



EPA Puget Sound Financial and Ecosystem Accounting Tracking System (FEATS)

Photo by Rebecca Pirtle, Editor, Kingston Community News (Doe-Kag-Wats Estuary of the Suquamish Tribe)

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Federal Grant Number	PA-00J322-01	*2a. Reporting Period Start Date:	10/1/2011	*2b. Reporting Period End Date:	3/31/2012
3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including zip code)			4. Project Manager Contact Information		
Name: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Address 1: 1033 Old Blyn Highway Address 2: City: Sequim State: WA Zip Code: 98382-			Name: Hansi Hals Phone: (360) 681-4601 Ext: Fax: (360) 681-4611 Email: hhals@jamestowntribe.org		
5a. Program (RFP)		5b. Project Title		*6. Collaborating Organizations/Partners	
Tribal Projects		Jimmcomelately Creek and Estuary Restoration: A Five Year Report; Determining the magnitude, extent, contributing sources, and possible impacts of elevated nutrients in		<input type="checkbox"/> Subawardee	

Submission Instructions: EPA fills in the white boxes. Grantee fills in the yellow boxes (boxes with asterisks). Refer to guidance document for how to fill out the boxes. After completing the form, save and e-mail it to the Project Officer and cc: the Technical Monitor.	Project Officer: Lisa Chang U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Email: chang.lisa@epa.gov Technical Monitor: Daniel Steinborn U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Email: steinborn.daniel@epa.gov	*7a. Name/Title of Person Submitting Report	Hansi Hals Environmental Planning Manager
		*7b. Date Report Submitted	4/30/12

FUNDING/COST ANALYSIS

8a. Total EPA Assistance Amount Awarded:	136300	8b. Funding Year (Federal Fiscal Year Funds Appropriated)	FY 2010 ----- ----- -----	*9. Total EPA Amount Expended To-Date:	83424	*10. Funds Drawn Down from EPA To-Date:	51689
11. Match Amount Required	\$0.00	*12. Total Match Amount Expended and Documented To-Date:	0	*13. Have you experienced any cost overruns or high unit costs?	No		
*14. What issues or questions do you need the EPA Project Officer or Technical Monitor to respond to?		EPA helped us get our QAPP developed and approved expeditiously for the summer sampling. For the time being, we are all set.					

BUDGET UPDATE

	15a. APPROVED BUDGET			*15b. SPENT TO-DATE		
	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL
Personnel	\$31,292.00		\$31,292.00	31111		\$31,111.00
Fringe Benefits	\$11,945.00		\$11,945.00	11305		\$11,305.00
Travel	\$2,000.00		\$2,000.00	\$0.00		\$ 0.00
Equipment	\$0.00		\$ 0.00	\$0.00		\$ 0.00
Supplies	\$2,000.00		\$2,000.00	\$0.00		\$ 0.00
Contracts	\$63,740.00		\$63,740.00	19216		\$19,216.00
Other	\$0.00		\$ 0.00	\$0.00		\$ 0.00
TOTAL DIRECT CHARGES	\$110,977.00		\$110,977.00	61632		\$61,632.00
Indirect Charges	\$25,323.00		\$25,323.00	21792		\$21,792.00
TOTAL	\$136,300.00		\$136,300.00	\$83424		\$83,424.00
*Explain Any Discrepancies:	None.					

ECOSYSTEM GOALS ADDRESSED

16a. Primary Goal	Healthy Habitat
16b. Additional Goals	Water Quality -----

DIRECT THREATS ADDRESSED

17a. Primary Threat	Surface Water Loading/Runoff from the Built Env
17b. Secondary Threat(s)	-----

LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND ACTION AGENDA

18a. Strategic Priorities Employed	Priority B Priority C Priority E -----
18b. Near-Term Actions Supported	B.1.1
18c. Other Actions Supported	

LINKAGES TO EPA PUGET SOUND MEASURES

19. Measure(s)	Habitat Restored/Protected -----
----------------	----------------------------------

LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND DASHBOARD INDICATORS

20a. Primary Indicator	Marine Water Quality Index
20b. Additional Indicators	Swimming Beaches -----

PROJECT LOCATION

21a. Latitude	48.02297	21b. Longitude	-123.00534
21c. Hydrologic Unit Code	17110020 - Dungeness-Elwha	-----	-----
21d. Action Area	Strait of Juan de Fuca	-----	-----

MEASURES OF SUCCESS (Key Grant Outputs)

*22a. Description (e.g., "shellfish beds reopened")	*22b. Unit (e.g., "acres")	*22c. Project Target ("number")	*22d. Project Measure To-Date ("number")
Quality Assurance Project Plan developed and approved for all environmental data collection.	QAPP	1	1
Successful year-long nutrient monitoring of six sampling sites in Dungeness and Sequim Bays completed.	Months of monitoring	12	10
Jimmycomelately Restoration 5 Year Report produced.	Report	1	1
An action plan developed to reduce anthropogenic sources of nutrients in Sequim and Dungeness Bays.	Report	1	0

PROJECT MILESTONES

Instructions: In the tables below, please explain your progress toward meeting agreed outputs for the period, **reasons for slippages**, and any additional information including **reflections, lessons learned, and/or thoughtful analysis**. When appropriate, include analysis and information of **cost overruns or high unit costs**, and changes to work plan or budget not requiring prior approval from EPA. We encourage photo documentation - please attach to the report as a separate document.

23a. Work Plan Component/Task: Component 1: Jimmycomelately Restoration: A Five Year Report

23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed: B.1, E.3.3 Synthesize results and communicate science findings from the Jimmycomelately Restoration Project.

***23c. Estimated Costs:** \$69,213.00

Actual Costs to Date:

(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
1.1	Secure contract for general report management and production	6/30/11	COMPLETED	Contract secured	Contract secured as of June, 2011.
1.2	Database class for contributors	8/30/11	COMPLETED	Database class created	Database training transpired in July 2011 with individual follow up in July and August 2011.
1.3	Database development to present visuals/graphs	3/31/12	COMPLETED	Database developed to present visuals/graphs	Completed and used by all chapter authors for the JCL report. Data analysis performed and graphs produced for the

					report.
1.4	Data analysis	3/31/12	COMPLETED	Physical channel, hydrology, salmon surveys, vegetation, wildlife, and water quality monitoring data analyzed	Completed for all parameters. Results from data analysis are presented in chapters of the JCL report, together with conclusions for each parameter.
1.5	Report writing/review	3/31/12	COMPLETED	Report written; report reviewed	All chapters written. Each chapter reviewed by at least two readers; in most cases three readers. Formatting underway and production scheduled for May 2012.
1.6	Report production and distribution	3/31/12	CURRENT	Report produced; report distributed	Finalized text has been submitted to the Tribe's publication specialist for formatting. Printing and distribution is scheduled for May and June 2012

23a. Work Plan Component/Task: Component 2: Sequim and Dungeness Bays

23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed: C.1, C.6, Determine contributing pollutant sources in Sequim and Dungeness Bays so that remedial actions can be identified and implemented.

***23c. Estimated Costs:** \$67,087.00

Actual Costs to Date:
(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
2.1	Develop QAPP	8/2/2011	COMPLETED	QAPP Approval	Approved: August 2, 2011
2.2	Conduct monitoring	Ongoing	CURRENT	Field data	Monthly sampling through February 2012 completed
2.3	Write summary report of nutrient data	3/31/12	CURRENT	Report	data analysis begun and literature review underway.
2.4	Conduct land-use inventory		CURRENT	Inventory of possible contributing nutrient sources	Map analysis of lands adjacent to tributaries of Sequim Bay and the shoreline has been completed.
2.5	Develop action plan related to land- use concerns		PLANNED	An action plan to reduce anthropogenic sources of nutrients	No action taken during this report period.

2.6	Conduct eel grass and macroalgae survey of Sequim Bay	3/31/12	COMPLETED	Contract secured; draft report	Report complete. Presentation provided to Jamestown Natural Resources Dept. in Feb. 2012. Comments back to contractor (March 2012) accepting the report (excellent!).
2.7	Final Report synthesizing information from nutrient assessment, land-use survey, and macroalgae and eelgrass survey		PLANNED	Final report	No action taken during this report period.

23a. Work Plan Component/Task:					
23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:					
*23c. Estimated Costs:					
Actual Costs to Date: httt23ttttthtttttt13ttttt					
(If required by PO)					
23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks

23a. Work Plan Component/Task:					
23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:					
*23c. Estimated Costs:					
Actual Costs to Date: htt23tttttttttttht13tttt					
(If required by PO)					
23d. Sub-	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h.	*23i. Remarks

Task No.				Outputs/Deliverables	

23a. Work Plan Component/Task:

23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:

***23c. Estimated Costs:**
Actual Costs to Date:
 (If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS (specific to reporting period)

*24a. Task No., Sub-Task No.	*24b. Challenge	*24c. Solution

HIGHLIGHTS/LESSONS LEARNED/REFLECTIONS

***25.**

Numeric nutrient criteria have been established for relatively few estuaries but the criteria that have been set typically fall between 350 and 490 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for total nitrogen (TN) and have been used as either as water quality standards (e.g. for aquatic life use support such as eelgrass) or as modeling targets for TMDL studies. If we use these values for comparison, what we see from the results of our nutrient sampling is not a particularly good report card. Taking the median values of nine samples (monthly from June 2011 through February 2012), all ten sampling stations (five in Sequim Bay, five in Dungeness Bay) exceed the low end of the range shown above. Fortunately, only one station - in Dungeness Bay - marginally exceeded the high end of the range with a median value of 490.2 $\mu\text{g/L}$ TN. Comparing our results with the average of the above range (420 $\mu\text{g/L}$ TN), nine of the ten stations exceeded this in their median values.

More alarming, however, are some of the individual sample results. Three of the Sequim stations on August 8th were over ten times that of the high end of the range (i.e. 5126, 7280, and 5702 $\mu\text{g/L}$ TN). The Dungeness Bay stations were generally more consistent, but on one occasion – October 20th – one station was over twice that of the high end of the range.

There is positive news, however. What we learned from the underwater video survey conducted in August 2011 under the auspices of this grant is that the majority of the shoreline of Sequim Bay is fringed by eelgrass. This is very good news as it is such a critical habitat for so many species.