Navigation Improvements**
**Feasibility Study**

## *PROJECT INFORMATION*

**Project Manager:** Jordan Macy

**Project Authority:** Continuing Authorities Program, Section 107 – Navigation Improvements

**Project Phase:** Feasibility

**Non Federal Sponsor:** Pease Development Authority Division of Ports and Harbors

**Project Description:** This Section 107 study will evaluate the feasibility of navigation improvements in the Hampton Harbor Federal Navigation Project (FNP), which is located along the New Hampshire seacoast about 13 miles south of Portsmouth Harbor, and about 5 miles north from the mouth of the Merrimack River at Newburyport, Massachusetts. Hampton Harbor is geographically split between the Town of Hampton and Town of Seabrook, New Hampshire.

The Hampton Harbor FNP (see Figure 1, below) consists of

- an 8-foot entrance channel with a width of 150 feet from the Atlantic Ocean into the inner harbor,
- South Jetty comprised of a 1400-foot state-owned segment and a 400-foot Federal extension,
- North Jetty comprised of a 1500-foot state-owned segment and a 1000-foot Federal extension,
- inner harbor channel branches to the north (Hampton side) with widths varying from 150 to 100 feet and south (Seabrook side) with widths varying from 200 to 250 feet,
- 9.6-acre anchorage in Seabrook with an authorized depth of 8 feet,
- two anchorages in Hampton – 7.4 and 6.1 acres with authorized depths of 6 and 8 feet, respectively,
- and a connecting channel between the Hampton and Seabrook anchorages measuring between 100 and 200 feet in width and having an authorized depth of 8 feet.


**Figure 1. Hampton Harbor Federal Navigation Project**

The focus of the study area is on the Seabrook side of the Hampton Harbor FNP, where shoaling conditions have been impacting navigation safety, effectiveness and efficiency in the Seabrook channel and anchorage areas as a result of the Blackwater River breach of the Middle Ground Bar in 2016.

This Project Management Plan (PMP) defines the scope, schedule and budget for the Hampton Seabrook Harbor CAP section 107 Navigation Improvements Feasibility Study (hereinafter referred to as "the study"). The study will develop and evaluate alternatives that the PDT believes will improve navigation conditions and reduce the likelihood of future shoaling conditions in the Seabrook channel and anchorage. This PMP presents site-specific information for this project (alternatives, data needs, etc.) and will change with project progress and will be updated as needed.

**Pertinent Project Background:** Navigation conditions at the time of this study are impaired in the Seabrook channel and anchorage. Commercial fishing in Seabrook has been affected by shoaling and is highlighted by approximately 346,800 CY of dredged material removed from the Hampton Harbor FNP since 2012. Operations and Maintenance (O&M) dredging of the FNP near Seabrook has occurred at a high frequency over the past two decades. Much of the high frequency is attributed to breaching of the Middle Ground Bar by the Blackwater River. Due to the dynamic nature of the Hampton Harbor flood shoal system, it is anticipated that the Middle Ground Bar will continue to breach or shift without further intervention.

In 1998, a breach of the Middle Ground Bar developed along the south shore of the harbor, immediately adjacent to River Street. The occurrence of the breach (aka River Street Cut) led to severe erosion of the shoreline abutting several properties on River Street, as well as increased shoaling of the Seabrook anchorage. The breach across the Middle Ground Bar and the associated shoaling were addressed under the USACE Section 227 Research and Development (R&D) authority for Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program in March 2005. The Section 227 project consisted of building two sheet pile bulkhead walls and backfilling the breach of the Middle Ground Bar with sediment dredged from the restoration of the anchorage and channels. The construction of the Section 227 project successfully retrained the Blackwater River away from the River Street Cut. By 2013, the inner harbor channels and anchorages of Seabrook were re-established and included as features of the FNP.

In 2016, the Blackwater River breached the Middle Ground Bar at downstream limit of the 2005 bulkhead, and rapidly shoaled the Seabrook anchorage. In 2019, O&M dredging removed over 130,000 CY of sediment from the Seabrook channel and anchorage. This dredged material was beneficially used to nourish beaches in Hampton and Seabrook. At present, the Middle Ground Bar breach developed in 2016 remains a persistent feature in the Harbor, and shoaling continues in the Seabrook channel and anchorage areas, impairing navigation and commerce.

**Project Cost Sharing Requirements:** The Feasibility Phase will be initially Federally funded up to $100,000. Any remaining feasibility phase costs will be shared equally (50% each) with the non-Federal sponsor pursuant to the terms of the FCSA. During Design and Implementation Phase, all costs except Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) beyond the feasibility phase are considered total project costs and will be shared as follows. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 10 percent of total costs of construction of the General Navigation Features (GNF) (including costs of construction of dredged material disposal facilities) for depths, excluding associated over-depth and entrance channel wave allowances, less than or equal to 20 feet; 25 percent of total costs of construction of the GNF (including costs of construction of dredged material disposal facilities) for depths, excluding associated over-depth and entrance channel wave allowances, in excess of 20 feet but equal to or less than 50 feet. Consistent with the terms of the PPA, the non-Federal sponsor will perform necessary non-Federal

audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on Land, Easements, and Rights of Way (LER) required for the project. If the value of the sponsor's contributions listed above is less than the non-Federal sponsor's required share, the non-Federal sponsor must make a cash payment so that non-Federal contributions equal the required share. In addition, the non-Federal sponsor must pay an additional 10 percent of the total costs of construction of the GNF (including costs of construction of dredged material disposal facilities) which will be offset by the value of LER provided by the non-Federal sponsor for the project. Further, the non-Federal sponsor will be responsible for the construction and operation and maintenance of any local service facilities required for the project. Operation and maintenance (O&M) of the GNF will be a Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per-project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per-project limit. The costs of O&M of the GNF are not counted toward the statutory Federal per-project participation limit for Section 107.

**Project Authority:** Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 provides authority for USACE to improve navigation including dredging of channels, anchorage areas, and turning basins and construction of breakwaters, jetties and groins, through a partnership with a non-Federal government sponsor. The maximum Federal cost for project development and construction of any one project is $10 million and each project must be economically justified, environmentally sound, and technically feasible.

**Project Assumptions:**

- The Federal project would reduce future shoaling to the FNP caused by existing hydrodynamic forces in Hampton Seabrook Estuary.
- Real Estate interests would be properly identified during the study.
- The public will be supportive of navigation improvements addressing shoaling in the FNP.
- The non-Federal Sponsor is assumed to be willing and able to support their share of study costs and participation.
- There are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the project.
- Any dredged materials can be disposed on-site within the Middle Ground Bar to restore shellfishing habitat

**Alternatives to be considered:** The Federal Interest Determination (FID) phase identified two alternatives including (1) no action plan, and (2) construction of a bulkhead sheet pile wall that extends northerly 800 linear feet beyond the existing Section 227 project bulkhead wall. The PDT is tasked with formulating at least 2 additional alternatives for consideration.

**Required Output:** The Project Manager will hold team meetings to ensure that project changes and specifics are communicated to each team member on a timely basis. Each team member has the responsibility to read and understand the project's PMP and inform the project manager of changes to scope, schedule or budget.

The "Feasibility phase" is the project formulation period where the planning activities are completed to demonstrate that Federal participation is warranted to solve or mitigate the identified

water resources problem. The result is the approval of a decision document (the Detailed Project Report) to guide USACE's future involvement. All of USACE's plan formulation will be completed during this phase, including all technical analyses, policy compliance determinations, and Federal and non-Federal environmental and regulatory compliance activities required for approval of the decision document. The reports obtained from the technical disciplines in support of the study will be included as report's appendices and will include the coastal hydrodynamic and sediment transport analysis, the real estate planning report, the cost analysis, and other analyses and investigative reports as appropriate.

Each discipline will provide technical analyses and input for the alternatives so that the DPR will consist of the consolidation of the documentation of the technical and policy analyses, findings, and conclusions that the District Engineer will consider for a recommendation to the Major Subordinate Command Commander to approve the project for implementation. The decision document will be used to support the Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) developed at the start of the final Design and Implementation phase.

The DPR will also include the proposed project's review under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In accordance with USACE NEPA regulations, an Environmental Assessment will be prepared along with a draft and final Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). An Environmental Impact Statement is not expected to be required for this action. The EA and FONSI will be incorporated into the decision document.

**PROJECT TASK DESCRIPTIONS BY SECTION:**

## PLANNING DIVISION

*PROJECT MANAGEMENT/PLANNING* *$120,000*

- Lead the study team in the plan formulation, evaluation, and design efforts.
- Lead team meetings
- Prepare and manage project schedule, scope and budget.
- Serve as the primary point of contact for communication with the non-Federal Sponsor and outside sources
- Prepare and ensure review of Detailed Project Report based on team input
- Review Environmental Assessments and project appendices
- Manage review processes and obtain project approval.
- Includes supervisor review and oversight

*ECONOMICS / GIS* *$52,580*

- Team Meetings
- Conduct analysis of annualized O&M costs over the project lifetime
- Gather socioeconomic data for study area (Census data on demographics)
- Interview local contacts to obtain fleet information and vessel transit information, commodity quantities and values.
- Determine crewmember wage rates, leisure rates, hours worked

- Determine frequency and type of vessel damages due to controlling depth, and frequency and length of tidal delays
- Calculate benefits based on reduction in O&M frequency, reduction in cost of vessel damages, reduction in delay costs (fuel/wages), reduction in lost profits due to stale fish
- Determine trend analysis of commodities, fleet size, sailing draft
- Make summary tables for report to reflect data collected
- Provide figures and GIS support for report
- Assist team to incorporate comprehensive benefits analysis into study. Level of effort TBD. Labor estimate (time / $) will be modified as needed once appropriate comprehensive benefits scope is identified. ~$5k used as placeholder.
- Prepare Economics Appendix for DPR/EA showing results of economics analysis
- Incorporate costs (calculate IDC, Annualize, etc.)
- DQC & ATR Review and Response to Comments
- File Management and Project wrap up
- Senior Economist oversight and S&A

*ENVIRONMENTAL – CULTURAL RESOURCES* *$15,100*

- Coordinated Site Visit
- Team Meetings
- Background Research of Area of Potential Effect
- Comparison of Alternatives
- Prepare Affected Environment for Draft EA
- Section 106 Coordination (SHPO, BUAR, Tribes, others)
- Finalize Sections of DPR/EA
- Prepare PED Cost Estimate for additional tasks if needed
- DQC Review and Response to Comments
- Internal / ATR Review and Response to Comments
- Project Closeout

*ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES* *$103,300*

- Site Visit & Reconnaissance, Coordinated Site Visit & MFR
- Team Meetings
- Initial Coordination Letters & FCAR
- Assist in Formulation and Comparison of Alternatives
- Environmental Sampling and Surveys ($10,000)
- Prepare Draft & Final Environmental Assessment and FONSI
- Sediment Sampling and Testing ($20,000)
- Coordinate CZM, WQC
- Prepare and Issue Public Notic
- Prepare PED Cost Estimate
- DQC Review and Response to Comments
- ATR Review and Response to Comments
- Budget includes Section and Branch Chief budgets
- Project Closeout

## ENGINEERING DIVISION

*HYDROLOGY, HYDRAULICS AND COASTAL ENGINEERING* *$355,500*

- Project Management for Contracting Support
- Coordinate HQ USACE approvals
- Review background information and historical documents
- Site visits
- Assist with development of alternatives for harbor modeling
- Numerical Modeling (Consultant / A/E contract estimated at $310,000)
- Coordination and Oversight of Numerical Modeling (Consultant / A/E contract)
- Project Delivery Team Meetings
- Estimate Local Mean SLC Rates
- Evaluate Sensitivity of Alternatives to SLC
- Assess Potential Adaptation Measures
- Draft HH&C sections of DPR/EA and Appendices to Report
- Support PED Cost Estimate
- Review and respond to ITR and Peer Review and Comments
- DQC review and response to comments
- ATR Review and response to comments
- Budget includes Section and Branch Chief budgets

*DESIGN BRANCH – CIVIL SECTION* *$45,040*

- Attend team meetings
- Site Visit & on site measurements/photos as required
- Coordination within PDT and technical personnel and other personnel as necessary.
- In coordination with the other PDT members, develop design elements for four alternative solutions.
- Create design models from new survey files and data
- Provide CADD Support
- Determine quantities of materials and provide input to Cost Engineering for preparation of cost estimate
- Determine Environmental quantities for impact assessment
- Set of plans or sketches will be developed, including site plan(s), typical sections, and details as required
- Screen alternatives, or recommendations for screening process
- Prepare Civil design memorandum and input to feasibility report
- Prepare input for associated environmental assessment documents
- Address and Respond to Civil-related DQC & ATR review comments
- Budget includes Section Chief budget

*GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING* *$34,250*

- Coordination with PDT and Team Meetings
- Site Visits
- Collect Background information and research project

- Evaluate Geotechnical issues for 4 alternatives
- Review subsurface information, develop and evaluate soil properties
- Develop typical wall/bulkhead cross section
- Consider connection details with existing project
- Develop typical dredge/revetment cross section
- Construction considerations
- Coordinate and provide input to plans prepared by Civil section
- Prepare Geotechnical Appendix for DPR/EA
- Conduct DQC/BCOE/ATR Review and respond to comments

*STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING* *$49,100*

- Coordination with PDT and Team Meetings
- Site Visits/Field Work (review previous designs, as builts, etc)
- Analysis of four assumed sheetpile alternatives
- Coordinate with Geotechnical and other PDT members beyond meetings
- CAD (Develop drawings, typ sections, details, as required)
- Prepare structural design memoranda/appendix for DPR/EA
- Review Draft Report/Quality Control (Section Chief of Sr. Engineer)
- Incorporate DQC/ATR Review Comments
- Construction considerations
- Supervision and Administration

*COST ENGINEERING* *$59,500*

- Coordination and Scoping participation in PDT meetings & discussions
- Assist with alternative discussions and development
- Research vendor pricing for materials and support cost estimate
- Create ROM Estimates for Alternatives Analysis & Evaluation
- Update/Create ROM Estimates for TSP Milestone
- Update ROM Estimates for ADM Milestone
- Finalize ROM Estimate for Final Report
- Develop Construction Schedule (Match WBS)
- Develop Risk Based Contingency and Facilitate Risk Register Meeting(s) with PDT
- Develop Risk Models
- Develop Total Project Cost Summary
- Prepare Cost Appendix for Draft DPR / Feasibility Report
- Update Study Cost Appendix for Final DPR / Feasibility Report
- Conduct ROM Reviews at Alternatives Analysis, TSP & ADM milestones
- Provide DQC Review and Response to Comments
- Respond to ATR Review Comments
- Includes section chief oversight on all products

**REAL ESTATE DIVISION**

*REAL ESTATE* *$40,000*

- Attend PDT Meetings and Site visits as needed
- Obtain rights-of-entry for general survey and exploration activities documents. (Research public records and existing maps to obtain site and ownership information)
- Assess NFS real Estate Acquisition Capability – Complete Checklist
- Provide and Review Risk of Land Acquisition prior to PPA execution w/ NFS
- Review project mapping, identify RE requirements (permanent [fee, easement] & temporary [access/haul roads, borrow, disposal and contractor work areas, etc.])
- Analysis of real estate impacts of proposed alternatives
- Appraisal branch to prepare preliminary LERRD cost estimates for proposed alternatives
- Prepare estate language with possible need for justification in coordination with EP/PM & OC for inclusion in RE Plan
- Prepare Real Estate Plan
- Provide DQC Review and respond to comments
- Respond to ATR Review and respond to comments

## Section 107 Study Milestones:

Project Milestones for CAP projects are established by HQUSACE (1105-2-100) and NAD and are documented in the Draft Project Management Business Process (PMBP) Manual January 2009 Version 0.6. The PM will maintain project budgets, schedules and milestones for individual CAP projects in P2. Project information will be updated by the PM to reflect changes to individual project budgets and schedules.

| FEASIBILITY STUDY MILESTONE SCHEDULE | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Activity** | **Start** | **Finish** |
| Initiate Feasibility Study | 10-Jun-21 | |
| FID Approval | | 10-Oct-2022 |
| FCSA Execution | | June 2023 |
| Tentatively Selected Plan | | January 2025 |
| Initiate District Quality Control | | March 2025 |
| Initiate Concurrent Review | | May 2025 |
| Decision Document Approval | | July/August 2025 |

## Project Delivery Team (PDT):

PDT members are responsible for informing the project manager and PDT as soon as possible regarding issues or changes in work priorities that could impact individual project schedules. Each PDT has the potential to impact the entire project schedule.

| PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | **Name** |
| Project Manager/Planner | Jordan Macy |

| | |
|---|---|
| Biologist | Donald Faughnan |
| Cultural Resources | Marc Paiva |
| Coastal Engineer | Brandon Raymond |
| Economist | Andrew Leblanc |
| Structural Engineer | Dave Sleeper |
| Geotech | Siamac Vaghar |
| Civil Engineer | Romina Gugo |
| Cost Engineer | Dan Palmer |
| Real Estate | Nicole Dapcic |
| Navigation / PPMD | Coral Siligato |

## Project Budget:

| SECTION 107 FEASIBILITY STUDY BUDGET | |
|---|---|
| | **Estimated Budget** |
| **Planning Division** | |
| Planning/Project Management | $120,000 |
| Environmental Resources | $103,300 |
| Economist / GIS | $52,580 |
| Cultural Resources | $15,100 |
| **Engineering Division** | |
| Hydrology Hydraulics and Coastal Engineering | $355,500 |
| Design - Civil Engineering | $45,040 |
| Geotechnical Engineering | $34,250 |
| Structural Engineering | $49,100 |
| Cost Engineering | $59,500 |
| **Other Sections** | |
| Appraisal & Real Estate | $40,000 |
| Survey | $55,000 |
| **Additional Study Costs** | |
| Office of Counsel | $4,000 |
| Vehicle/Mileage | $1,000 |
| E/P Management Support Group | $1,500 |
| Programs | $2,500 |
| | |
| **STUDY COST SUBTOTAL** | $938,400 |
| **Contingency (10%)** | $93,840 |
| **FEASIBILTIY COST SHARE STUDY SUBTOTAL** | **$1,032,210** |
| **SPONSOR COST SHARE ESTIMATE** | **$516,105** |
| **FIRST $100,000 (100% FEDERAL FUNDS)** | **$100,000** |
| **FEDERAL COST SHARE ESTIMATE** | **$616,105** |
| **TOTAL FEASIBILITY COST SHARE ESTIMATE** | **$1,132,210** |

**PMP Approval:**
We concur with this Project Management Plan (PMP) for the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Section 107 Navigation Improvements Feasibility Study. We understand the PMP is a living management document that will be updated through the course of the Feasibility Study.

| | |
|---|---|
| Jordan G. Macy<br>Project Manager/Planner | Matthew E. Tessier<br>Chief, Design Branch |
| Lawrence R. Oliver<br>Chief, Environmental Branch | Jason A. Paolino<br>Chief, Geotechnical/Water Resources Branch |
| Christopher L. Hatfield<br>Chief, Plan Formulation Branch | Gary R. Lacroix<br>Chief, Technical Support Branch |
| Timothy W. Shugert<br>Chief, Real Estate Division | David I. Margolis<br>Chief, Engineering Division |
| Wendy C. Gendron<br>Chief, Planning Division | |

**PMP Change Log**

| Date of change | Edits Made | Reason for Edits |
|---|---|---|
| 28-Apr-2023 | Initial Draft | To achieve PDT consensus / execute FCSA |
| 10-May-2023 | Add ~$38k S&T, and $5k for GIS | Final EB estimate, SD needed for beach placement, GIS support for graphs and figures |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |