

OASLC Board of Directors Meeting

Via Video Conference

March 27, 2013 2-4 PM

This was our first meeting!

Attendees: Benjamin Pister, Jeff Mow, Tahzay Jones, Rebecca Talbott, Diane Chung, Susan Boudreau, Frank Hays

Agenda:

1. Introductions

-OASLC Director, Education Coordinator, BoD Members

2. Charter Review

-Select a BoD chair

-Roles, Responsibilities, Expectations

3. Brief History of OASLC – The 30,000' View

-Where we've come from, our mission and the RLC concept

-FY13 accomplishments, plans, status of funds

4. Management Review

5. Now what?

-OALC Strategic Plan

-Technical Advisory Committee

-Approach to spending remaining funds

6. OASLC Board and Coastal Settlement Funds Approval

7. Next meeting date?

Minutes:

-All board members were in attendance, with Roy Wood from KATM sitting in for at least the beginning of the meeting

Charter Review

-After introductions, Benjamin read through an outline of the OASLC Board Charter to remind everyone of the Board's purpose and instructions.

-Benjamin suggested that we next select a chair for the Board. Jeff asked everyone whether a chair was really necessary, pointing out that the I&M Boards operate well without one. The Board unanimously agreed that there was no need for a chair, and that Benjamin could still handle the logistical aspect of conducting Board meetings.

-Rebecca asked whether we need to amend the Board charter, since it explicitly instructs the Board to elect a chair. Tahzay pointed out that the Board can amend the charter by unanimous consent.

ACTION ITEM – Let it be known that the OASLC Board unanimously agreed to amend the charter to proceed without a designated chair.

OASLC History, Background & Budget

-Benjamin gave a presentation introducing the Research Learning Centers broadly, then some background on the OASLC itself, including its partnership with the Alaska SeaLife Center (ASLC), the POPS Technical Asst. Call, and general activities over the years.

-Next Benjamin walked the group through the FY13 budget planned for the OASLC. This included plans both before and after sequestration. The OASLC budget plan was reduced from \$785,000 to \$699,863. Most of the reductions came from lapsing the Science Communicator (3rd FTE) and reducing the money sent to ASLC by \$200,000 to \$160,000.

-Someone asked what the OASLC overhead (\$140,000) to KEFJ included. Jeff explained that included utilities, administrative time and effort, vehicle use, etc. for housing the OASLC at KEFJ. It also included some reduction in purchasing power since receiving the base increases to host the OASLC. Rebecca asked if it would be possible to pull the KEFJ overhead out from the "All Other" category into its own, then break expenses down further (Utilities, Vehicles, etc.) Although this is difficult to do precisely because the OASLC funds are wrapped up into the KEFJ base funds, Benjamin agreed to represent that overhead more accurately within the various categories in the future.

-Frank asked how the amount sent to ASLC was determined, how the work they were doing would be impacted by \$40,000 less, and how the decision would be made on what work to cut. Benjamin explained briefly the projects they were working on and that the ASLC staff were currently wrestling with how to go about making this decision. Essentially, projects that could be postponed without impacting the results (e.g. seasonal work) would be postponed. A brief discussion ensued about how much control the OASLC Board had over what projects the ASLC decided to take on. Benjamin explained

that the ASLC is a strong collaborative partner and willing to work with us to find the best use of their abilities that meets both our and their mission.

-Rebecca remarked that the OASLC budget for FY13 seemed to do a good job of attempting to reach the balance of two thirds outreach and education and one third research, and asked if that was accurate and if so intentional. Benjamin replied that since he was new, he let the work in FY12 largely determine the work and budget of FY13 which just happen to result in the current budget. But little attention was paid to finding that balance for this year. Jeff remarked that shifting efforts away from research and more towards outreach and education is definitely a cultural shift within the RLC world. Rebecca added that might not be true for all the RLCs such as North Cascades.

-Tahzay asked whether the cuts absorbed by OASLC due to sequestration would go away in FY14. Jeff replied that they would probably not go away, that sequestration appears to be a permanent change. Tahzay remarked that the cuts to the OASLC budget looked more like 10% than 5%, the latter of which was the goal for sequestration. Jeff explained that the sequestration planning exercise forced the OASLC budget to be considered within the overall KEFJ budget, since the former is part of the latter. The KEFJ budget was already hard hit before sequestration due to onetime costs in FY13. In practice, the park might be faced with choices like closing the Exit Glacier Nature Center on certain days, or reducing the ASLC agreement. Also, one of the requirements for sequestration planning was to reduce non-essential contracts and agreements, which lead to the decision to reduce our CESU agreements with ASLC and KBRR. It causes difficulties with the OASLC because a large fraction of their work is accomplished through agreements.

-Susan asked if any out year budget planning had been done. Jeff replied that KEFJ had done a budget cost projection (BCP) but it was currently unclear how the OASLC fared in that, since the effort had occurred while he was interim superintendent at Denali. Benjamin also did not participate in that process. Jeff agreed to look into it and send that plan to the Board.

ACTION ITEM: Jeff Mow to send OASLC Board results of BCP exercise for the OASLC on March 28th.

-Diane asked how the OASLC got more money than \$645,000, which was the original OFS request. There was a second OFS request granted in 2010 for \$185,000, part of which went to the OASLC.

Strategic Plan and Technical Advisory Committee

-Susan asked if Benjamin had a plan to develop the strategic plan, which was part of the Management Review and the Board charter. Benjamin explained that he intended to craft a plan using the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC, not yet in existence) to develop a well-rounded plan that addressed the needs of the coastal parks in natural and cultural resources as well as interp and education. At the same time the plan should be short and to the point with a clear path to follow. He had no details on how to proceed, but hoped to avoid a cumbersome process.

- Someone suggested that the OASLC strategic plan move forward in concert with coastal and ocean strategic process that Tahzay is working on, to which there was general agreement.

-Frank suggested the Board members reach out to stakeholders in their geographic areas to form a list of interested partners (internal and external) and a general list of needs. Then that list could be combined before moving forward.

-Susan strongly recommended using a facilitator, no matter how the process moves forward, to which Benjamin agreed.

-Rebecca suggested building upon (and making sure not to duplicate) the OASLC Management Review, since several stakeholders were already interviewed for that. On average, interviewees contributed 1-2 hours on average with us and often had very thoughtful comments and recommendations for such a strategy. She asked that Benjamin review the list of who was interviewed and do a gap analysis as to stakeholders that were missed (as Frank suggested), and also to mine the interviews for comments relevant to going forward on a strategic plan.

ACTION ITEM: Rebecca will get the list of interviewees to Benjamin April 5th. Benjamin will review the list of interviewees and determine where there were gaps (geographically and otherwise); and review the notes for comments regarding the strategic plan.

Frank pointed out that the Management Review focused on the OASLC itself (looking within, rather than without), and did not include all stakeholders. Some footwork needs to be done to engage other stakeholders and introduce the OASLC to them. He also suggested OASLC staff spend some time introducing the OASLC to stakeholders and getting more acquainted with the resources in the vicinity of the coastal parks. Benjamin agreed and is willing to do this, if travel restrictions would allow it.

-Frank suggested targeting folks involved in Tahzay's coastal conference calls. Tahzay pointed out that there was very little participation in that group from cultural resource folks or interp and education folks.

-Rebecca suggested that the Board will need to suggest specific participants in the TAC to represent cultural resources and interp and education.

ACTION ITEM: Tahzay will send the Board his list of participants on the coastal calls by April 5th. Board members will make additional suggestions of people willing to be added to the list of potential TAC members, including external partners, and email them to Benjamin by May 10th.

ACTION ITEM: The Board will meet in conjunction with the ALC meeting the week of May 20th for an update. This meeting will likely be by conference call, for perhaps an hour or so. Benjamin will update the Board on the list of TAC members.

ACTION ITEM: Benjamin and Tahzay will work together to develop a "plan" for developing the OASLC strategic plan. They will present their course of action to the OASLC Board by the end of July. The members of the Technical Advisory Committee will also be identified by this time.

-Diane asked whose responsibility it was to communicate with the other parks not directly represented on the Board. Benjamin replied that it was up to both Diane and him to communicate with the other

parks in her network. Among other methods, Benjamin will be sending out approved minutes to all the parks to keep them in the loop.

Remaining OASLC Funds

-Benjamin asked the Board for guidance on how to spend the remaining \$7,000-\$10,000 left in the OALSC FY13 budget plan. He had ideas, but wanted to make sure it was done equitably and transparently.

-Frank suggested using some of it to travel to WEAR to see the resources and meet the stakeholders in that area.

-Susan advised thinking about necessary infrastructure for OASLC activities in out years.

-Jeff mentioned the growing concern over marine debris and that we will not know to what extent we need to respond until June, or so. At which time he may be looking for funds to respond.

ACTION ITEM: Benjamin will send out a list of ideas to the Board by April 5th. The Board will respond with suggestion and priorities by April 30th.

Coastal Settlement Funds and the OASLC Board

-Benjamin informed the Board that they will most likely be asked to act as the final reviewing body for project proposals to spend down the coastal settlement funds during the next few fiscal years. Bob Winfree is leading a group to develop that process now. Jeff pointed out that there is a strong possibility that AKRO may look to the OASLC Board to weigh in on many coastal and ocean issues that are external to the OASLC itself, and that those issues are growing.

Next Meeting

The Board agreed to convene by conference call, in conjunction with the ALC meeting in May, since most members will be involved in both. The exact time of the ALC meeting is not yet known.

ACTION ITEM: Benjamin will send out a Doodle Poll to schedule a meeting time later in July.