

Prince William Sound Oil Spill Recovery Institute
Advisory Board Minutes - March 2006 *~~DRAFT~~*

Meeting Location: Conference room, North Pacific Research Board, Anchorage, March 16, 2006

<p>Announcements and Roll Call</p>	<p>Call to order by Vice Chair Doug Mutter at 8:35am OSRI Board Roll Call by introduction: Douglas Mutter, John Calder (telephone), Carol Fries, Michael Bronson, Leslie Pearson, Mark Fink, Chuck Meacham, Glenn Ujioka (telephone), R.J. Kopchak (telephone), Doug Lentsch, Marilyn Leland, Susan Saupe, John Goering. Absent: Steve Hudson. A quorum was established. Staff: Nancy Bird, Katey Walter, and Penny Oswalt Recorder: Nancy DiNapoli No visitors present. Molly McCammon, Branch Haymans and Alan Mearns made presentations.</p>
<p>Approval of Agenda</p>	<p>Motion to approve the agenda. Motion by Bronson, second Saupe. The agenda was approved with a change of timing for the presentation of the AOOS web site exhibit. Approval unanimous.</p>
<p>Approval of Minutes</p> <p>Motion</p>	<p>The minutes were approved with two clarifications. 1) “Revised Organizational Structure of PWSSC & OSRI”, Fink wishes to note on the record his non agreement with the proposed new reporting structure of the Research Program Manager position, referred to in paragraph 3 of the Executive Director’s report , Fall ’05 meeting minutes. 2) page 10, “Motion to Elect Officers...” motion shall read: “Motion to elect the nominated Officers and Member-at-Large to serve on the executive committee.” Motion to accept Fall 2005 Board meeting minutes with changes. Motion by Fink, second Leland. Approval unanimous</p>
<p>Executive Director’s Report</p> <p>Dr. Arturo Keller award</p>	<p>Bird introduced the new OSRI Research Program Manager, Dr. Katey Walter. Thanks were conveyed to the six board members who helped with interviews and recruiting. Walter briefly introduced herself and described her background in biogeochemistry and aquatic ecology. She has attended Scientific and Technical Committee (STC) and North Pacific Research Board (NPRB) joint meetings and, thanks to the timely assistance of Alan Mearns of NOAA Seattle, Walter will attend a three-day Oil Spill workshop at NOAA PMEL later this month.</p> <p>Bird reported on travel to attend meetings in Washington, D.C. of the National Federation of Regional Associations (NFRA), related to the ocean observing system program and Ocean. US. Work is proceeding slowly on lobbying and legislation regarding integrated ocean observing systems.</p> <p>The partnership meeting of the Coastal Response Research Center (CRRC), the Cooperative Institute for Coastal and Estuarine Environmental Technology (CICEET) and Minerals Management Service (MMS) took place in New Hampshire Feb. 13. The meeting resulted in a joint award by OSRI and MMS to Dr. A. Keller, in support of a Novel Skimmer Surfaces project. The OSRI share of funding will be a maximum of \$75k because of MMS partnering, leaving unspent monies in the technology response fund. Assessment of the success of the partnership is underway. Executive</p>

RFP response discussion	<p>Director recommends Work Plan and STC committees consider direction for the partnership. The partners agreed that the quality of the proposals received was not as high as they expected. Katey Walter and Nancy Kinner, (CRRC co-director), will meet in April to assess solicitation methods. Discussion followed on RFP improvement solutions. Goering and Bronson considered the award size may be too small. Executive Director noted that \$1 million was available with full leveraging of the partnership. Bronson brought forward two points, which are revisited later in the meeting: Will the oil industry share their list of proposed projects to help with advertisement of OSRI's RFP's? Can OSRI receive outside funds to add to proposal awards? Saupe discussed the NSF proposal requirements and review methods. Walter suggested that a clear set of proposal writing suggestions be made available to help non-academic proposers improve the quality of their proposals. Leland noted the recent International Oil Spill Conference and Fries will be attending a dispersants workshop in September, two potential forums for publicizing our RFPs.</p>
Prize concept	<p>Kopchak introduced an idea based on the aerospace X-Prize competition. With partners contributing a substantial purse (\$1 million), could a prospectus be developed to answer an identified need driving solutions in oil and ice issues? Kopchak will assemble a team to develop the idea and examine standards and specs from other prize competitions. The volunteer team consists of: K. Walter, Kopchak, Lentsch, and Bronson. Bronson asks: if the idea works, how would it exist in the OSRI Work Plan budget? Meeting chair Mutter requested K. Walter collect relevant program examples.</p>
STC report to Director	<p>Discussion turned to the March 8 report on dispersant testing submitted by STC representative Jeep Rice. His conclusion cited two future research themes: oil dispersant chemistry/effectiveness and biological effects of treated oil. Bronson advises OSRI to take seriously these two areas in future RFPs.</p> <p>The Science and Technical Committee (STC) met earlier this week to review three proposals received in response to the joint OSRI/NPRB request for proposals. Extensive discussion of the three proposals follows the motion regarding the STC recommendations.</p> <p>A tentative date for the next STC meeting was scheduled for June 19, 2006 in Cordova, possibly in conjunction with the Work Plan Committee as a primary part of the agenda will be development of the FY07 Work Plan.</p>
Old business	<p>The Governor's office is still refining the list of names for appointment to fill board vacancies. The OSRI Annual Reports, both a two-year 2003-04 and a one-year 2005 report are in production and will be distributed this spring. The board is invited to contribute feedback on the reports.</p> <p>The Grant Policy Manual (GPM) team meeting in December was very productive. Additional revisions to Section 4, Submitting Proposals were distributed to the advisory board for review and adoption later during this meeting.</p>

<p>Finance Committee Report</p>	<p>Treasurer Kopchak asked Bird to present this segment. The FY05 audit was completed by early January resulted in only two minor comments, one management comment regarding a purchase order document and one federal finding on a missing report filing. The federal report had, in the past, been automatically filed by the auditing firm and will now be formally included as part of the auditor’s tasks. The PWS Science Center’s Board of Directors has appointed an audit committee which will meet annually with the auditors both with and without the finance staff present. This is a standard recommended process for non-profit financial oversight.</p> <p>The FY06 first quarter report was presented in the agreed upon format. Project annual and quarterly reports are posted at the PWS-OSRI.org website and cover pages of the project reports were included in the meeting background materials. FY06 First quarter report shows a \$61K unallocated balance available, (\$30K in Goal 1 - Understand and \$31K in Other programs). Goal 1 - Senior Research Fellowship, SWAN model and PWSSC IT, and Other Programs – Research Program Manager show balances of funds unencumbered or not contracted.</p> <p>Fink noted that FY06 expenditures on page 3 do not match the amounts showing in the Grantee’s Quarterly Reports. Oswalt explained that the amounts shown in the FY06 - 1st Quarter reports are what have been received by the date on the report. The Grantee reports show what the university or agency has expensed by the end of the Quarter. This may not have been invoiced to OSRI.</p> <p>The FY06 OSRI Deposits, Interest & Program Funds Available report was discussed. This report was prepared using numbers posted from the MSDW monthly reports. It is intended to give the board an indication of what interest funds might be available for future use. Branch Haymans, Stanley Morgan and Dean Witter account executive, will discuss the changes in appreciation when he arrives later in the meeting.</p>
<p>9:45-10:00</p>	<p>Morning Break</p>
<p>Branch Haymans, Account Executive Morgan Stanley</p>	<p>The Deposit, Interest & Program Funds Available report was introduced at the June meeting. The report lists yearly investment appreciation. Discussion by Branch Haymans of Morgan Stanley Dean Witter explained the unrealized loss number in first quarter FY06 investment appreciation. Because bond prices and interest returns move in opposite directions, a snapshot value of bond investments can show a negative value of bonds approaching maturity. Actual realized losses from bond fund trading are small, while actual accrued interest not yet realized exceeds 2005 appreciation. He will develop a more accurate estimation of earnings to be used during the fiscal year.</p>

<p>AOOS web site</p>	<p>Molly McCammon, Executive Director, Alaska Ocean Observing System presented a real-time display of www.ak.aos.org. Ocean. US taskforce is currently recommending \$70 million in earmarks for enhancing marine observations. They are working to include these in the 2007 or 2008 federal budget.</p> <p>Prince William Sound has the highest density of marine observations and is the pilot project area for real time data presentation. A map-based display at the website shows PWS locations with web cam, historical, forecast and real-time, selectable from a side bar menu. Bronson asked about the nature of OSRI support for AOOS. Current levels of support include \$150k for hydrographic surveys, \$60k for development of the ROMS model, \$60K for development of the RAMS model, \$40k for data management support, and \$40k for maintenance of meteorological sites. AOOS has a separate budget of \$400k devoted to the pilot PWS observations.</p> <p>The RAMS model is needed to address the complex coastline of the Sound, other regions can use simpler weather data. RAMS data feed into the ROMS model, the usable data report. Fink asked how the OOS multiyear program supplies modelers with data and how useful are oceanographic surveys? They provide historical – hindcast testing of models. The 2004 field test revealed flaws traced to the slower than real time data feed. Saupe remarked that the most important function of oceanographic data is to identify boundary conditions and transects to help validate the model.</p> <p>The AOOS web site has received several hundred public comments, many requesting metric-english data conversion. Web cams are the sites most popular offering. Peter Olsson of the Alaska Experimental Forecast Facility at UAA is developing a medium to present Alaska historical data from sources like NPRB and RCAC. Cook Inlet and Southeast Alaska are next in line for development.</p>
<p>Work Plan and current contracts</p>	<p>Fink noted that some program descriptions in the Work Plan do not show funding amounts and names of other funding supporters. Bronson remarked that he wants stronger recognition of oil spill response usefulness and effectiveness links made in the work plan project statements. The 2007 work plan will include the requested information. The 2007 work plan committee consists of K. Walter, Bronson, Lentsch, Kopchak, Pearson, and Saupe. The committee will meet in Cordova around the time of the June 19, 2006 STC meeting. A second meeting will be held later in August.</p> <p>K. Walter will put together one-page project summaries with descriptions, results and images. An example was distributed of a one-page project summary from the North Pacific Research Board.</p>
<p>Met Stations</p>	<p>The installation or upgrading of 10 meteorological stations around the sound is being accomplished at a cost of roughly \$30k each plus approximately \$3k each for annual maintenance as outlined in the OSRI Science Plan. The</p>

	<p>installation costs have primarily been covered by PWSSC through Congressional appropriation grants received through NOAA. OSRI funds are supporting the continued maintenance at these sites. PWS Aquaculture Corporation has provided power to run the hatchery located stations; recently, they also began covering the cost of data transmission through Starband satellite service.</p>
PWS Circulation and water exchange	<p>The PWS circulation and water exchange processes project is beginning to provide volumes of usable data with some gaps from the Montague mooring. Weather conditions may force a reschedule of this year's servicing trips. Bronson remarked that he wants stronger recognition of oil spill response usefulness and effectiveness links made in the work plan project statements.</p>
Biological Monitoring	<p>Reports on the PWSSC Biological Monitoring Grant were distributed in meeting materials and in the hydroacoustics section of pws-osri.org.</p>
RAMS model	<p>Regional atmospheric circulation modeling (RAMS) work continues with Peter Olsson, at the AEFF. Modeling and data management/archiving were funded at \$60k and \$40k respectively</p>
Field experiment	<p>Bronson wants to see sharper language describing the 2004 field experiment and planning for the 2007 as recognizing the application of the models to needs of the oil transportation industry. The next ROMS report should reflect oil spill trajectory usefulness in its description. There was discussion about the need to have Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. engaged in the 2007 field experiment.</p>
RFP language	<p>RFPs need to articulate the relationship of the proposed project to oil spill or oil pollution issues, i.e., "why is this important to us?"</p>
CRRC Partnership	<p>It was noted that only half of the \$150k allocated as the OSRI share for the CRRC partnership awards is encumbered.</p>
Fellowships	<p>Graduate student fellow J. Alanko, funded for 2005-2007, studies surface current patterns. Fink noted that his abstract seems to meet goal #1, understand, rather than response goal #2. Bronson reiterated that a PI should take the opportunity to write-up the response element of his work as the understand goal area is almost overfull. For example CODAR is characterized as a response topic on the north slope.</p> <p>The research reports of fellow C. Foster were reviewed by the STC. Goal category choice (#1 versus #3) was questioned in Foster's work.</p>
Education	<p>Education program coordinator Kate Alexander led the Cordova team to a great showing in the statewide Ocean Science Bowl. The 4 students have been invited to present their paper in California.</p>

Workshops	No workshops are currently being planned in 2006; the \$30k allocated may go unspent.
<p>STC Report</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>STC Recommendation</p> <p>General discussion</p>	<p>Alan Mearns joined by teleconference at 11:40. The review comments on three forage fish proposals considered jointly by the STC and NPRB were summarized and distributed at the meeting.</p> <p><u>Motion to accept recommendation of the STC</u></p> <p>Motion by Fries, second Saupe: We accept the recommendation of the STC and approve project 103 at \$150k and not fund projects 104 & 105 as proposed. Amendment: STC shall request that proposer 103 re-articulate the hypotheses to specifically test seasonal and diurnal aspects of the study.</p> <p>Discussion followed, including a second amendment, requiring oil spill relationship clarification. Proposed amendment two was later withdrawn. Proposal 103 was ranked substantially higher than 104 and 105. K. Walter shared her review opinion on each proposal. Proposal 103 was very well written and addressed the RPF criteria. It was still recommended that significant changes be made; to expand the project to two full years, include the diurnal element and compare results with previous studies. In proposal 104, the reviewers cited seven “significant deficiencies” with research “too loosely described”.</p> <p>Proposal 105 was described as “comprehensive science” and “is clearly headed in the direction that NPRB wants”. The panel however, found proposal 105 poorly organized and incomplete.</p> <p>Kopchak and Ujoika expressed keen interest in forage fish and biologically unrecovered species. Kopchak wants forage fish researchers to identify pathways of exposure to toxins in pacific herring and forage fish. Forage fish studies need multi-year commitments to fill in gaps. How can EVOSTC NPRB and OSRI integrate data and design a longer term forage fish recovery plan?</p> <p>Saupe endorses the STC recommendations 100%. Specific comments were made about the biophysical habitat mapping done for spill affected areas. Board members posed different scenarios wherein proposals could be modified, combined or share samples or work in tandem. Confidentiality and partnership agreements limit our options.</p> <p>Meeting chair Mutter brought discussion away from “what can we do to salvage 104 and 105” and back to the motion on the table.</p> <p>Motion and one amendment passed unanimously.</p> <p>K. Walter was charged with corresponding with Clarence Pautzke to explore the possibility of partial funding for proposal 105 based on the Board’s interest in key elements of Proposal 105, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 105 addresses many of the research questions identified in the NPRB/OSRI RFP. Important information can be provided by this study about seasonal and interannual dynamics of forage fish occurrence and food web relationships, temporal dynamics of stable carbon and nitrogen isotopes and whole-body energetic content of forage fish. This work would address trophic level stability and fluctuations among different forage fish types to determine how this

	<p>relates to their survival/success. The scope of the work includes other trophic levels such as zooplankton and forage fish predators through ongoing partner studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A substantial number of Board members viewed additional information on salmon and herring as important with regards to their distribution and abundance, seasonality, stable isotope signatures, whole body energetic contents, and food web interactions. • The Board would like to take advantage of the opportunity to link the proposed work by Kline to multi-year datasets from the previous GLOBEC project and the ongoing Stellar Sea Lion- Herring project and the PWSOOS. • The Board feels that it is important to prevent a break in the time series sequence of forage fish sampling that has been ongoing as far as long as 1994 for important forage fishes such as herring. • Coordination of the proposed forage fish sampling concomitantly with zooplankton surveys and stable isotope analyses occurring through other projects is an important opportunity that should not be missed to improve understanding of energy and food web dynamics. <p>The specific elements of Proposal 105, identified by the Board for funding in 2006, include the field work component of the proposal for sample collection this year, with salmon and herring as the priority fishes of study. The Board encourages field sampling of other species and analysis of stable isotope and whole body energetic content of new and archived samples as possible within budget limitations (approximately \$50,000.00). Samples not analyzed with 2006 funds should be archived for future analytical opportunities.</p>
Lunch break	12:20 - 1:00
<p>Partnerships Discussion</p> <p>Oil & ice field test</p> <p>Action request</p>	<p>A yearly proposal schedule is included in the Cold Climate Spill Research Partnership Description. The discussion question posed is: Are these proposal criteria a limiting element on proposals received? Perhaps the executive committee being six members may work better within the confidentiality restrictions? With the Keller proposal, no board action is needed because Saupe and Bird were vested with the authority to accept.</p> <p>K. Walter led discussion on a proposed oil and ice test spill in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Ken Lee of COOGER is developing plans for 2007 or 2008 testing of oil-mineral aggregate (OMA), which is a fine-grain particle application that affects oil weathering and transport. CRRC would like to commit \$100k on behalf of NOAA for this test spill. This may be an opportunity for OSRI to independently support additional studies during the Canadian test spill, or in conjunction with CRRC. CICEET and MMS participation is doubtful.</p> <p>The \$100k is all but committed in a non competitive process, noted Saupe, NOAA scientists are to study ocean physics and biology. “Could this</p>

<p>Motion</p>	<p>experiment be conducted in US waters, and what are the scientific standards?" asked Pearson. NOAA needs to address a list of questions. OSRI can react to the NOAA objectives. We have \$180k available in 2006. Fries asked: Should we influence the NOAA test design before committing OSRI funds? <u>ACTION K.</u> Walter is to confer with Lentsch and Pearson, and address: 1) Why is MMS not involved? and 2) Does NOAA list of questions jibe with 2002 oil & ice workshop? Together with Pearson, Lentsch, and Bronson, K. Walter will follow up with John Whitney of NOAA to explore R&D priorities that overlap with those identified by OSRI. Pearson leaves meeting.</p> <p>Discussion returned to the partnership, RFP and proposal issues. Fries and Lentsch were inclined to continue for another year with the Cold Climate Partnership. Fink remarked that the cumbersome four entity review process may be dropping good proposals. Some good science, based on good ideas, may be held up by the existing process, noted K. Walter. <u>ACTION K.</u> Walter will address: Can we return to a proposer asking for a re-submittal directly to OSRI? Will partners and confidentiality requirements prevent this? Partners and STC meet in April with Kenner. If necessary, we have the oil industry list of proposed projects to help with advertisement of RFP's to be supplied by Bronson. The FY07 work plan can be crafted to have an alternative to the partnership plan. Fink expressed some reservations about partnering with industry and recommended that the OSRI list of research priorities be a starting place. Confidentiality issues also need to be solved. <u>MOTION</u> To move forward with existing four-entity partnership for one year with the expectation of resolving RFP issues. Motion carried, with Fink opposed.</p>
<p>Budget tracking table</p>	<p>Bird reviewed a table detailing proposed annual work plan budgets for 2005-2010 which was included in meeting materials. This table originally was prepared for the Science Plan and will be updated, at least, annually to reflect the most current revenue and expense figures. For example, revised budget figures are included in the current table to reflect the change in expenses of the Research Program Manager position. The updated table also includes the actual deposits from prior years (not just estimated figures) and a new line addresses what amount of funds are required each year to be taken from the OSRI savings or budget reserve. At the current rate of spending, the amount of funds in reserve will decrease to about \$300k by the year 2010. Shall we continue this rate of reserve spend-down? The question will be considered in future work plan development.</p>
<p>Grant Policy Manual Motion</p>	<p><u>MOTION</u> To accept the GPM as proposed with the latest staff recommended changes. Moved by Fries, second by Mutter. Change which Fink wished discussed: 1) Position changeover of Science Director to Research Program Manager, and 2) need for quarterly reports on all projects. A new chapter 4.0 Submitting Proposals, was handed out by Bird at the meeting. Major changes were; awards <\$100k go to STC after</p>

	<p>Executive Director and Research Program Manager consensus, with technical review by staff and STC serving as check/balance. Executive Director shall be recused from decisions on PWSSC staff proposals and partnership details will be addressed in the appendix.</p> <p>Motion passed unanimously.</p>
Program updates	<p>Does board want PIs to present at meetings? Meacham felt that would be productive during lunch break.</p>
Committee appointments	<p>FY07 work plan committee joint meeting with STC is scheduled for June 19, in Cordova. Lentsch, Bronson, Kopchak, Saupe and Pearson will work with the committee. An August meeting may also be scheduled.</p> <p>Finance committee (Fries, Fink and Kopchak) will meet before September to see budget and review audits and reports.</p> <p>Leland resigned as Advisory Board Secretary due to her impending acceptance of a new position with Alaska Rural Electric Co-op. Position duties include membership of the executive committee and review and signing of the minutes.</p>
Officer Election	<p>Fries was nominated and unanimously approved as new Board Secretary.</p>
Calendar Review	<p>The STC meeting, June 19, will consider forage fish research continuity. The topic of proposal 105 researcher being held at current level to assemble and archive during the interim year. Issue will be considered as part of the FY07 work plan, after NPRB finalized their process. If 105 is funded, K. Walter will work with proposer to develop a forage fish – zooplankton plan to address seasonal and interannual continuity. Fries remarked that the RFP is a competitive process and a reissue of the RFP may be the correct procedure. The board and STC have the right to make funding decisions, remarked Meacham. Fink suggested, we can revisit the proposal because the review was “good” even it that is not the highest classification. The STC recommendation can be modified by the board. The partnership plan is still a new dynamic. We need to ask NPRB and STC to allow reconsideration of funding on some basis, reduced scope of work, perhaps. We have \$50k available. It would be important that we do not loose by missing a season of sampling.</p>
Motion	<p>MOTION K. Walter and C. Pautzke are to explore the possibility of the partnership funding a portion of proposal 105. Moved by Mutter, second by Fink. Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>The September 11 OSRI board meeting will be extended to mid-day on the 12th, the work plan will be finalized.</p>
Board Member Comments	<p>Bird: Appreciated getting the GPM adopted. In the next six months, the bylaws will be revised and the OSRI mission will be sharpened.</p> <p>Ujioka: Keep the issue biologically failing species in mind.</p> <p>Kopchak: The Jan.2006 v.31, issue of <i>Fisheries Journal</i> had an article titled “Fisheries Restoration”, useful from a planning perspective. Remember that it is not our mission to provide restoration, but we do study lingering oil and impacted areas and on herring and forage fish.</p>

	<p>Fink: Best wished of success to Marilyn Leland, and welcome Katey Walter. Saupe: AOOS developers will be presenting at the RCAC meeting in May. Leland: After 17 years in RCAC and many years on this board she has mixed feelings about moving to a new industry. We, as an organization have come a long way and continue to improve. Meacham: Walter Parker “left big shoes to fill”, working hard to catch up. Bronson: We can meet the challenge to increase goal #2 projects; we should collect ideas from the north slope R&D planners. Mutter: Leland is welcome to recommend replacements for herself, when she tenders her resignation from the board. We have advertised openings for the at-large representative in the past. ACTION: Bird will advertise the opening and collect nominations from board members via email. Lentsch, Mutter, Fries: all welcome K. Walter and will miss Leland.</p>
Adjournment	3:20pm Call to adjourn by Leland, seconded Lentsch. All approve.