

## MINUTES

### GLOS Steering Committee Conference Call – June 8, 2006 – 10 a.m. EDT

#### I. **Call to Order, Roll Call** (Dave Schwab)

Dave Schwab  
Keith Bedford  
Mark Bobal  
Jeff Boehm  
Helen Brohl  
Gerry Galloway  
Norm Grannemann  
Mark Grazioli  
Paul Horvatin  
Brian Huberty  
Gail Krantzberg  
Tom Landon  
Gail Morrison  
Sandra Morrison for Leon Carl  
Jeff Reutter  
?? for Mark Burrows  
Richard Stewart  
Steve Stewart  
Dale Phenicie  
Dick Wagenmaker

Roger Gauthier  
Christine Manninen  
Jon MacDonagh-Dumler  
Dave Knight  
Jon Dettling  
Erika Jensen  
Stuart Eddy

#### II. **Secretariat Reports**

##### a. Advocacy update and earmark status (Jon MacDonagh-Dumler)

###### Appropriations:

Impasse exists on spending level priorities. Senate is in favor of higher levels than House for the overall Commerce budget. There is a low probability that NOAA's funding will be appropriated before the November elections and might be tied up in an omnibus appropriations bill.

###### Authorizing Legislation:

A Senate bill has passed, a House bill has been introduced. However, the House bill is locked in committee due to disagreements within the Resource Committee. The hope that some sections could be attached to another bill (e.g., Magnussen Fisheries Act) but that one is stalled as well.

Brohl – Where do COOPS funding efforts stand?

Reply – Chad Messler says subcommittees not moving quickly, they're looking at an omnibus bill at end of the year instead of appropriations.

Brohl – Has there been additional movement on “dismantling existing earmark” for COOPS? Is there a continuing battle between industry and GLOS?

Reply – This is not an either-or situation. Both funding directions are important and inter-related and they are being pushed concurrently.

b. Annual Meeting Logistics (Christine Manninen)

Annual Meeting being held in Ann Arbor

Dates: Monday and Tuesday, June 19 and 20, 2006

Location: Sheraton FourPoints Hotel, 3200 Boardwalk, Ann Arbor, MI 48108

Please inform of attendance as soon as possible. Christine will help with travel arrangements where possible. There are no rooms left in the block originally reserved at the Sheraton, but other hotel accommodations are available nearby; she will be providing information on other hotels via the listserv.

PowerPoint presentations (.ppt files) and other presenters' materials need to be provided to the GLOS Secretariat by Thursday, June 15. Email them to Stuart or contact him ([seddy@glc.org](mailto:seddy@glc.org) or 734-971-9135) to make other arrangements.

Web-conferencing arrangements are being made and several presenters and participants will be taking part from remote locations.

A preliminary agenda is available at: <http://www.glos.us/>.

The planned approach involves an overview of activities through much of the first day and 2<sup>nd</sup> morning. The afternoon of the 2<sup>nd</sup> day will be a formal Board meeting session.

Krantzberg – not available for the Board portion. Will the Board discuss the frequency of Board meetings?

Reply – The inaugural Board meeting will be webcasted and results (minutes, etc.) will be available afterwards.

R. Stewart – Also not available due to another meeting; sending a non-voting representative to participate in the discussion, Carol Wolocz. She is making arrangements and needs hotel info.

### III. Steering Committee comments on:

- Membership Benefits, Roles and Responsibilities document (Dave Schwab)

All membership material is important as advertising material, a useful part of attracting members to the organization.

Existing list was assembled by the Steering Committee as tentative, has straw-man status right now, any input from anyone is welcome.

Comments:

Additional benefit: Membership gives the participants a means of showcasing their own products.

Additional benefit: Members elect the Board of Directors on a staggered basis annually and only members are able to have a say in Board configuration.

Question: Anyone attending on behalf of IOOS?

Reply – Mike Hemsley will be on the web conference and is scheduled to speak early Monday a.m. Otherwise, attendees will be from the NFRA or from the Great Lakes. One consideration for the Board will be participation in monthly Ocean.US conference calls.

Question – Is anyone addressing the issue of access to national vs. regional data?

Reply – To be addressed on morning of Day 2 by Phil Bogden of GoMOOS.

Request for clarification of differences between GLOS RA and SOP.

Reply – RA Board vs. SOP involves the struggle over conflicts of interest in setting up an organization closely involved with government agencies. The SOP provides input to the Board about substantive design and planning for the system while the Board is responsible for resource allocations and prioritizations.

- Proposed Membership Classes and Dues (Dave Schwab)

The original Board of Directors/membership model from the GLOS Business Plan is essentially “Option 1”.

Option 2 provides for more formal engagement and is consistent with the current draft By-Laws.

Option 3 provides for all members to be part of an oversight panel.

The dues structure shown at the end of the Membership Benefits document is a recommendation for all 3 options.

Krantzberg – Why are recommended dues for the Canadian government set at \$0?

Reply – Canadian government will probably not participate as a voting party. It will have its own OOS with which GLOS will coordinate.

Krantzberg – Why is GLOS not binational?

Reply – IOOS is US program, there is no binational setup at the federal level, which means there is no real option for a single binational entity at the regional level.

Brohl – GLOS could be binational in terms of cooperation of systems, but this requires an agreement with a complementary Canadian partner as opposed to a single OS. Technically there is no Canadian component to match NOAA funding availability, but GLOS could seek interaction with a Canadian component once one becomes available.

Reply – Yes, the binational element is critical for the Great Lakes, but funding cannot be provided from GLOS to Canada. A Canadian counterpart is hoped for and expected. It will be engaged as it begins to evolve within the region.

Also note that the Board can alter structure at its own discretion if any consideration here, including the nature of Canadian participation, is not acceptable to them.

Huberty – Navigation work with Transport Canada did not get much engagement from Ocean.US. Is anyone else seeing this as a pattern?

Schwab – Yes, but more engagement by IOOS is appearing as it gets better established. There are already reporting requirements to IOOS for newer projects.

Continuing discussion:

A non-dues organization is also possible. But what are dues to be used for?

Reply – Travel costs of Board members and advocacy activities are the primary uses. Dues may be the only option for advocacy if other monies are all from federal appropriations. Also, federal funders frequently needs matching funds from the regions, to which dues income could be applied.

Grazioli – Why no dues amount for local units of government? After all, local government must be on the SOP if things like source water protection are an IOOS/GLOS goal.

Reply – “State” should read “State/Regional/Local”

Granneman – How do federal funds get kept out of advocacy efforts?

Reply – That is part of the accounting process. Federal funds are kept separate from other funds and are not available to advocacy activities. Non-profit status as a 501(c)(3) will require reports about the GLOS funding stream and a limit on the percentage of the budget used for advocacy (less than 5% of total budget).

Reutter – Encourages inclusion of several additional pieces of information:

- Pros and cons of dues options.

- Other possible dues structures.

- Other uses of dues.

National Association of Marine Labs recently implemented a new dues structure for marine labs across the country based on FTEs within the programs. Possibly a very valid option, especially since it might make it easier to bring in as many members as possible including small organizations, individual programs within large organizations. NAML separates funding and roles based on federal vs. non-federal, much as is planned for GLOS. He will send NAML guidelines to Christine.

Granneman – It may be a challenge to calculate FTEs, e.g. by organization or by office/lab, by role or amount of activity within the basin vs. outside the basin.

[Comment:] Membership seems to primarily allow for selection of Board members and input to committees. What about input to committees without membership status? Could that be possible? Also, is membership by organization or by office/lab?

Reply – Probably by organization but with access to various offices by type of expertise.

Granneman – USGS contributes funds to IOOS but not to any regional organization, as far as he knows.

[Comment:] Some RAs are using an MOA model, allowing membership for a dues amount or for some level of “in-kind services”.

Grazioli – Local government drinking water protection and similar activities involve a lot of data. If asked for both a great deal of data plus dues, they may not (probably won't) join.

Gauthier and others – Discussion is good and all input is valuable for informing the Board. Note, however, that this doesn't need to be solved at this time, but the Board will need to address it at its upcoming meeting..

Knight – Dues also may be used as startup funds. Perhaps as funding for the first steps in solidifying the organization but gone later?

Granneman – Sell membership as collaboration opportunities, access to enhanced inter-organizational connections? It still probably will not be an easy sell.

[Comment:] Lay out options for the Board to help them understand what approaches are possible. Especially need to answer the question, “Why do we need this money?”

[Note:] The Business Plan needs to demonstrate viable sources of funding if the RA is to be certified.

Gauthier – The Board will receive a more complete options write-up with pros and cons listed. Options probably will step through “no dues – fixed dues – proportional dues – in-kind option

for data providers”. Also, again, this structure can be changed over time. The final dues structure needs to include a mechanism for what constitutes membership if the RA ends up using a no-dues structure.

Note by Bobal – He presented the proposed fees structure to his superiors and got a less than enthusiastic reception. It is being checked on with others higher up the chain of command.

Note from Schwab – Additional option as a variation on Dave Knight’s “dues at startup” idea: No dues at startup, making it easier to get members, then poll all about the need for dues and an acceptable structure?

- Draft Annual Work Plan (Roger Gauthier)

The current version is a very first, early draft.

Some comments already received.

Structure:

- Background – comments so far: Not enough info about end-users, why we exist and who would be served.

- Funding

- Scope of Work

- Management, Roles/Responsibility

- Coordination, Marketing, Advocacy

- Budget

- Personnel

- Note: Section 6 (Budget) is predicated exclusively on planning grant funding only); additional funding via an earmark would need to be addressed if this became a reality.

Need to revisit and discriminate between backbone and regional components.

Grazioli – Southeast Michigan data is mentioned. Is GLOS actively looking for others?

Reply – Workplan focuses on June 2006 – June 2007. Prototyping during this phase, then expansion to other parts of region.

Wagenmaker – Ambitious plan, much will spill over. Add a section that presents anticipated out-year objectives and near-term coordination needs.

Bobal – The budget lists and amount for “fringe benefits” – what is meant by this?

Reply – This additional information will be provided in the next draft.

Granneman – HEC effort taking place if no earmark?

Reply – Very little of it. The RA will stay a coordinative body for first Fiscal Year but most on-the-ground activities will have to wait. Also, the HEC may be a typical situation – a priority gets developed, funding is sought, whether or not the dollars come, background understanding has been developed. Also, efforts may span a number of years before an actual “observing system component” emerges.

Granneman – Maybe not for meeting, but at one of last regional national meetings included material about the National Monitoring Network coordination with the IOOS initiative. Any work on that within GLOS?

Reply – Discussion on that is taking place at higher level than the RAs. RAs will come in as active participants as a national structure is established.

### **Upcoming Schedule**

- Briefing books mailed to GLOS Board of Directors and Steering Committee  
w/ revisions based upon above discussions: June 9<sup>th</sup>
- GLOS Annual Meeting: June 19-20

### **IV. Other Business**

**Next Conference Calls:** The second Thursday of each month @ 10 a.m. EDT (July 13<sup>th</sup>, August 10<sup>th</sup>)