



Agenda

City Council Committee of the Whole

Monday, October 23, 2023 at 5:00 PM

Cowles Council Chambers In-Person & Via Zoom Webinar

Homer City Hall

491 E. Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603
www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Zoom Webinar ID: 953 057829 Password: 234969

<https://cityofhomer.zoom.us>
Dial: 346-248-7799 or 669-900-6833;
(Toll Free) 888-788-0099 or 877-853-5247

CALL TO ORDER, 5:00 P.M.

AGENDA APPROVAL (Only those matters on the noticed agenda may be considered, pursuant to City Council's Operating Manual)

CONSENT AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

DISCUSSION TOPIC(S)

- [a.](#) Homer Harbor Expansion Funding Conversation

Memorandum CC-23-236 from Special Projects Coordinator

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

ADJOURNMENT NO LATER THAN 5:50 P.M. Next Regular Meeting is Monday, November 13, 2023 at 6:00 p.m., Work Session at 4:00 p.m. and Committee of the Whole at 5:00 p.m. All meetings scheduled to be held in the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.



MEMORANDUM

Homer Harbor Expansion Funding Conversation

Item Type: Informational Memorandum
Prepared For: Mayor and City Council
Date: October 16, 2023
From: Port Director Hawkins and Special Project Coordinator Carroll
Through: Rob Dumouchel, City Manager

At their October 11 meeting, the Port & Harbor Advisory Commission passed a motion recommending City Council:

- concur with the USACE on \$1.15M cost increase of the General Investigation (GI) due to the addition of geotechnical survey/sampling and ship simulation;
- pass an Ordinance committing additional GI matching funds in the amount of \$288,523.25 (25% of \$1,154,093 additional GI cost);
- pass a Resolution in support of pursuing additional State of Alaska capital funds in the amount of \$288,523.25 to help complete the local match (50% of \$1,154,093 additional GI cost).

This memorandum provides background and information on four questions Councilmember Aderhold posed to help facilitate City Council discussion at the October 23, 2023 Committee of the Whole regarding the next steps in the port expansion. Commissioner Shavelson will be available at the meeting to answer questions the City Council may have for the Port & Harbor Commission.

What is the status of continued USACE funding for the remaining years of the General Investigation study (original \$3 million)?

Background: Homer Harbor Expansion (HHE) received funding from Congressional Directed Spending (CDS) to initiate the new start General Investigation.

All US Corps of Engineers (USACE) General Investigations (GIs) are funded incrementally, on a fiscal year (FY) basis. \$300,000 was requested by the USACE for FY23, which was matched by local and State funds for a FY23 GI budget of \$600,000. Due to a misunderstanding between Federal entities regarding how the USACE budget and CDS funds would interact for multi-year projects, the study was not included in the FY24 USACE budget. Neither were additional CDS funds allocated, thus the study is now facing a Federal funding gap and delay.

Current Status: The remaining balance of FY23 funding is \$274,231. This will fund USACE study activities through December 2023 and allow the USACE team to continue to advance the study, though at a reduced staffing level and pace beginning January 2024. See October 17, 2023 letter attached from Project Manager Curtis Lee for details.

The USACE is actively pursuing two potential sources for Federal continuation funding: unused funds in the FY24 Workplan and inclusion in the USACE FY25 Workplan and the President’s FY25 Budget. The former would allow study resumption in July 2024; the latter a study resumption in October 2024. Both sources are competitive and the decisions are made at levels well above the USACE staff working on our GI. It is a possibility that we will not receive funds from either source. The team will know more in Spring 2024 as Federal budgets get created.

Lack of USACE funding should not be equated to a lack of Federal interest in the project. The Alaska Congressional Delegation, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, and USACE Vertical Team are aware of and working on the issue and aiming at inclusion in the FY25 budget. Additionally, the USACE Alaska Division, upon confirmation of the funding gap, secured access to an additional \$49,999 of reprogrammed Federal FY23 funds through the Pacific Ocean Division to support study activities once the current funds are exhausted. Those funds can be used as Federal match for local sponsor-funded study activities that go above the \$300,000. USACE staff anticipate being able to secure another \$49,999 in FY24.

While many Federally funded projects experience bumps along the way, our understanding is that no General Investigations have ended due to lack of Federal funding. Refusing to fund the completion of an initiated project would be an unprecedented act by USACE.

GI Budget Projection:

After reaching the Alternatives & Measures Milestone, the USACE project development team updates the Project Management Plan (PMP). The update identifies the amount of Federal funding required through FY2026 to complete the GI study.

The GI cost increase from \$3M to \$4.15M is a change to the Project Management Plan. Cost drivers (geotechnical and ship simulation) are discussed in the next section.

Presuming Optimal Funding Stream		Required Federal Funding Stream	
Milestone	Date		
Execute FCSA	29 Mar 2023		
Federal Funds Received	14 Apr 2023		
Alternatives Milestone	30 Jun 2023		
Tentatively Selected Plan Milestone	12 Jun 2024		
Agency Decision Milestone	28 May 2025		
MSC Transmittal of Final Report	28 Nov 2025		
Chiefs Report	29 Mar 2026		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2023* - \$300,000 Fed, \$300,000 Local FY 2024 - \$800,000 Fed, \$800,000 Local FY 2025 - \$950,000 Fed, \$950,000 Local FY 2026 - \$27,046.50 Fed, \$27,046.50 Local 	TOTAL FED: \$2,077,046.50 + TOTAL LOCAL: \$2,077,046.50 = <hr/> \$4,154,093.00**
---	---

* PL 117-328 Congressionally Directed Spending and a below threshold reprogramming of \$49,999
 ** Pending VTAM / 3x3x3 Approval

Why is the USACE requiring geophysical analysis and ship simulation as part of the GI study?

Geophysical work is required for all USACE harbor designs. The City has existing geophysical data which USACE has determined is not sufficient for study needs. Historically, geophysical survey and core sampling have been completed either in the second phase of the USACE process (Pre-Construction Engineering and Design) or in the GI phase. In part, in an effort to maintain the \$3 million GI study cost, geophysical work has more recently been done in the second phase. This has had the unfavorable outcome that design and cost estimates completed during the GI without the benefit geophysical data were not even close to actual costs. This led to funding shortfalls and/or extremely large contingency line items in the project budgets. Advancing the study without this critical data can also result in an inaccurately large cost assessment that does not support the cost/benefit analysis required to recommend project advancement at the conclusion of the study.

To mitigate this, and for the following reasons, the USACE is requiring geophysical analysis (at ≈\$200,000 for sub-bottom survey work + \$600,000 for core sampling) in the GI phase:

- The results of the geophysical work will inform choices about the materials, design, and location within the project area of the preferred alternative;
- The materials and design decisions could significantly impact the cost of the preferred alternative, without a meaningful change to the benefits calculation;
- Without this data, the USACE protocol would assume the worst-case conditions and design a preferred alternative that would hold up under those conditions. Such a design could be so costly that the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the project is not favorable;
- Geophysical costs are costs that would be incurred no matter what. Shifting the timing gives the project the best chance of success.

Ship simulation (≈\$450,000) is required for harbors accommodating vessels 100' or greater in length.

What are decisions City Council needs to make and what are the consequences of those decisions (pros, cons and consequences)?

- 1. Whether to concur with the USACE Project Management Plan (PMP), which includes a \$4.15M GI cost. If it is the will of the Council, concurrence would be completed through a Resolution directing the City Manager to sign revised PMP.***

Background: If there is a change to the PMP, the USACE project development team is required to seek concurrence from all parties (the USACE Vertical Team and the local Sponsor).

Pros of Sponsor Concurrence	Cons of Sponsor Concurrence
Officially completes the Alternatives & Measures Milestone and sets plan/expectations for completion of subsequent study phases. Signing the PMP does not financially obligate the City to the increased GI cost, however, local match funds will be necessary by the third year of the GI	Concurrence means study activities will continue until FY23 funds are expended. If Council then decides decline the additional match requirement, reimbursement of unspent funds will be lower.
Avoids delays in PMP transmission up the USACE Chain of Command that officially documents study progress and demonstrates schedule delays caused by lack of Federal funding; allows the Vertical Team to use PMP reporting as a tool to highlight need for continuation funding.	
Other:	Other:

2. Whether to entertain an Ordinance to commit City funding to meet additional match requirement to continue with the HHE General Investigation.

Pros Additional Match Commitment	Cons of Additional Match Commitment
Helps meet long-term goals for facility (supported by Port & Harbor Advisory Commission and City Council in the Capital Improvement Plan).	
Demonstrates City’s continued commitment to Federal funding partners.	Leaves lower fund balances to dedicate to other projects.
Demonstrates City commitment to State to help leverage additional State matching funds. Capital requests go to the State Legislators in early January and in mid-February for consideration for Governor’s amended budget. City would have two State budget cycles to lobby for additional State matching funds.	
City match funds could move study forward during Federal funding slow down by conducting Phase 1 of the geophysical work (sub-bottom profile survey at ≈ \$200,000 as Work-In-Kind) in summer 2024. The geotechnical data is evergreen; once completed the City owns the data which has value for any other future development in the area (i.e. deep water dock expansion; barge moorings).	If City chooses to get ahead of the 50% Federal match with geophysical survey, funds could potentially be at risk if Federal funding does not come through to continue the study, though GI termination due to lack of Federal funds is unprecedented and unlikely.
Allows the GI process to stay the course to determine whether expansion is feasible and Federally competitive; alleviates the need to initiate another study in the future if harbor expansion is desired.	
Other:	Other:

Consequence of non-concurrence and declining additional match funding:

- The USACE would officially end the study. Expenses incurred to date would be split according to 50 Federal/50 Local Sponsor share. Any unspent local funds would be returned to the City and the project would be closed out.
- When the study ends, the City owns any data produced.
- Potential need to reimburse State Legislative grant; though unknown at present.

3. Where could the additional matching funding come from?

Potential sources for additional GI match funds include:

Request \$288,523.25 from the State of Alaska in the FY25, and if necessary, FY26 State capital budget. The State is currently funding half of the local share requirement through an FY23 Legislative Designated grant.

City of Homer can choose to fund \$288,523.25 from the following potential sources at City Council discretion.

Full appropriation from General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance.

Pros of General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance	Cons of General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance
Immediately overcomes the obstacle of identifying and appropriating funds for the local match.	Limits other options for use of the General Fund unassigned fund balance.
	The City generally prefers to not use General Funds for Harbor Enterprise purposes, although the original \$750,000 was appropriated from the General Fund
	Potentially end year with very tight fund balance
Other:	Other:

Incremental obligation of City funds through budget amendments. Approve a FY24 mid-biennium budget amendment for half the match amount; amend FY25 budget for half the match amount.

Pros of General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance	Cons of General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance
Spreads out the cost between multiple budget years and the appropriation is part of a holistic package as opposed to a one-off ordinance spending from the General Fund's unassigned fund balance.	Same as above
Other:	Other:

Port & Harbor Reserves Match Funding account.

Pros	Cons
Source of funding matches the ultimate user (the Harbor Enterprise)	Harbor funds set aside for grant matches were not intended for this project.

Immediately overcomes the obstacle of identifying and appropriating funds for the local match.	Reducing balances for future Harbor matching grant projects could put grants received out of reach for an inability to pull together the local match.
Other:	Other:

4. Can we assign “City Council champions” so someone from Council is on point to make sure the study is moving forward with actions that need to be taken when there are bumps along the way, such as the position we are in now?

This is a City Council decision. To date, Council, as a body, has been provided monthly and quarterly GI reporting as well as briefed on potential changes to the PMP. Given the long-term importance of the potential project, volume of information, frequency of meetings, and the interagency/intergovernmental nature of the endeavor, Council Champion(s) could benefit communications with Council regarding actions needing to be taken and help represent City Council official positions with government officials.

RECOMMENDATION:

Informational only to facilitate City Council discussion regarding any requests for Legislation on next steps for the Homer Harbor Expansion GI.

Attachments:

- Minutes from the October 11, 2023 Port & Harbor Advisory Commission Meeting
- October 17, 2023 letter from Curtis Lee, USACE Project Manager re: current study budget and USACE objectives during a reduction of work period starting January 1, 2024.
- Projected GI Flow of Funds chart
- Port and Harbor Reserves Financials

Port Supervisor Administrator Woodruff began the staff report by noting that it would be a brief report since the Commission just met two weeks ago. She added that she hadn't included any financial data for the same reason. Ms. Woodruff informed the Commission that Amy Burnett from HDR is going to revisit the communications plan that HDR developed based on the feedback she received at the September 27th meeting. She stated that there are plans for Ms. Burnett to be in attendance for the Commission's November 8th meeting. Chair Matthews suggested that it might be smart to have her meet with the Commission after City Council makes any decisions regarding the Port Expansion Project and Communications Plan.

Chair Matthews asked for some clarification on a comparison that Ms. Woodruff had made in the packet regarding total revenue generated per acre. Ms. Woodruff pointed out that she had made a mistake during her calculations, and that she would bring an updated number to the Commission's work session the following day.

Chair Matthews said she dug up some numbers based on what Anchor Point and Deep Creek charge in terms of single launches and annual passes given that many people in those areas will launch from Homer as well. She discovered that Anchor Point charges \$80 per launch, and Deep Creek charges \$75 per launch or you can obtain their annual pass for \$750. She noted that neither charge for trailer parking to her knowledge.

7.B. Homer Marine Trades Association (HTMA) Report

Commissioner Zeiset reminded everyone that the HMTA will be attending the Pacific Marine Expo in November. He noted that there is still booth space available for any businesses that are interested. He also said they are still looking for someone to teach Focus on Learning classes at the high school.

8. PUBLIC HEARING(S)

9. PENDING BUSINESS

9.A. Harbor Expansion

Port Director Hawkins began the discussion by providing the reasoning as to why the Corps was requesting more money for the project, stating that geophysical work that needs to be done in the area is going to be the bulk of the expenses. Instead of the original \$3 million that the project was estimated to cost, the Corps has now assessed that it will cost about \$4.15 million. Mr. Hawkins said that staff and HDR has recommended that the project be broken down into two places. First would be to do the sub-bottom profile, and then next would be to take that data to the Corps and work together to decide exactly how many holes need to be drilled. He expects the cost for the drilling to come down after doing the sub-bottom profile. Commissioner Shavelson asked how the Corps got to the benefit cost ratio without the sub-bottom profiling previously. Mr. Hawkins explained that they had provided the Corps with some data from a previous project, but that the Corps believed they needed more data based on prior projects that they have been burned on after making false assumptions.

PITZMAN/SIEKANIEC MOVED TO SUBMIT A RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL OUTLINING THE FOLLOWING:

1. SUPPORT CITY COUNCIL CONCURRENCE WITH THE UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON A \$1.15 MILLION COST INCREASE OF THE GENERAL INVESTIGATION STUDY DUE TO THE ADDITION OF GEOTECHNICAL SURVEY/SAMPLING AND SHIP SIMULATION TO THE GENERAL INVESTIGATION.

2. RECOMMEND CITY COUNCIL PASS AN ORDINANCE COMMITTING ADDITIONAL GENERAL INVESTIGATION MATCHING FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$287,500.
3. RECOMMEND CITY COUNCIL PASS A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ADDITIONAL STATE OF ALASKA FY25 CAPITAL FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$287,500 TO COMPLETE THE FEDERAL MATCH.

Commissioner Pitzman shared his thoughts, stating that he was surprised that they're already being asked for more money this early into the project. He added that it's unfortunate, but we're moving ahead with the geophysical data that we need, and we need some entity to step up and get it started. Commissioner Siekaniec agreed with what Mr. Pitzman said, stating that it was unfortunate needing to ask for more money, but on the other hand it's something that needs to be done if they're serious about expanding the harbor.

Commissioner Shavelson asked if it would make sense to condition the City's support on the State's support in order to help leverage the money from the State, similar to a matching fund. Port Director Hawkins added that he wasn't sure whether that would help or not, but suggested that the Commission make it a priority of the legislative season that it's heading into. Chair Matthews referenced a call that the Commission was on with the Governor where he seemed very supportive of the project. She noted that the Commission is now at a hinging point, where if they don't stay vested in the process while working to secure funding, she fears the project will quickly die moving forward.

Mr. Hawkins explained that Randy Bowker, Assistant Secretary of the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Colonel were in state two weeks ago, and they are aware of the project, and aware of the need to find funding to put into the work plan to continue the project. Mr. Shavelson questioned that if the state's money doesn't kick in, where does that leave the geophysical work? Mr. Hawkins responded by saying that the work would still need to be done, so the City would have to come up with the additional funding locally. He outlined the parameters of the 50/50 matching programs, explaining that the federal government comes up with 50% and 50% is funded locally. The 50% that's funded locally is split between the City and the State of Alaska. Chair Matthews asked what a likely timeline is that those funds would need to be utilized by. Mr. Hawkins said that his guess would be sometime before spring.

SHAVELSON/SIEKANIEC MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION BY ADDING THAT THE COMMISSION CONDITION THE CITY'S SUPPORT ON THE STATE'S SUPPORT.

Commissioner Siekaniec questioned if that would throw the timing a year further down the road if the Commission can't know about state support until the state budget gets approved. Mr. Shavelson added that if the City can move quicker than the State and we appropriate the money, then where that leaves us in terms of having that money spent on the geophysical work versus if the state money is still dangling out there. Mr. Hawkins responded that the State's budget doesn't come into play until July 1. He added that the first phase of the geophysical work is estimated to be about \$200,000. Mr. Pitzman shared some concerns about tying the City's money, stating that this is a Homer Harbor, and if we aren't willing to be the one that leads and gets things started it makes it look like we aren't as invested as we should be. He urged Commissioners to understand the need to meet start-up funds before everybody else is in line. He ended his thoughts by stating that he believes the City should advance its share and count on its partners to match. Mr. Shavelson added that he wasn't aware of the phased approach, and further requested to withdraw his amendment to the motion. There was consensus among the commissioners to allow Mr. Shavelson to withdraw his motion.

VOTE (amendment): NON OBJECTION: UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Motion carried.

VOTE (Main Motion): YES: PITZMAN, VELSKO, ZEISET, SIEKANIEC, SHAVELSON, MATTHEWS

Motion carried.

10. NEW BUSINESS

10.A. Review of Base Lease

Chair Matthews began the discussions, noting that this was a request from almost a year ago that the Commission looked at. The City's base lease document has since been revised by administration and staff. She turned the floor over to Commissioner Shavelson who stated that he felt the base lease document needs some sort of reopener clause. He used the example of an ordinance that's passed through City Council that would affect the conditions of a leased property. He also pointed out that the wording pertaining to Lease Ordinance in City code is confusing and has a lot of wiggle room. Mayor Castner explained that at renewal time, a lease is treated as a new lease and it has to comply with the law as it is then, not as it was. He added that the City Council can't write things that are retroactive, but they can change rules so that when it comes up for renewal it meets the new rules. He also said that he thinks the lease should contain language pertinent to violating the lease.

Chair Matthews said that her main concern when looking at the base lease is that it doesn't allow for the Commission to make recommendations to City Council or the City Manager specific to the use that may occur after the lease has been offered. She added that there doesn't seem to be enough specificity put into the different types of uses. Lastly, she said that her recommendation might be that leases specific to Spit property come through this Commission prior to being approved. Commissioners Pitzman and Zeiset added that they both have leases on the Spit, and both leases have standards which they must meet. Mr. Zeiset inquired about what the role of Commissioners is in regards to leases. Mr. Shavelson gave his perspective, saying that Commissioner's roles should be to ensure the highest and best use of the City's assets on the Spit.

The Commissioners reached a general consensus that Chair Matthews will meet with Port Administrative Supervisor Woodruff to draft a memo addressed to City Council that outlines the Commission's requests.

10.B. Approve 2024 Meeting Schedule

Chair Matthews directed the Commissioners to the meeting schedule in the packet and asked if anyone had any issues with the schedule. The Commission noted that their originally scheduled meeting date for November falls on the same week as Thanksgiving.

SIEKANIEC/PITZMAN MOVED TO AMEND THE 2024 MEETING SCHEDULE BY MOVING THE NOVEMBER 2024 MEETING TO NOVEMBER 20TH, 2024.

There was no discussion.

VOTE: NON OBJECTION: UNANIMOUS CONSENT



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ALASKA DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 6898
JOINT BASE ELMENDORF-RICHARDSON, AK 99506-0898

October 17, 2023

Mr. Bryan Hawkins, Harbormaster
City of Homer
4311 Freight Dock Rd
Homer, AK 99603

Dear Mr. Hawkins:

The purpose of this letter is to give you a project expenditure update and explanation of continuing work planned for the Homer Navigations Improvements, AK Feasibility Study.

As of 17 October 2023, the Alaska District has expended a total of \$325,769, with \$274,231 remaining to fund Project Delivery Team (PDT) activities. See Enclosure.

During the study reduction of work period at the beginning of next calendar year the PDT plans to continue to advance study efforts related to economic, environmental and geotechnical data collection. The PDT will continue working to gain approval for the Homer Small Boat Harbor Vessel Economic Survey, begin preparations for environmental field work and support the City of Homer with the development of a Geotechnical Drilling Plan.

The Alaska District values the partnership with the City of Homer, and we appreciate your patience as we continue working through the current funding challenges.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (907) 753-2539 or via email at Curtis.D.Lee@usace.army.mil

Sincerely,

Curtis Lee
Project Manager

Enclosure

Enclosure – Homer Navigation Improvements, AK Project Funding

	Total	Federal	Sponsor
Agreement	\$3,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Funds received	\$600,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
Funds expended	\$325,769	\$162,885	\$162,884
Funds remaining	\$274,231	\$137,115	\$137,116

Projected Flow of Funds for Homer Harbor
Expansion General Investigation

Current GI Budget	<i>Federal</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>	
Funds Available	300,000.00	750,000.00	750,000.00	
Funds Expended to Date	162,884.50	-81,442.25	-81,442.25	
Funds Remaining	137,115.50	668,557.75	668,557.75	
Projected Flow of Funds With Additional Match				
2023-24 Expenditures	137,115.50	-68,557.75	-68,557.75	
		600,000.00	600,000.00	
		-	-	
October 2024	800,000.00	400,000.00	400,000.00	
		200,000.00	200,000.00	
		-	-	
October 2025	950,000.00	475,000.00	475,000.00	
		275,000.00	275,000.00	Additional match needed
October 2026	27,046.50	13,523.25	13,523.25	Additional match needed
		288,523.25	288,523.25	Total additional match

Port & Harbor Reserve - Fund 456

Current Information - as of 9/20/23

Account Name	Current Balance	Encumbrances	Available Balance
Harbor General	\$ 1,507,846	\$ 995,674	\$ 512,172
Harbor Match	\$ 1,493,675	\$ -	\$ 1,493,675
Load and Launch	\$ 343,567	\$ -	\$ 343,567
USCGC Berth Space Maintenance	\$ 149,142	\$ 20,000	\$ 129,142
	<u>\$ 3,494,230</u>	<u>\$ 1,015,674</u>	<u>\$ 2,478,556</u>

Open Encumbrances - as of 9/20/23

Description	Requestor	ORD #	Amount Remaining
USCGC Berth Space Maintenance - FY24 only	Port	23-45	\$ 20,000
Crane 7 Rebuild	Port	23-34, 22-66	\$ 26,383
Outfall Line Pump	Port	23-23	\$ 25,000
Ice Metering System	Port	23-23	\$ 145,000
Harbor Bottom Survey	Port	23-23	\$ 25,000
Tank 1 Sludge Removal	Port	23-23	\$ 40,000
Electrical Works for Sewage Lift Station - Fish Grinder	Port	23-23	\$ 40,000
Paid Parking Program Expansion - Planning & Permitting	Port	23-23	\$ 60,000
Parking Signage and Mobile Parking Delineation Barriers	Port	23-14	\$ 12,626
Professional/Technical Support for PIDP Grant Application	Port	23-12	\$ 63,070
Owner's Representative	Port	22-79	\$ 369,057
Design of Parking Improvements to Select Lots	Port	22-78(A)	\$ 13,418
R&M Consultants - Grant Assistance	Port	22-19(A)	\$ 11,668
Float Repair for End Caps K thru Q	Port	21-52	\$ 35,650
Fish Grinder Building Replacement Design	Port	21-36(S-2)(A)	\$ 7,946
Fish Carcass Trailer x2	Port	21-36(S-2)(A)	\$ 10,856
Harbor Office ADA Entry Door Improvements	Port	21-36(S-2)(A)	\$ 10,000
Fish Grinder Building Replacement	Port	21-36(S-2)(A)	\$ 100,000
			<u>\$ 1,015,674</u>

Future Fund Activity

Activity Description	FY24 Amount	FY25 Amount
Operating Budget Transfer - Harbor General	\$ 315,157	\$ 242,704
Operating Budget Transfer - Match Funding*	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
Operating Budget Transfer - Load and Launch*	\$ -	\$ -
Net Activity	\$ 815,157	\$ 742,704

Proposed Future State

Account Name	Current Balance	Encumbrances	FY24 Net Activity	Available Balance
Harbor General	\$ 1,507,846	\$ 995,674	\$ 315,157	\$ 827,329
			FY25 Projects \$	-
			FY25 Net Activity \$	242,704
			FY25 Ending Balance \$	1,070,033
Harbor Match	\$ 1,493,675	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,993,675
			FY25 Projects \$	-
			FY25 Net Activity \$	500,000
			FY25 Ending Balance \$	2,493,675
Load and Launch	\$ 343,567	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 343,567
			FY25 Projects \$	-
			FY25 Net Activity \$	-
			FY25 Ending Balance \$	343,567
USCGC Berth Space Maintenance	\$ 149,142	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 129,142
			FY25 Projects \$	-
			FY25 Net Activity \$	-
			FY25 Ending Balance \$	129,142
Harbor General	\$ 1,070,033			
Harbor Match	\$ 2,493,675			
Load and Launch	\$ 343,567			
USCGC Berth Space Maintenance	\$ 129,142			
Port & Harbor Reserve Ending FY25 Balance (Est.):	\$ 4,036,417			

*FY24 Budget transfers are done at end of fiscal year