

OASLC Board of Directors Meeting

Via Video Conference

10 AM – 12 PM, November 1, 2013

Video Bridge: 165.83.63.221##2001

Room 409 for those in Anchorage

Minutes (in black)

Attendees: Benjamin Pister, Pam Rice, Tahzay Jones, Rebecca Talbott, Diane Chung, Susan Boudreau, Frank Hays

Agenda (in gray):

Old Business:

1. Fallout from ASLC Agreement Failure

-See final notes from Guy Adema concerning the meeting Jeff and Benjamin had with Mark Vaughn (attached Meeting summary OASLC re ASLC agreements FINAL), key thing is Establish an MOU with the ASLC (attached example: MOU NPS-UAF Coal Ck Ed)

-Who would sign this MOU since there is no chair? Me? KEFJ Supe? Everyone?

-There was some skepticism on the part of the Board that an MOU between the OASLC and ASLC was really necessary. It carries no obligation to convey funds, neither the OASLC or ASLC seem to require it, it requires extra work, and there is at least some general guidance from the solicitor that we should avoid unnecessary agreements. There was concern about setting a precedent that in order to engage in an a CESU agreement the contracting office would require an MOU. Tahzay brought up the idea that an MOU may be requested because the OASLC intends to continue to partner with the ASLC using many different CESU agreements over the long term.

ACTION ITEM: Pam and Diane will bring the topic up with Mark Vaughn in person the week of November 4th, and ask for clarification, since they will be in Anchorage for the SWAN meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Benjamin to resend emails to the Board regarding ASLC agreement information from August 8th, as back ground information.

-Due to the ASLC agreement failure in FY13, 160k went to KEFJ, in response in FY14 Benjamin has been trying to make up ground to ASLC, but has only been able to find about 30k, for a total of 230k. Is this a reasonable priority? Are there some things in the budget which should be sacrificed to give more to ASLC? . . .

-General consensus of the Board was to not to increase funding to the ASLC, but to keep it at a stable, base level, and move on to other priorities as directed in the management review. A base of 150k was suggested in the Management Review and had a lot of thought behind it, even though Jeff's guidance had been 200k in FY13.

-Susan pointed out our partners will have to get used to a new reality and there will be less money coming from federal sources.

-Benjamin pointed out there are legacy research projects that should be completed before completely reducing the funding and reallocating funds to other park needs, to which the board agreed. Susan pointed out that it is very important to make sure to get the final reports and data products out of these legacy projects.

-Some of the proposed projects with the ASLC are local Seward projects benefitting no other parks, namely three youth education programs. We should move away from that, and seek to conduct those programs elsewhere.

2. Plan for the Strategic Plan

-See notes below. We're back to square one for a facilitator. But I would like the Board's input on the general approach for the strategic plan. Assume dates will be pushed back a bit.

-Joan Darnell may be willing to facilitate or offer Zach's services. Other names have been suggested after them. Some are retired NPS folks.

-The plan seems good, though the timeline should be pushed back a few months. Tahzay suggested the folks whose input matters most will tend to be available in February, March and April.

-Include ways for stakeholders to respond outside of meetings, such as Survey Monkey. Include some external stakeholders, but don't go overboard.

ACTION ITEM: Board to consider appropriate external partners to include in strategic planning process.

-Diane suggested including a way to prioritize strategies and tactics to fulfill them as they are formulated during the process. Consider using the Technical Committee to do so.

ACTION ITEM: Benjamin will discuss facilitating the strategic plan with Joan Darnell. If Zach ? is unavailable, try Judy Adelson or Nancy Swanton.

New Business:

3. "Establish, per BoD, a stable level of funding for the OASLC so the Director has adequate stability within which to implement strategic plan . . . KEFJ Supe and new BoD"

-see attached OASLC_OFSandGreenbookLanguage.pdf

-as part of this we will discuss the “overhead” ASLC pays to KEFJ. Pam and I have some thoughts. The second base increase had been treated by Jeff as overhead for housing the OASLC and justified as lost purchase power. Although we have trouble making the same argument, it seems impossible to extract that money to a more reasonable level. Pam suggested leaving the status quo as is, never asking for an increase in overhead costs from OASLC (or at least not for a very long time), absorbing the region’s take in FY14 to make up for the 160k in FY13, and sharing future cuts and increases evenly across the board.

-The Board agrees with this approach.

-ACTION ITEM: Benjamin will include language to this effect in the Board Charter and send it to Board members for review and voting no later than November 15th.

4. Draft FY 13 Annual Report

-A draft in bullet form is attached (OASLC FY13 Annual report)

-Need to establish a new due date (originally Oct 31st)

5. Draft FY14 Annual Work Plan

-Attached: FY14 OASLC Annual workplan

-Attached: FY14 Budget Build OASLC

ACTION ITEM: Benjamin to submit via email revised budget and final work plan for Board review by November 30th.

-Include above the line/below the line items in the budget for transparency and intent should funding levels fluctuate.

-Use Google Drive for sharing

-Include a breakdown of ASLC projects, and include descriptions in the FY14 Workplan.

-Alaska Marine Science Symposium . . . this is not the year to increase funding. Maintain sponsorship at \$1500 level.

6. Coastal Settlement Funds Update

-Entire Tech. Committee has volunteered for the review panel. However, Jennifer Thelen has decided she does not have the time to participate on this task. Does this leave the review panel geographically biased? If so, should we add someone from ARCN to the process? Can the Board decide whether the subsequent proposals are unbiased?

-Frank suggested adding Peter Neitlich to the TC/Review Panel to add a bit more geographical balance, especially since Jennifer Thelen has indicated she will not have time to participate in the Coastal

Settlement review. Tahzay suggested someone from ARCN if Peter is unavailable. Susan added that the TC could be augmented by “advisors” when needed, rather than inflate the team some more.

-There was some discussion about shrinking the Tech. Committee in the long run (after this year). However, this would compound the issue of geographical and disciplinary balance desired. This may be an ongoing discussion as time goes on. No changes were suggested at present.

7. Timeline for Technical Committee turnover

-We did not discuss a timeline directly. Only within the context above.

The Board agreed to meet again in January.

Plan for the Plan

One big topic we were scheduled to discuss is the "plan" to draft the OASLC strategic plan, as set forth in the management review and the Board charter.

My vision for the strategic plan is really more of a "tactical plan". As I see it there are many documents that give the OASLC goals to work towards. They include the management review, the Pacific Ocean Parks Strategic Plan, C2A, the National Ocean Policy, and the [national RLC mission and vision](#). These documents give us all, or at least most, of the strategy we need and to spend much time debating new strategies would only serve to reinvent the wheel. Instead what I envision is a document that outlines in some detail the specific tasks we hope to accomplish to meet our mission and the strategies mentioned above. While some tasks may end up being a little more broad in their scope (for example, reinvigorate the OASLC website with pages addressing research in each park), other tasks will be fairly narrow and precise (for example, use OASLC funds to leverage research on the effects of ocean acidification on western Cook Inlet razor clams and subsequent impacts on bears.) Therefore this plan would basically outline the OASLC work plan for the next four years.

November/early December 2013 - Hold three virtual meetings, one for each of the three networks. I want to give plenty of opportunity for every NPS stakeholder in the region to give input and have a say in what our plan says. That is important for transparency and buy in. Staff from each network can use the Polycom system to work with the facilitator and myself. One or two of these meetings could be in the regional office for anyone who wants to attend there. These meetings would consist of me laying out the background and history of the OASLC and laying out the scope and vision of the OASLC within the context of those documents I mentioned above. Then there would be active brainstorming by participants as to how the OASLC can serve them and what specific tasks should go into the plan. These meetings will probably last on the order of four hours, or so. I will be preparing background materials for all participants to read beforehand.

February 2014 - After the meetings Jim, the facilitator, and I will assimilate everyone's comments and suggestions into a single draft for comments and review by stakeholders and participants. This will include review of the draft by the OASLC Board.

May 2014 - Jim and I incorporate comments, suggestions and edits into the plan and resubmit it to the Board for final approval.

June 2014 - OASLC strategic plan is signed by Board members.

Initially John Bryant was willing to facilitate, but recently became unavailable. His alternate suggestion, Christy Anastasia is also unavailable. I have several suggestions from the Technical committee to follow up on, but would appreciate any other suggestions. I am hoping all the OASLC would have to pay for is any travel on the part of the facilitator. I expect this to be fairly minimal, perhaps only one or two overnight trips to Seward.

Board, you may want to begin thinking about who you would like to participate in this planning process. All park staff are welcome as far as I am concerned, but Interp and RM should be involved at a minimum. How much involvement, if any, would you like from outside partners, such as the ASLC or Kachemak Bay Research Reserve? When the Southern California RLC went through their strategic planning they included meetings for partners at each park (three parks total). I don't know if that is something we should do here, or not.

Thoughts? Comments? Constructive suggestions?