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Funding Support

• $405,000 since beginning of project
• 9% of the budget is remaining
• Last invoice date 9/11/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>$32,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$3,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$155,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>$38,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$9,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>$248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>$10,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contractual Services</td>
<td>$6,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Fee (18% Salaries)</td>
<td>$22,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect 28% MTDC</td>
<td>$70,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Support II

• What percent, if any, of the cost of your system’s O&M was covered by GCOOS? 87%

• Leveraged GCOOS funding for
  – Award from NOAA/OAP for OA monitoring system
    • $39,860 for CenGOOS O&M
  – Award from NASA for Carbon System monitoring and evaluation
    • $18,700 for CenGOOS O&M
  – Award from CIAP/MS-DMR
  – Instrument calibration and buoy sandblasting from NDBC.

• Comments for the Board on Funding Support?
  – Funding is appreciated, but inadequate to meet goals for uptime
Results from GCOOS Support

• There have been many inquires about using CenGOOS HFR and buoy data. Data can be downloaded from the HFR National Server and we do not have a method for tracking usage.

• HFR data from DwH was heavily utilized
Data Usage

We do not have a way to track all users of the data. What we do know follows:

• CODAR
  – NOAA OR&R during DwH spill
  – ASA Science for NRDA work
  – Ocean Conservancy
  – GoMRI projects have used HFR data
  – Research projects

• Buoy
  – Local mariners
  – USGS for restoration activities at Chandelier Islands
  – Research projects
Meeting Data Portal Requirements

• CenGOOS has the ability to meet GCOOS Data Portal requirements

• Do you have any comments or thoughts on how you or the GCOOS-RA should handle QA/QC related to IOOS DMAC Standards? There are manuals developed by QARTOD for some sensors, but not sure about what IOOS QA/QC DMAC standards exist.

• Can we count on your data flow in the future given existing constraints? Yes.
Understanding Subcontractor Needs

• What is needed to keep your system healthy?
  – Spare CODAR equipment!
  – Upgraded sensors and spares for everything
  – Replace CODAR station installations at Gulf State Park located in Orange Beach, AL and at Henderson Beach State Park located in Destin, FL

• Where are the gaps in information?

• What is your current operational status? As of 9/23/2013:
  – Buoy collecting data but Globalstar modem failed (?). MAPCO2 system reporting data in near-real time
  – CODAR
    • Henderson Beach State Park: 3 days ago reflected power spiked and we have to visit the site to diagnose problem
    • Gulf State Park: operational
    • Singing River Island: operational

• What is your future outlook (6 months to a year)? Will continue as planned

• Do you have plans in the near future for technology upgrades?
  – Yes if funding permits
Optional
GCOOS Data Portal, Newsletter, Web

• Is the GCOOS Data Portal serving you well?
  – Yes
  – The related project for the OA Wave Glider had a
great data page utilizing ESRI web server capabilities
  that was put together by GCOOS staff

• Are the GCOOS newsletter and website serving you well?
  – Has your work/program been highlighted in GCOOS
  communications? Wave Glider has.
  – If not, would you like it to be? Sure
Considerations for the BOD
Concluding Thoughts

The low level of funding from NOAA/IOOS has allowed for some base level of funding for O&M but we are now 7 years out since directed funding was able to be utilized for capitalization. Equipment and platforms are aging and the operations are becoming unsustainable.