

# Prince William Sound Oil Spill Recovery Institute

## Advisory Board Fall 2004 Meeting Minutes

**Meeting Location: Cordova Library Meeting Room**

**9/13/04 Morning session: Joint Meeting with the Prince William Sound Science Center's Board of Directors**

**9/13/04 Afternoon session: OSRI Board Meeting**

**9/14/04 Morning session: OSRI Board Meeting**

<p><b><u>Monday,</u> <u>September 13, 2004</u></b></p> <p><b>Roll Call</b></p>	<p><b>Call to order by Vice-Chairman Doug Mutter at 8:10 a.m.</b></p> <p><b>OSRI Board Roll call:</b> Douglas Mutter, Jack Davin, Leslie Pearson, Carol Fries, Mark Fink, Gail Evanoff, R.J. Kopchak, Michael Bronson, Doug Lentsch, Marilyn Leland, Susan Saupe, John Goering, Walt Parker, Nancy Bird, and Carl Schoch were present. A quorum was established. <b>OSRI Board members absent:</b> John Calder, Virginia Adams, and Glenn Ujioka.</p> <p><b>A quorum of the PWSSC Board was also present.</b></p> <p><b>PWSSC &amp; OSRI Staff present:</b> Claude Belanger, Mary Anne Bishop, Nancy DaNapoli, Tom Kline, Penelope Oswalt, Dick Thorne, James Thorne, and Walter Cox via teleconference.</p> <p><b>Visitors:</b> Phil Mundy, Dick Dworsky, John Whitney, Ross Mullins, Ken Adams, Kristin Smith.</p> <p><b>Recorder:</b> Barclay Jones-Kopchak</p>
<p><b>Agenda Approval</b></p>	<p><b>The Revised Agenda for 9/13/04 was approved.</b></p>
<p><b>Report on 2004 Drifter Buoy Field Experiment</b></p>	<p><b>2004 Drifter Buoy Field Experiment:</b> Walter Cox, Program Manager, delivered a report via teleconference with on-site slides on the 2004 Drifter Buoy Field experiment. Freshwater incursions into PWS were of continuing interest as were cyclonic current movements observed. John Whitney, NOAA Hazmat, reported that NOAA had concurrently conducted a trajectory analysis of where spilled oil might travel to which could be used as input for the NOAA trajectory forecast model. A final report on this project is expected by early October.</p>
<p><b>Break</b></p>	<p><b>A break was taken from 10:03-10:08 a.m.</b></p>
<p><b>Partnership Programs with PWSSC &amp; OSRI</b></p>	<p><b>Alaska Ocean Observing System:</b> Molly McCammon, Executive Director, Alaska Ocean Observing System (AOOS), provided a brief overview of AOOS as a part of the International Ocean Observing System. AOOS was one of 11 regional organizations, all now involved in governance and data integration issues. PWS is regarded as a pilot program for Alaska. One of the questions is how to balance funding between real time data collection and modeling efforts. As a user-driven program AOOS needs to work with user groups and focus on</p>



<p><b>Final Comments &amp; Adjournment of Joint PWSSC/OSRI Board Meeting</b></p>	<p><b>Comments:</b> PWSSC Chair Kohler called for a more conclusive discussion on the public and internal work plan timelines. PWSSC Board member Backus invited OSRI input to the PWSSC Research Committee’s current work on a Science Plan for the PWSSC. PWSSC Board member McCammon invited OSRI Board members to join PWSSC’s newly formed Funding and Development Committee.  <b>Adjournment:</b> The Joint PWSSC/OSRI Board Meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.</p>
<p><b>Lunch Break</b></p>	<p><b>A lunch break was taken from 11:20 a.m. to 1:08 p.m.</b></p>
<p><b>OSRI Only Afternoon Session</b></p>	<p><b>Mutter called the OSRI Board Meeting to order at 1:09 p.m.</b></p>
<p><b>Approval of Minutes</b></p>	<p><b><u>Motion to Approve 2/12/04 Minutes</u></b>  <b>MOTION: Kopchak moved, and Leland seconded, a motion to</b> approve the minutes of 2/12/04 with the correction that page two, eight lines from the bottom, read “Bird ended her report by welcoming Schoch <u>to</u> is his...”  <b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p>
<p><b>Public Comments</b></p>	<p><b>Phil Mundy</b>, Exxon Valdez Oil Spill (EVOS) Trustee Council Science Director and also a member of the OSRI Scientific and Technical Committee, commented on the PWS simulated oil dispersion experiments in the summer of 2004. He cited a growing awareness of the need for real time data collection.  <b>Ross Mullins</b>, fisherman, reported that the development of the pink salmon fry implementation model derived from the Sound Ecosystem Assessment (SEA) program was coming to fruition. He urged that OSRI’s studies not overlook potential effects on fish and their habitats.  <b>Ken Adams</b>, fisherman, spoke of the ongoing need for updating field data and supported Mary Anne Bishop’s acoustic monitoring program.  <b>John Whitney</b>, NOAA Hazmat, encouraged the development of a local cadre of people who understood real time data collection and modeling.</p>
<p><b>Vice Chair’s Report</b></p>	<p><b>Vice Chair’s Report:</b> Mutter reported that Chairman Calder was unable to attend this meeting due to other meetings in Norway.</p>
<p><b>Director’s Report</b></p>	<p><b>Administrative issues:</b> Bird reported that follow-up work in obtaining final reports from Principal Investigators was going well. An active contract spread sheet was developed, as requested. (See Meeting Packet, Tab 5.1) A handout of the updated website with banner header tabs to facilitate direct access to related websites was shared. She noted that annual and final reports are now available through the website. (Handout #3)</p> <p>► Fink said reminder notes indicating recent site updates on the website opening page would be helpful.</p> <p><b>Oil &amp; Ice Workshop Report:</b> Bird announced the Coast Guard is interested in translating the Oil Spill Recovery in Broken Ice workshop</p>

	<p>reports into Russian. She is now working on translation logistics in conjunction with the publication designer.</p> <p><b>Emergency Prevention Preparedness and Response (working group of the Arctic Council):</b> Parker said the Oil &amp; Ice Workshop report had been well-distributed among the circumpolar nations and now should be further exploited by them. Parker attended the last EPPR meeting.</p> <p><b>North Pacific Research Board:</b> Parker reported that the National Research Council was developing its Science Plan which would provide national organizational guidelines. The plan strongly incorporated physical oceanography while its weakest part was its limited regionalization with only three Alaskan regions (Gulf of Alaska, Bering Sea, and Arctic/Beaufort Sea).</p> <p><b>Budget Page Revisions and Information:</b> Bird distributed FY04 Budget page revisions (Handout #4), Information on the Science and Technical Committee travel budget (Handout #5), Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund Analysis by Fiscal Year (Handout #6), Administrative Budget Details (Handout #7), and the Revised Policy Statement: Investment of funds administered by the PWSSC (Handout #8).</p> <p><b>Travel:</b> In late August, Bird was one of two Alaska representatives to attend an organizational meeting of the National Federation of Regional Associations, part of the Integrated Ocean Observing System, held in Washington, D.C.</p> <p><b>Future funds for OSRI:</b> While in Washington, D.C., Bird met with Coast Guard and Treasury Department representatives who oversee OSRI's funds that are part of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. She will discuss Handout #6 in more detail during the Finance Report on Tuesday. Bird also reported that the PWSSC Board continues to work on legislation to extend OSRI's existence past 2012.</p>
<p><b>Science Director's Report</b></p>	<p><b>Status Report on FY04 Work Plan:</b> The projected FY04 budget is underspent by \$320K and thus only \$343K from the OSRI Reserve was needed instead of the projected \$663K. Schoch reviewed the seven work plan components.</p> <p><b>1. Understand (\$707K)</b> - Peer review determined that there was no consensus for a herring modeling project within nowcast/forecast and this \$100K component was eliminated. \$15K was spent in tide height measurement though Schoch discovered the monitoring devices were not marine grade. \$15K was spent on meteorological measurements. However, while the few data which were generated could contribute to hindcasting they were still not useful to the Regional Atmospheric Modeling System (RAMS). Schoch concluded that time had been wasted in developing the meteorological monitoring system but OSRI did retain value in the associated capital equipment.</p> <p>Other program spending included: RAMS (\$125K), Ocean circulation modeling (\$125K), Observational oceanography (\$150K), Ecology of</p>

the Copper River Delta project (\$100K), Zooplankton acoustic monitoring (\$75K), and Herring and Pollock acoustic monitoring (\$75K).

During the PWSNF Field Experiment, only \$12K of the projected \$20K for 3D oil dispersion simulation was spent. The projected \$15K for support of the field experiment was spent on drifter buoy related expenses.

**2. Respond (\$130)** – The Oil and Ice Workshop came in at \$19.8K, just under its \$20K budget. GIS environmental sensitivity mapping spent its \$60K. \$50K had been set aside for an Oil Dispersion Impact Analysis project but OSRI is waiting for recommendations from the Alaska Regional Response Team (ARRT). Pearson and Fink expressed concern that these funds would have to be held too long.

**3. Inform (\$151)** – While \$60K had been budgeted for K-12 science education programs only \$37K in proposals were received and awarded. Four graduate fellowships were funded at \$25K apiece. One fellowship position was left vacant. There were no interns. \$3K of the budgeted \$15K was spent on website upgrades and \$1.3K of the budgeted \$3K on communication services. \$10K budgeted for the annual report was still pending.

**4. Projects of Opportunity (\$39K)** – OSRI engaged in five projects of opportunity: Salmon modeling workshop (Prince William Sound Fisheries Research Applications Program-PWSFRAP) at \$3K, River otter survey (Ben-David) at \$3K, Marine Symposium at \$2.5K, Viscous oil pumping at \$24K, and AOOS at \$5K.

**5. Science Director (\$120)** – Schoch reported that although two proposals he submitted to the National Science Foundation (Long Term Ecological Review (\$800K) and Real-time Environment Assessment Program (\$1.4M)) were not funded, they received high marks and he and his co-Principal Investigators had been encouraged to re-submit. A Shorezone Mapping for PWS (\$700K) proposal submitted to EVOS was not funded, although PWS Regional Citizens' Advisory Council did commit funds to begin some of the work this past summer. He also noted the award of the two proposals submitted to NOAA for enhancement of the ocean observation program (Handout #1 previously distributed by Bird).

Schoch has worked on several projects: Rockfish recruitment and habitat fidelity; Sea cucumber larval recruitment and spatial distribution; and Shorezone mapping. He attended five conferences and was a speaker at three of those; and, his work appeared in three reviews. He participated in the AOOS Pilot Project and wrote three papers. He also is teaching Oceanography 111 at the Cordova branch of Prince William Sound Community College.

**6. Partnerships** – Schoch described the partnerships with the Coastal Response Research Center and the Imaginarium as *Respond* related.

	The pilot program with AOOS was part of the <i>Understand</i> component.
<b>Scientific and Technical Committee Report</b>	<p>Committee Chair John Goering reported that the committee reviewed via email several documents prepared by the Science Director.</p> <p><b>Graduate Fellowships:</b> A description of this revised program is included in the packet and is recommended by adoption by the committee. Schoch shared a timeline for the Graduate Research Fellowships and noted that one of the current fellows, Xinglong Wu/University of Miami, is expected to continue through 2006. Other current fellows are concluding their programs so three new fellowships will be offered in the coming year.</p> <p><b>Cold Climate Spill Research:</b> Schoch noted that OSRI became a founding member last year of the Coastal Response Research Center (CRRC) based at the University of New Hampshire. Together with the Cooperative Institute for Coastal and Estuarine Environmental Technologies (CICEET – also at UNH), an opportunity developed this year to leverage funds among all three entities and create a new research solicitation focused on cold climate oil spills. The request for proposals was posted at the CICEET website in August and Sept. 30 is the deadline for receipt of pre-proposals. OSRI’s \$200K is being matched by 300K from CICEET and CRRC together, making a total of \$500K available for cold climate oil spill related proposals. Some discussion ensued on the process with concerns expressed by some that the OSRI Board should have an opportunity to make a final decision on awarding a project or projects using its \$200K. Schoch explained that CICEET has an established review process and that at its conclusion, projects will be recommended for award. The OSRI Board will make the final decision.</p> <p><b>Science Plan:</b> The committee had reviewed the Science Plan timeline.</p>
<b>Break</b>	<b>An afternoon break was taken from 2:46 – 2:53 p.m.</b>
<b>Science Plan &amp; Introduction to FY05 Work Plan</b>	<p><b>Science Plan and 2005 Work Plan:</b> Schoch stated that the plans were based on the National Academies Review of OSRI, the OSRI and PWSSC Boards’ strategic plan, the OSRI Advisory Board, the OSRI Scientific and Technology Committee, and PWSSC. He noted that graduate fellowship monies are now allocated to their areas of study rather than grouped together under <i>Inform</i>. The 2005 budget is projected to be 25% less than the 2004 budget.</p> <p><b>1. Understand (\$557K) – (a) Weather Stations:</b> \$40K is proposed for OSRI to maintain five meteorological stations to SNOwpack TELemetry standards (Natural Resource Conservation Service - NRCS). The PWSSC (through a NOAA grant) is contributing about \$30K toward the total cost of upgrading these stations to SnoTel sites. The annual maintenance is proposed for OSRI to cover.</p> <p><b>(b) Oceanography of PWS (\$135K)</b> would include post doctoral staff to collect and analyze data (.75 FTE), marine technician (.5 FTE),</p>

oceanographic equipment maintenance (\$10K), and local charter vessels and logistics (\$15K). This would fund PWSSC personnel to observe and analyze data in a timely fashion and transfer these to the website.

**(c) Ecology of the Copper River Delta (PWSSC) (\$75K)** – would include a post doctoral staff (.75 FTE).

**(d) Ecology of PWS (PWSSC) (\$75K)** – would include a post doctoral staff (.75 FTE).

**PWSSC Salary Support:** In reference to (c) and (d), Schoch described the need to “hardwire” PWSSC salaries to ensure greater stability. OSRI would turn over staff “seed funds” to PWSSC with stipulations that the OSRI Scientific and Technology Committee would provide guidelines for needed research areas over the next five years. Schoch explained that PWSSC’s recruiting for and filling the post doctoral positions would involve the national competition required in the mission statement. Kopchak spoke to ‘animating’ archived data to ‘cornerstone’ subject matter longevity.

**(e) Marine mammal ecology (Alaska Sea Life Center) (\$2K)** – To solidify OSRI’s partnership with ASLC, OSRI would maintain a remote camera on the Needles near Montague Strait to monitor sea lions. The camera would broadcast to an Internet site.

**(f) Atmospheric monitoring (AEFF) (\$60K)** – These funds would support the technology and computers necessary for weather forecasts needed for circulation modeling. Fink was concerned whether this project meshed with OSRI’s mission.

► Bronson was interested in timelines of OSRI project funding over their lifetimes.

**(g) Ocean circulation forecasts (NASA Jet Propulsion Lab) (\$60K)** - Less than half of the previous funding level for ocean circulation modeling, \$60K would fund an investigator at JPL. This new generation model assimilates data in real time using a NASA supplied super computer. Schoch explained that after three years of development, this improved ROMS model will be transferred to a home in Alaska.

**(h) Wave forecasts (Texas A&M University) (\$5K)** – would forecast regional wave heights.

**(i) Database management (UAA & UAF) (\$40K)** – This project would disseminate data via the web. UAF had expressed commitment to designing web pages and would contribute a full-time staffer. Ecotrust may also contribute to the effort.

**(j) Student fellowships (2) (\$50K)** – These fellowships are in the *Understand* component. One fellowship is reserved for a student working under Dr. Chris Mooers at the University of Miami. This

	<p>student will keep the Princeton Ocean Model running.</p> <p><b>(k) Senior research fellowship (1)</b> (\$15) – In 2005, it is proposed that these funds keep Dr. Steve Okkonen involved in the observational program. In following years, this position would be open to other senior researchers.</p> <p><b>2. Respond (\$225K) – (a) Partnership with CICEET and CRRC</b> (\$200) – To augment the \$300K provided by CICEET(\$200) and CRRC (\$100K) OSRI would contribute \$200K to fund this collaborative effort in cold climate spill research. Schoch provided an overview of the RFP goals and timeline. There followed a discussion of Board review of RFP respondents by title and author and the extent of Board input.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Since a time had been publicized for public comment, a break in the Science Director’s presentation was taken for those wanting to comment to speak.</p> <p><b>Tom Kline</b>, PWSSC Principal Investigator, commented on the difficulty in finding and funding reviewers for proposals.</p> <p><b>Phil Mundy</b>, EVOS Trustee Council Science Director, noted that OSRI didn’t have a lot of money to spend on science plan reviews like EVOS and AOOS. He felt the Science Plan was a good start and would coordinate well with GEM. An annual Science Plan review was needed and he recommended that the Science Plan be sent to the Science and Technology Committee of GEM and NPRB via the web with a comment period. He observed that some NPRB Board members regarded Lower Cook Inlet and PWS to be outside their purview just as a policy perspective. He encouraged their common Board member, Parker, to use his influence to expand their regional view and to not solely rely on NOAA.</p> <p><b>Ken Adams</b>, fisherman, offered kudos to Schoch for his energy in developing partnerships. He noted, however, that data flow schematic seemed top-down oriented to him and without opportunity for user input.</p> <p>► Schoch responded that he would be happy to insert a ‘return arrow’ to indicate user input in the institutional data flow chart.</p> <p><b>Kristin Smith</b>, Director Copper River Watershed Project, was interested in soliciting public input for the Science Plan. She thought that other research (SEA, etc.), with millions of dollars spent, should be characterized as other than “limited.” She posited that Delta research, especially biological research, was critical, in addition to oceanographic research.</p> <p><b>Mary Anne Bishop</b>, PWSSC Principal Investigator, invited everyone</p>

	to project presentations that evening at the Science Center.
<b>Science Plan &amp; Introduction to FY05 Work Plan (cont.)</b>	<p><b>(a) Partnership with CICEET and CRRC (cont) –</b>  ▶ Schoch offered to contact the CICEET and CRRC Program Managers to see if he can derive and circulate the list of pre-proposal titles to OSRI Board members.</p> <p><b>(b) Student Fellowship (1) (\$15K)</b>  <b>3. Inform (\$98K) – (a) K-12 Science Education Programs</b> –These comprised two programs; Discovery Room (\$25K) and the Forest to the Sea (\$15). <b>(b) Coastal community outreach and education (Imaginarium) (\$15K)</b> – Development of an oceanography focused learning kit is proposed that would be made available to other coastal communities. <b>(c) Cordova High School (CHS) student scholarships (\$1K)</b> – To further encourage science interest OSRI would attach cash prizes to CHS Science Fair awards. <b>(d) National Ocean Science Bowl (\$2K)</b> - \$1K would be contributed to sponsor the Tsunami Bowl (held annually at the Alaska SeaLife Center and sponsored through the Alaska Sea Grant program). \$1K would go directly to the Cordova High School team for travel costs. <b>(e) Student fellowship (1) (\$25K)</b> – This fellowship would support social science research on the socio-economic effects of oil spills. <b>(f) Website (\$5K)</b> – for website maintenance. <b>(g) Annual report (\$10K).</b></p>
<b>Recess meeting</b>	<b>At 5:33 p.m. Mutter declared the meeting in recess until the following morning.</b>
<u><b>Tuesday, September 14, 2004</b></u>  <b>Roll Call</b>	<p><b>The meeting was reconvened by Vice-Chairman Mutter at 8:00 am.</b></p> <p><b>OSRI Board Roll Call:</b> Douglas Mutter, Jack Davin, Leslie Pearson, Carol Fries, Mark Fink, Gail Evanoff, R.J. Kopchak, Michael Bronson, Doug Lentsch, Marilyn Leland, Susan Saupe, John Goering, and Walt Parker. A quorum was established. <b>OSRI Staff present:</b> Nancy Bird, Carl Schoch, and Penny Oswald.</p> <p><b>PWSSC staff and other visitors present:</b> Mary Anne Bishop, Nancy DiNapoli, Tom Kline, Dick Thorne, and James Thorne.</p> <p><b>Recorder:</b> Barclay Jones-Kopchak</p>
<b>Finance Committee Report</b>	<p><b>Finance Committee Minutes:</b> The 4/14/04 Finance Committee meeting minutes were presented as approved. (See Meeting Packet, Tab 4.2) The committee also met Sept. 10.</p> <p><b>FY04 3rd Quarter Report:</b> Kopchak presented the FY04 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report. There were no questions. (See Meeting Packet, Tab 4.3)</p> <p><b>FY03 Audit:</b> The Letter to Management listed two minor problems which have been resolved internally. The problem of cash disbursements without supporting documents was found to be a filing system personnel problem and is now corrected. To resolve the sub-recipient monitoring issue, OSRI now notifies grantees of Federal audit</p>

	<p>requirements in their contracts. It stipulates that an audit be returned to PWSSC whenever threshold funding levels are reached. The audit was discussed and approved.</p> <p><b>Administrative Overhead Policy Statement:</b> For information purposes only, Kopchak reviewed the policy statement adopted in 1998 regarding administrative overhead and how it is applied to funds earned through interest. When the annual interest earnings for OSRI is received by the PWSSC, 20% is immediately allocated for administrative overhead. All other program funds are held in a single main account which generates interest. When OSRI begins tapping into the interest earnings on these funds, 20% for administrative overhead will be due. It is anticipated that OSRI will begin tapping into the interest earnings in FY06.</p> <p><b>Future interest earnings outlook:</b> Bird referenced yesterday's Handout #6, detailing earnings for programs funded through the national Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund Analysis. This includes OSRI funds from 1997 to the present. She reported \$862,000 is projected for OSRI's receipt in October 2004. She also said OSRI will have an opportunity to recommend changes in 2006 to the current investment strategy as that is when the current five-year note will come due. OSRI's expected annual income will decrease about \$20,000 in each of the next two years.</p> <p><b>FY05 Budget:</b> The Board reviewed the form and format of the FY05 Budget. (See Meeting Packet, Tab 4.4 with replacement page 1 – (Handout #4)). Under administrative expenses, staff said the “reserve” funds (totaling \$39,211) will be allocated to line items and will be spent in FY05. Several corrections were made during the meeting and staff was directed to promptly send all Board members the corrections after the meeting.</p> <p><b>Travel Budget:</b> In light of the expanded role of the Scientific and Technical Committee's activities and increased travel budget, staff is requesting a new line item for this expenditure. Board members discussed historical uses of administrative revenue which includes the Board travel expenses. In FY03, STC travel costs were covered through the Technical Coordinator's line item (under programs, not administration). The expanded travel anticipated for STC would strain the administrative budget. This issue will be addressed later in the meeting.</p>
<p><b>Graduate Research Fellowship Program</b></p>	<p><b>Graduate Research Fellowship Program:</b> Schoch allocated the four fellowships among the related program areas: <i>Understand</i> (2), <i>Technology</i> (1), and <i>Inform</i> (1) and one Senior Research Fellow. Schoch proposed that each fellow obtain a matching grant (\$8,333) in in-kind services, i.e., an advisor's time or salary. Schoch capped fellowships at two years for Masters degree students and three years for</p>

	<p>doctoral students. He proposed that one deadline be set for all applications and stated this will increase competitiveness. Also, the grant will be awarded directly to the student and not the advisor. Bronson asked about 'blue collar' access to fellowships. Schoch explained that the <i>Inform</i> fellowship was specifically open to 'students,' not just graduate students.</p> <p><b><u>Motion to Approve Graduate Research Fellowship Program</u></b>  <b>MOTION: Fink moved, and Leland seconded, a motion</b> to approve the Graduate Research Fellowship Program Description.  <b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p>
<p><b>Approval of FY05 Work Plan and FY05 Budget</b></p>	<p><b>Post-doc Language Flexibility:</b> Bird explained that as she stated in her letter of recommendation (Handout #1) she requested authority to use the \$75K listed under Biological for Zooplankton (Post-doc) and \$75K listed under the Copper River (Post-doc) for project related expenditures (salaries, vessel charters, and other logistical costs within these focus areas) and not be 'line item limited' for the next two years. (See Proposed FY05 Budget p.3, and Draft OSRI FY05 Workplan p.54).</p> <p>Schoch stated that the proposed amendment is a change from what he proposed in that the OSRI funds would be allocated for project support, not just PWSSC staff support. He noted that the Board apparently had previously committed support to these projects and noted that the request is for continuation of these projects for two more fiscal years (through FY06). He emphasized that the Board should recognize this if they choose to support this amendment of the proposed workplan, and said he does not want to debate this again next year. He envisions the Science Plan retaining the two post-doc positions as proposed and that the Board approve a waiver for two years to fund the close-out of the two ongoing biological projects in Prince William Sound and the Copper River Delta.</p> <p>Discussion ensued and resulted in consensus to support a waiver of the two post-doc positions for two years in order to fund the close-out of the two biological projects in PWS and the CRD. Staff was directed to make changes to the workplan text, using the project descriptions provided by Drs. Bishop and Thorne, for the FY05 workplan. Board members emphasized the importance of on being able to track where matching funds originate.</p> <p>There was some discussion about habitat mapping and making more use of remote sensing data. Interest was expressed by several Board members in doing another field experiment project, perhaps at a different season of the year. Schoch said he wants to see this repeated</p>

in FY07 when the Regional Ocean Model (ROMS) will be ready to run; he also said he wants to develop partnerships to fund these kind of experiments. He emphasized that he is trying to focus OSRI funds on those projects most difficult to be supported by others and believes other supporters for the field experiments can be found. Bird stated that the PWSSC cash support for the field experiment exceeded funds provided by OSRI. There was consensus that the field experiment was very worthwhile and several OSRI Board members said they would support OSRI funding the entire project again.

**JPL Modeling Project:** Board members discussed the relative priority of the JPL modeling project. Fink and Fries were concerned with the long term nature of the JPL Data Assimilation Modeling project. (See Draft OSRI FY05 Workplan p.36). Bronson drew a simple pie chart of prospective budget/goal allocations with the *Response* slice expanding from 25% in 2005 to 33% in 2006. Kopchak and Saupe felt use of the new model would enlarge the *Response* component, compatible with OSRI goals. Schoch saw the \$60K in support of this project as an act of good faith to keep the PWS model going; he said biological components will be discussed at a winter 2005 workshop. Some saw the \$25K Observation fellowship as the cheapest way to keep the POM going for the next three years (though it would actually be a year-to-year contract).

#### **Motion to Approve FY05 Work Plan & Budget**

**MOTION: Kopchak moved, and Bronson seconded,** to approve the FY05 Work Plan and Budget as presented in the document titled “Draft OSRI FY05 Workplan and General Science Plan – August 25, 2004” with replacement of the two biological post-doctoral positions for Zooplankton and the Copper River with project-specific line items totaling \$75,000 each for “Biological Monitoring of Zooplankton in PWS” and “Ecology of the Copper River Delta.”

**Fink offered a friendly amendment, seconded by Bronson,** to clearly identify the fellowship for Xinglong Wu as an *Understand* fellowship.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **Discussion:**

**Dollar Figure Corrections:** Bird corrected dollar figures in the Proposed FY05 Budget 9/10/2004 (Handout #4). Halfway down the page “Encumbered and Allocated” should read (1,934,653) (~~1,895,442~~) and “Total Unencumbered Funds Available” should read 1,683,924 [~~1,723,135~~]. In the FY05 Workplan Budget box at the bottom of the page “Administration” should read 172,544 [~~133,333~~] and the “Total Appropriated FY05 Work Plan” should read 1,177,544 [~~1,138,333~~].

*(Editor's note: Further corrections to the budget were made following the meeting and a final FY05 budget was distributed to OSRI Advisory Board members in early October 2004.)*  
 Kopchak called the question but no other Board member was ready to vote on the motion.

**“Travel & program” Line Item:** The new line item, “Travel & program” requested an annual \$10K contribution for travel for the Science Director. (See Proposed FY05 Budget, Other Programs, p.6) A short discussion ensued as to how much travel money should be encumbered; staff recommended carrying over about \$28K from previous years to cover STC travel for 2-3 years. Several Board members opposed carrying over these funds and preferred to allocate travel funds on an annual basis. Mutter summarized that Scientific and Technical Committee travel was to come from program monies.

**Motion to Amend Travel & Program Line Item**

**Motion: Kopchak moved, and Lentsch seconded,** to amend Proposed FY05 Budget, Other Programs, page 6, ‘Travel & program’ (Sci. Director & Sci/Tech Com) line item, read 2,500 (Column One, ~~28,840~~); 22,000 (Column Two, ~~40,000~~); and 24,500 (Column Three, ~~38,840~~).

**Discussion:** Schoch noted that he preferred to split Science Director travel (\$10K) from that of the Scientific and Technical Committee (\$12K) so that one was not dependent on the other. Brief discussion resulted in consensus that staff could split this travel into two accounting line items.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Amended Motion to Approve FY05 Work Plan and Budget**

The question was called again on the Amended Motion to Approve the FY05 Work Plan and Budget.

**The amended motion passed with two Board members dissenting.** Fink and Fries objected to the proposed JPL ROMS modeling project.

- ▶ FY05 Budget, p. 3 – Eliminate “post-doc” language:  
     Biological: Copper River Delta —~~Post-doe~~  
     Biological: Prince William Sound —~~Post-doe~~
- ▶ Mutter requested that Board members be provided with updated and corrected budget documents integrated with text.
- ▶ Science Director travel (\$10K) should be listed as a separate line item from Scientific and Technical Committee travel (\$12K).

<b>Break</b>	<b>A break was taken from 10:12 to 10:18 a.m.</b>
<b>Science Plan</b>	<b><u>Motion to Refine Science Plan for 2005 Consideration &amp; Adoption</u></b>

	<p><b>MOTION: Mutter moved, and Leland seconded,</b> to request the Science Director to open the draft Five Year Science Plan to a 45 day public review period, to convene a meeting of the Scientific &amp; Technology Committee in Anchorage, with Advisory Board members invited, to review recommendations and prepare for adoption of the Science Plan at the February 2005 Board Meeting.</p> <p>In discussion, Kopchak stated that the intention is for the STC to review the public comments received and recommend to the Science Director any changes to be made to the Science Plan. The meeting will be open to the public although the agenda may not include a public comment period since there is a 45-day comment period and public comments have been received at this meeting on the plan. Further discussion included concern that enough time be allowed between this STC meeting and the February Board meeting for the Science Director to incorporate any changes and distribute a revised plan for Board review at least 30 days prior to the meeting.</p> <p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Leland was interested in having an annual calendar as to the status of proposals, meetings, etc.</li> <li>▶ Bronson asked that Science Plan language articulate its status with target budget allocations and be used as a contextual framework for the annual Work Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Motion to Compile Work Plan Calendar</u></b></p> <p><b>MOTION: Kopchak moved, and Fries seconded, a motion</b> to direct Staff to compile an annual calendar by no later than Dec. 31, 2004 of the processes involved in the annual work plan cycle.</p> <p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p>
<p><b>Board vacancy</b></p>	<p><b>Member-at-large seat:</b> Leland’s term as Member at Large ends at the end of this meeting. Leland expressed her willingness to continue for one more meeting and then recommended that she be replaced by Tony Parkin of PWSRCAC. Discussion.</p> <p><b><u>Motion to Reappoint Leland</u></b></p> <p><b>MOTION: Fries moved, and Kopchak seconded, a motion to reappoint Leland to a two year Member at Large seat.</b></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Board members discussed board continuity. Fink wanted to define how to elect members at large.</p> <p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Kopchak directed staff to solicit applications for possible</li> </ul>

	replacements for Leland should she step down.
<b>Election of Officers</b>	<p><b>Election of Officers:</b>  Vice Chair: Leland nominated Doug Mutter as Vice Chair.  <b>Mutter was unanimously elected Vice Chair.</b>  Treasurer: Pearson nominated R.J. Kopchak as Treasurer.  <b>Kopchak was unanimously elected Treasurer.</b>  Secretary: Leland nominated Mark Fink as Secretary.  <b>Fink was unanimously elected Secretary.</b>  Members at Large for Executive Committee: Leland nominated Carol Fries and Doug Lentsch as Members at Large for the Executive Committee.  <b>Carol Fries and Doug Lentsch were unanimously elected Members at Large for the Executive Committee.</b></p> <p>► <b>Finance Committee:</b> Kopchak was willing to recruit Board members to the Finance Committee.  ► <b>Workplan Committee:</b> Bronson, Lentsch, Pearson, and Saupe expressed their willingness to work with Schoch on the Workplan Committee.</p>
<b>Calendar for committee and Board meetings</b>	<p><b>Proposed Calendar:</b> Board members reviewed the proposed Calendar of Meetings. (See Meeting Packet, Tab 8.2)</p> <p><b>2005 Board Meetings:</b> Board members plan to meet February 10-11, 2005 in Anchorage and September 22-23, 2005 in Cordova.</p> <p><b>Scientific &amp; Technical Committee:</b>  ► Schoch will schedule the fall meeting of the Scientific &amp; Technical Committee.</p>
<b>OSRI Board member comments</b>	<p><b>Board member comments:</b> Pearson appreciated Schoch’s good work. Saupe was impressed by the Science Plan. Kopchak thanked the staff especially Schoch. He was encouraged by talk with industry and cautioned that informal meetings might violate the Open Meetings Act. Leland thanked the staff. Goering was happy to have Schoch on board. Fries appreciated Schoch’s new analysis and recommendations. Davin was hopeful for OSRI’s future. Evanoff had talked with Village fishermen regarding their interest in dispersant use training. She would like to see OSRI involvement and identification of oil spill response with dispersant use. Bronson said that the Advisory Board needed to set policy and be willing to deal with criticism and let the staff do its work. Lentsch echoed Bronson’s sentiments. He announced that Buzz Rome’s final report of the GRS Demonstration Project was due soon and that the project had gone well. Lentsch was encouraged by PWS’s status as an AOOS pilot project. Fink appreciated the spirit of discussion and staff work. Bird thanked the staff and said she would work with the Science Director to stay more in touch regarding policy</p>

	issues. Mutter was impressed by OSRI's active and involved board.
<b>Adjournment</b>	<b>The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.</b>

These minutes were reviewed and approved February 10, 2005.