National Sea Grant Advisory Board Semiannual Meeting

Tuesday, March 9 and Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Washington Plaza Hotel
10 Thomas Circle Northwest
Washington, DC

TUESDAY MARCH 9, 2010

MEETING OPEN

- Around the room introductions of Board Members and Current Nominees
- Senator Patty Birkholz provided overview of her activities in Michigan.

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL:

John Byrne
Jeremy Harris
Ross Heath
Mike Orbach
Nancy Rabalais
Rollie Schmitten (not present)
Harry Simmons (not present for AM)
Bill Stubblefield
Dick Vortmann
Dick West
John Woeste (Chair)
Patty Birkholz (present for first hour)
Frank Beal
Leon Cammen
Jim Murray
Gordon Grau

REVIEW OF DAY'S ACTIVITIES/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- Review of August 2009 Meeting Minutes.
- **MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES. (1ST – Heath, 2nd – Stubblefield.) All ayes.**

WELCOME REMARKS

Leon Cammen, Director, National Sea Grant College Program

- Thanks to Dick West for service as Board Chair. Review historical role of Board and current role. Welcome to New Chair John Woeste and new members of the Board. Urge current members to think about recommendations for new members.
- Review of impact of the Board's advice / how Sea Grant has responded to Board advice.
- SG year in review: milestones
    - PIE underway
    - Alignment of program plans to national plan
    - Site visits planned
    - Focus Team annual meetings
    - NOAA engagement
    - $8M budget increase (FY2010) – gets SG back to FY2005 level

    - $7.5M budget increase request (FY2011)
    - Climate workshop
    - Regional "climate engagement" mini grants – worked very hard to get all the regions to involve SG / have them in the room for discussions. Drive home the importance of engagement with partners
    - Snapshot of SG Successes (examples in PPT)
- Sea Grant's Year Ahead
    - Site visits (start April)
    - Annual reports
    - Initiation of 4-year awards
    - New Information Management System & Website
    - National Initiatives
        - AIS
        - Aquaculture
        - Climate Adaptation
    - OAR Reorganization
    - NOAA Climate Services
    - SBIR competition

SEA GRANT'S ROLE IN NOAA

Sally Yozell, NOAA Director of Policy

1. Mission, Vision, Value – discussion of NOAA's role in the country, mission / values, etc.
2. NOAA Leadership Alignment – present key alignment changes. Added 2 senior level appointees, redefine roles to clearly outline authorities
3. NOAA Policy Initiatives & FY 2009 Accomplishments - discussion of NOAA Policy objectives, progress towards key goals, working with regional areas to balance needs of ecosystems and communities (ex: catch share debate – perhaps role for SG extension there). NOAA Stimulus update – overview of distribution of funds.
4. Strengthening Science Across NOAA – initiative rolling out – envisioning strengthening science across NOAA – wants to get young scientists interested in coming to NOAA, need to bring in strong, young group to backfill the folks who will be leaving (one of Lubchenco's top priorities). [Science underpins NOAAs Service and Stewardship Activities, Growing NOAA's Socio-Economic Capacity, Partnerships & Engagement, OAR provides complementary research – focusing *across* NOAA, Communicating and Marketing NOAA Science]
5. Administration Initiatives: Ocean Policy Task Force, Coastal & Marine Spatial Planning. [Scientific Integrity, Climate and Energy, Adaptation to Climate Change, Ocean Policy, Regional Ecosystem Restoration and Resilience Efforts]. Overview of Ocean Policy Task Force. Presidential policy statement expected in immediate future – really support

ability of different agencies tasked with ocean issues to work together as a collective whole.

6. Budget Update – review appropriations history.
7. Future

<u>DISCUSSION</u> – looking for input on (1) How can SG [better] support NOAA, & (2) How can NOAA [better] support Sea Grant:

Woeste – Thanks to Sally coming to talk to the Board.

Orbach – One of the issues with SG is that essentially all the funding goes outside of government (competition for internal needs) – having come from NGO, how do you see that?

Yozell – Think more funding could go outside. Lots of great activities going on in the regions. How bring some of the great stuff going on outside into NOAA to use? More pilot projects to create new ideas, developing cadres of innovative young thinkers within NOAA who have those connections to the outside.

Byrne – How can SG become more visible within NOAA? What frustrations do you see in other elements of NOAA that are not being satisfied? If SG knows what these are, then SG could better help.

Yozell – Still too new to NOAA to know the answer. Planning office hours with AAs, etc. to figure this out. Commit to keep tally to work with Leon to get this info back out to SG.

Stubblefield – Realize SG capabilities not utilized as fully as could be. With NOAA restructure, do you see an organizational answer to allow SG to be more fully utilized.

Yozell – think removing climate focus from OAR will help with this, allow program to work more closely with Chief Scientist / OAR AA – combination will allow SG to look more broadly across the agency

Rabalais – One of big Board issues under discussion is this divide between SG and NOAA as though SG is on the other side of some divide – know it's an issue, but not how to address it.

Yozell – lets try to crack that nut – big supporter of SG. Think emphasis on regional focus in last few years has been transformative. Interested in what Board thinks of this regional emphasis, and of NOAA moving towards a more regional focus?

Woeste – the Board will add that as a topic for more follow up discussion

Woeste – think it is a great initiative. May want to look at how each individual regional coordinator is approaching this – opinion is that some of these are working, and some are not.

Woeste – As look at new issues (spatial planning, social science competencies, etc.), what discussion has occurred about tapping expertise in academic institutions across the country, esp. for areas that address hot topics (sea level rise, etc.) that may involve expertise not currently reflected within NOAA?

Yozell – Looking at this currently –sent back feedback about how exactly to structure a new economist position, maybe an economist with addition individuals to provide social scientist report (i.e. emphasize that this is more than just economics)

Stubblefield – Issues of fiefdoms generally exist *outside* the beltway (as opposed to inside, where folks aim to work together), how is NOAA going to address this?

Yozell – With funding. The only way to incentivize people to do this is to have more cross-cutting / regional funding pots.

Yozell – would appreciate advice on how to bring gulf coast into picture on marine spatial planning.

Byrne – division of society into government, education, private sectors – only private sector creates wealth. SG connected to these other areas – any movement to strengthen connections in other areas of NOAA

Yozell – definitely talk of this, but haven't learned of any actual initiatives yet. Need more advice from private sector on what they need to do business better.

West – never really had private industry support in oceans. Really think NOAA has to step up and appreciate that / work on this partnership – the federal government is often looked at as just the regulatory part.

NOAA'S REGIONAL CLIMATE ENTERPRISE

E. Shea, Chief, Climate Services and Monitoring Division, NOAA National Climactic Data Center

- Presentation on Regional Climate Services – focus on regional, because that's where NOAA can be a keystone partner
- NOAA commits to providing critical assets in science and service to a Federal partnership – overview of NOAA's role in a new 'national' climate service
- NOAA Climate Service Proposal: vision (informed society anticipating and responding to climate and its impacts), mission (support decision makers regionally to globally at all time scales), goals (deliver sustained & effective services, promote partnerships, advance climate science)
- Overview of NOAA's role in a national strategy. Contributions at international, national and regional levels. State / local / regional level where most citizens will see NOAA's activities
- Shared Lessons: focus on integrated climate-society system, early & continuous partnership with users is essential, problem-focused approach, promote climate literacy and regular communication
- Importance of state, local & tribal engagement
- Remember that MOST adaptation decisions will be made at local, state and regional levels, and not at a national scale.
- 'Climate service pearl' – imagery for understanding NOAA Climate Service. Users are at the heart of this scheme, surrounded by 3 functional areas: regional climate products and services, regional climate science (modeling, research & assessment), state local and tribal climate services. Rings of other agency partners in all of these areas. Ultimately a national context for a regional climate service. See Sea Grant as a part of this in both the

research & services components. Does NOT distinguish between the NSGO and the State programs – all are Sea Grant, and Sea Grant is part of NOAA.

- For an example of how this would work, look to the Pacific Climate Information System. PaCIS as guide for NOAA implementing similar efforts in other regions. Many lessons leading to PaCIS have a Sea Grant origin. Sees Sea Grant as integral *NOAA* partner in a climate services effort.

DISCUSSION

Woeste – underlying principles resonate with this group

Orbach – think concept is fabulous. Adaptation to climate – 10% is science, rest is figuring out what to DO with it. And that requires a lot of non-science expertise. Question of relative amounts of resources applied to this area – how do you see this going forward?

Shea – agree with you. If look at climate budget in NOAA, heavily weighted to physical science. Part of answer is an equal level of commitment to the social aspect at the highest levels of the organization. Think it will take a WHILE to balance the resource investment. But will say that these activities are highlighted in budgets going forward. Matter of recognizing these needs, and establishing partnerships. In many ways climate service gives SG the doorway to get the physical science, but in a way are relying on SG to take that out to the community. There is a commitment to getting more resources to that part of the job.

West – concern that private industry has no answer to the question of 'who's in charge?' Outside the beltway – question of what is the role of the regional coordinator?

Shea – discussion of role of regional coordinator. Saying *right now* need someone in the regions focused on climate.

NOAA'S COASTAL ROLE IN NATIONAL CLIMATE SERVICES

M. Davidson, Director, NOAA Coastal Services Center

- FY2011: framing of ocean service priority plan for extreme events - $5m, $3m for CSC, $2M specifically for Sea Grant. Among the elements will do with this is continue to build on capabilities for building information that improves ecosystem and weather response forecasting , acquiring mapping & monitoring & socio-economic data for improved services.
- Related FY11 initiative – comparing coastal communities for climate hazards – focusing on making people aware of hazards and reducing our vulnerability to them
- Coastal and marine spatial planning
- Regional ocean governance program
- FY12 – actively working with Sea Grant to build on FY11 activities.

DISCUSSION

Woeste – Thanks to Margaret Davidson for the presentation.

Orbach – How do you see role of CSC developing over next few years in respect to NOAA / SG on these climate issues?

Davidson – climate service delivery, training delivery to SG folks, Feds provide national framework / guidelines / prototypes / etc. But efforts HAVE to occur at the local level. Encourage more regional planning, but like SG is already doing, NEED to get out and work directly with the communities.

Byrne – what, other than funding, is your greatest frustration?

Davidson – hoping will see new goal team structure – coastal folks scattered across NOAA, which is difficult. Expectation that FY11 is the best can hope for in FY12, since the FY12 budget comes out in advance of elections.

INTEGRATION OF NOAA COASTAL PROGRAMS

D. Kennedy, Deputy Assistant Administrator (Acting), National Ocean Service

- Overview of goals for NOS.
- Expecting more guidance from president with how to move forward on reports that have been submitted.
- NOS FY11 priorities: ocean policy task force; coastal & marine spatial planning; NOAA climate services; next generation strategic plan; renewed focus on science; respond to increased demand for NOS tools, products and services
- Waiting for Congress & OMB to ratify NOAA's proposed way ahead.
- Strengthening coastal/ocean focus: NOAA coastal strategy; NOAA's next generation strategic plan – includes new coastal goal. Important message: work has finally borne fruit, believe some of the budget formulation that has bypassed coastal efforts may now be more visible and at the table.
- Looking at budget formulation change in the FY12/13 time frame.
- Focus on coastal-climate nexus: NOAA climate science and service
- Assessing NOS coastal science: assessing the scale and scope of NOS science
- NOS-SG connections: capacity building and training; education; sustainable coastal communities [any time talk to Congress, mention coastal and they want to know how it will generate jobs]; coastal storms program. Already involved in all these, but can do a better job of coordinated activity.
- New opportunities: reshaping NOS Coastal Science.

DISCUSSION

Stubblefield – a few years ago made reference to OMB coordination requirement. Are these examples an outgrowth of this? Did you formally respond?

Kennedy – Did respond to OMB. 1st time got back 'do more', 2nd time got no response, so have moved on. But have received favorable feedback on role of coastal efforts

West – Reminder that board has extensive coastal expertise - offer that NOS has access to this Board for advice. Still think NOAA should utilize this Board as subset of SAB due to heavy coastal experience.

Kennedy – Have heard of this idea. Still struggling with where going with next generation strategic plan. Think coastal is going to stick. Takes this as a suggestion to look into. Think this group as stands without additional members isn't as comprehensive as would want for NOS.

Byrne – NOS is the national OCEAN service, haven't said much about ships / ship operations

Kennedy – in the existing system, had a commerce and transportation goal that addressed the naval side of the house. This has been under fire for a while. Question has been where IS the ocean, and is the ocean fish? Longer title is "great lakes, coasts & oceans." Struggling with how to raise the awareness of how the ocean intersects with this.

Woeste – Thanks Kennedy for his time, hopes for the discussion to continue in the future.

BIENNIAL REPORT COMMITTEE REPORT

J. Byrne, NSGAB

- Reminder that this Board is an independent group. And that charge on biennial report is to make independent evaluation of state of SG.
- All work conducted by conference call, email, etc.
- Message to network: know about SG strengths, but also need to know about failures, as these are the best opportunities to figure out ways to improve
- Committee consists of the members of the alignment team - Byrne (chair), West (co-chair), Woeste – along with Orbach and Pennock (SGA representative)
- Timeline: March 2010 - Board meeting, May 25-26 – writing session, June – draft circulated for comment, July – final draft, Mid-august – discuss and approve, Sept – report submitted to congress
- Provide draft report outline
- Need input on the nature of the report, draft outline, etc.

DISCUSSION

West – Consider this the most important thing for Sea Grant in near term. The message from the Hill is that a strong report can help them support Sea Grant. This will be the first outside, authoritative look at Sea Grant in a long time.

Byrne– Current report will serve as template for future reports, so want to get it right

West – NOAA should be informed now that this will be going directly to Congress and not up through the chop chain, though NOAA will be kept informed of the process.

Rabalais – We need to go forward with new information, not just keep repeating recommendations from old reports

Byrne – For this to be effective, it must be a short document

Stubblefield – The research committee report did some real data mining / survey / etc. Might want to look at some of these as a starting point – opportunity to ID areas where need to get more information.

Introduction of Frank Cushing (SGA government relations representative)

THE VIEW FROM OMB

S. Levenbach, Program Examiner, OMB

- Presented graph of Sea Grant budget versus NOAA Coastal programs – shows a rise in overall coastal programs while Sea Grant stayed flat. Rate of increase ~6% coastal, <1% for Sea Grant.
- What is the role of Sea Grant relative to other coastal programs – why congress investing in coastal but NOT in Sea Grant?
- Proportion of NOAA's budget spent on coastal programs has declined significantly. (Huge driver of NOAA budget rise is satellite programs)
- Sea Grant must quantitatively demonstrate performance for additional support in budget (direct line of sight from $ in budget to output). Ex performance measures:
    - Fish Stock sustainability index;
    - FY11 Marine Aquaculture Initiative (+$2.7M) – Q: how significant is the PM, and how will it be measured? Added sentence to initiative to address this. This is still difficult to see if this PM is feasible, and if it is worth the investment, etc.
    - Coastal Resilience Scorecard. First glance – skeptical of how do this, but provided clear method for obtaining this quantitative assessment
- Sea Grant must also find its niche within NOAA's coastal programs
- Sea Grant as locally relevant research and extension in support of economically and environmentally sustainable coastal communities.
- Late year R&D initiative from the Administration is part of why SG has additional funding this year.

<u>DISCUSSION</u>

Woeste – Board extends it's thanks for taking the time to meet with us.

Grau – Last time we meet, we talked about human resources, and that Sea Grant is a bit unique on this front within NOAA programs. Human resources is one thing Sea Grant can provide to NOAA but also across the coastal enterprise. If someone came in with research and demonstrated HR benefit from it, is that a positive Performance Measure for OMB?

Levenbach – Have seen interest from agency to try to develop particular expertise. Ultimately other priorities were chosen above that. If you look at real opportunities for growth, not sure human resources is a big driver unless it can be hung onto a big administrative issue. Office of Education has made this an important part of their strategic plan. Needs to be a way that brings multiple NOAA programs together – can't just be a SG program, needs to be tied in to other programs and provide compelling outcomes. In order for HR to be successful, need to

be NOAA wide with coordinated approach. Not saying this isn't important, but need to structure it to be able to out-compete other priorities.

Stubblefield – Reason for proliferation of coastal programs?

Levenbach – When a gap is perceived, interest on the Hill is to create new program rather than improve management of existing programs. Way to stop this is to provide a coordinated approach that will break down silos, show that NOAA has a program with the strengths to address the issues desired

Stubblefield – is the logical place for the forced integration at OMB?

Levenbach – This is challenging for us. Personally don't have expertise to direct how this is supposed to work – really needs to be done from the ground (agency) up. OMB has powerful tools, but they are blunt – not in a good position to implement these structural changes. Have received feedback from coastal programs with very different Performance Measures from the different programs, which indicates these are not very well coordinated

Cammen- In most recent case, correct that the effort wasn't coordinated – in large part because the programs only found out about it Christmas Eve, and NOAA required a very quick turnaround while most staff were on leave. However the programs are now coordinating efforts.

West- Until NOAA can show coordinated signals, OMB is going to think things aren't coordinated. NOAA needs to take responsibility for making sure information sent to OMB is coordinated (meaning NOAA needs to give line offices enough response time to actually be able to do this.)

Byrne – if OMB gives penalties for lack of coordination, is there subsequently an increase if this is remedied?

Levenbach – If we have seen this improvement, we can argue that these programs will be able to implement new administration priorities

Murray – There are a number of NOAA programs with climate service capabilities. Any comments generally on what OMB might be looking for from the climate services perspective?

Levenbach – This is an area that's evolving, especially the role of extension, which we see as critical in this area.

West – Give us 2-3 items needed in the upcoming biennial report that would be helpful to OMB

Levenbach – Let me get back to you on that. One thing that would really help, would be a budget request that integrates SG into NOAA's other missions. If the budget doesn't show support for a particular program, appropriators have difficulty supporting it.

Orbach – Do you look any differently at programs that fair better on the Hill than in their own agency?

Levenbach – There are a number of programs like that. To a certain extent, when we add or cut funding, we do look to previous enacted levels for various programs – disparities between enacted and requested amounts do influence funding decisions. When the recent Research

& Development initiative came through, we definitely looked to the Hill to make decisions about what to do with the funding.

Byrne – Would the budget be increased for NOAA activities if climate activity was added to NOAA so it was NOCAA?

Levenbach – Part of the strategy for rolling this out within the Administration is that this is just a restructuring / management exercise to better manage existing activities. Thinks adding climate to NOAA's title would cause issues with other Federal Agencies.

BOARD BUSINESS

- Discuss need to update the Charter and the Board manual. Hope to have these ready for adoption at Fall meeting

NSGO REPORT

L. Cammen

Changes in NOAA

- Dynamic time – mostly triggered by the reorganization for climate service, but has cascading effects. 2 initiatives: 1 – create climate service, 2 – strengthen NOAA Science
- Slide of existing OAR org chart. Funding wise, loss of climate items about cuts OAR in half. Ocean programs make up ~2/3 of remaining.
- Engagement (Murray): came in 1998 – NOAA not doing a terrific extension job, lots to learn from USDA. In 2000 initiated Byrne report to get ahead of request for external review. Had some success pushing these ideas from NOAA. At some point VAdm. Lautenbacher went to SAB and they committed to another Extension report – that report included extensive Sea Grant involvement. In later presentation, Winer will present on how NOAA has addressed the recommendations in this report to change the culture of NOAA. On extension front, NOAA has made a radical change in the last 12 years.
- Executive Committee for Engagement (ECE) – response to SAB report. Along with NOAA Extension and training Service (NETS), gives NOAA better ability to organize capacity to engage the public. Now need to take it to the next level. Created new structures, but without dedicating any resources to them – just asked busy people to take on one more task.
- Sea Grant's role in Climate: Sea Grant network climate synthesis; eight 'climate engagement' mini grants; Charleston workshop; RISA extension pilot; COMET training modules; member regional climate team; SBIR renewable energy; Coastal community climate adaptation initiative
- Next Generation Strategic Plan – 4 Goals: climate adaptation & mitigation, weather resilience, sustainable coastal communities and economies, sustainable and resilient fisheries, species and habitats. The Plan should be out for public comment soon – looking to be final by June

Budget Overview

- FY2009 – $55M.
- FY2010 - $63M (include $4.8M aquaculture, $2M Aquatic Invasive Species, $1M coastal community climate adaptation. Note that AIS and aquaculture were line items outside of Sea Grant in previous years.) All 2009 omnibii already out – marked improvement from previous years, in part due to presence of Grants Specialist physically located part of the time within the office.
- FY2011 – Presidents request $62.5M. $7.4M over last year's request of $55.1M. $1M Aquatic Invasive Species, $4.3M aquaculture. $2M community hazards assistance (emphasis on coastal community climate adaptation.)
- FY2010 Budget Highlights & New Activities . New Activities: Aquatic Invasive Species, Aquaculture, climate adaptation. Regional climate engagement mini-grants. Regional research plans.
- 2010-11 Aquatic Invasive Species Regional Strategic Investment (RSI). 3 year regional projects. Integrated research, outreach, education. National performance measures. $400K per project + $200K match. $3-4M in 2010-2011. With matching funds, a 2 year total of $4.5-6M. This is one of Sea Grant's first *regional* strategic investment competitions.
- 2010-2012 Aquaculture National Strategic Investment (NSI). 3 year awards. Two pools of funding: Extension ($1.6M fed) for new staff & extension projects; Research ($3.2M fed) for 'smart design' approaches to aquaculture, tools or approaches to siting of facilities, research on the social and economic issues associated with current and new marine aquaculture. National performance measures. With matching funds, a 3 year total of $7.2M for extension and $14.4M for research. Learning from Fish Extension - if proposal is to hire new staff, need to proved clear transition plan for what happens after 3 years.
- 2010-11 Coastal Community Climate Adaptation Initiative (CCCAI). $1M in 2010, $2M in 2011. FY 2010 – rapid response, community-based demo projects in each Sea Grant state. Proposals for 2010 funds due May 1 for projects to be completed in time for discussion at Sea Grant week. Logical extension of Sustainable coastal community development (SCCD). Panels 2006 SCCD evaluation recognized its success & called for increased funding. CCCAI represents first significant enhancement.
- Questions from the Board about tightness of time frame. Reason for quick time frame: want to demonstrate can create national program from local initiatives. Want to be able to use results presented at Sea Grant Week to justify future funding. Recognize this will constrain some of the ways these things are addressed.

NSGO Annual Review (January 2010)

- Positively received from Sea Grant network and NOAA. Review intended for informational purposes. Follow up from review.

Site Visits

- Site Visits are intended to review the following: program management and organization, stakeholder engagement, collaborative network / NOAA activities. Chaired by Federal Program Officer. The site visit team is NOT rating the program – this is not a competitive assessment. Site visit reports go to the Program and the NSGO. Site Review Teams (SRT) will spend NO MORE than 1.5 days with program. Additional ½ day to draft report.

Performance Review Panel (9/2011)

- Reviewing programs overall impact. Primarily evaluated against their own plans, though will look at relative performance. Panel includes Board members as well as external experts. Members form 5 working groups according to expertise – evaluate performance of all programs in their focus area based on the 4 year plans. Programs receive separate rating for each focus area, weighted by resources dedicated to that area. Initial PRP cover impacts since 2008.

Focus Teams

- Goal to tell telling a national story. Deliverables: national impacts & synthesis stories.
- These will be used in State of Sea Grant Report, media, NOAA, climate portal, local media, web, Program use, etc. Critical step for positioning program as a national player.

Information Management System & Website

- Queried the network last fall as to needs, and generated an ambitious set of requirements. After collation and review, a list of high level requirements were sent to network. Priority tasks include: user-friendly look & feel; ability to enter PIE requirements (including impacts), ready for annual reports (due July 30, 2010)
- Network Advisory Council (NAC) – help design metrics for whole network. Metrics development beginning this month. Continued input of NAC and Network is vital.
- Website – revising this to make it more user-friendly. Intention to have graphical google-map user interface for input from the Address book

Advisory Board

- NSGO staff will be presenting on the response to Board Reports.
- Upcoming items on the Agenda: State of Sea Grant; Allocation of funds (tomorrow).
- Need names / nominations for new members.

CHAIR AND PAST CHAIR REPORT

J. Woeste & D. West, NSGAB

Alignment Review

- 3 board members sat down with staff when strategic plans came in and matched them up against the national plan. Estimate 80-85% had no problems, a few needed tweaking, and a few had big problems.
- Thin state programs now get that they HAVE to be matched up with the national plan.
- Can now lay out some documents and there is a track from funding and intentions to outcomes at the local level.

Hill Meetings

- General acceptance and appreciation of Sea Grant - had good meetings across the board.
- Raised idea of NSGAB providing more general coastal advice to the broader NOAA community.
- Working to set up meeting with Sec. Locke.

SGA REPORT

G. Grau, President, SGA

State of Sea Grant

- Organization as strong as it has ever been. Sympathetic and supportive Administration and Congress. Thoughtful, astute and committed board. More collegial than ever. Strong relationships with NSGO and NSGAB.
- Climate. Report "Sea Grant's Role in Understanding and Preparing for Climate Change along America's Coasts" (Paul Anderson with assistance from Mary Donohue). Sent to NOAA Administrator and OAR AA. Report hailed as "very timely" and "what OAR needs to do." So where does SG fit?
- Met with Margaret Cummisky. Old perceptions of Sea Grant are disappearing: "Sea Grant has a vision…its partnerships are working…networking is helping to advance new opportunities." Awaiting details on the Climate Service reorganization and how it will impact programs, activities and people. OAR can focus on high risk / high return research. Pass along request to Senator Inouye for SG Week. The President's increase in the Sea Grant budget attributed to OMB's better understanding of Sea Grant. Effort on this front by numerous individuals, but extend a special "Thank You" to Dick West for his efforts. Interested in seeing the results of the human resources study.
- NOAA Administrator Annual Guidance Memo. Validation of the Sea Grant Mission and Focus Areas. Alignment of NOAA and our university programs. The AGM either derives from Sea Grant programmatic paradigms at national, regional and state levels or is convergent upon the directions that we have developed and pursued for a number of years.
- Sea Grant's contribution to National Priorities: a proven record in applying the resources of America's Universities to national issues. Important provider of human resources to NOAA, government (including coastal management agencies), and to public and private NGOs. Important contributor of science.
- NOAA Workforce Survey (assisted by Mary Donohue and Craig McClean). Went up through NOAA – going out next week or so to get feedback on how much of NOAA workforce has a Sea grant background.
- NSGCP Peer-refereed publications: 1990-2009 - productivity is relatively flat. Graph of these shows a drop off in last few years, which is a reporting (as opposed to actual) problem.

- 2010 could be “breakthrough” year, but challenges remain. Federal, state and local budget problems. Important to address OMB’s wish for integration of NOAA’s coastal programs – need to both do something and to be perceived as doing something. Important to engage proactively, not reactively, with NOAA in preparing for reorganization and development of the “climate service” and a redefined OAR.
- What we need to do. Seek increased funding for research: research is the principal vehicle for graduate education. Now more than ever, coastal America needs integrated physical, social, design and engineering sciences. Stress that we are national network distributed locally and acting regionally and nationally. Continue collaboration, with open channel of communication and consensus building throughout network and with NSGO, OAR, NSGAB. Stay “on message” with congress – we are helping the *people* who live in the coastal areas. Communicate that we connect the unparalleled resources of America’s universities to NOAA’s mission and to the benefit of our nation’s coasts.
- Upcoming Events: SGA conference call in April / May due to snow-out of February meeting. Many delegates rescheduled Cap Hill visits for March. Frank Cushing coordinated meetings with House and Senate Appropriations staff (cancelled due to snow, looking to reschedule.) SG leadership meeting – proactive stance on reorganization of NOAA / OAR. New AA for OAR? Coordination among leadership for SG week. Pursuit of new opportunities (eg coastal tourism). Planning continues for SG week - NOAA Administrator Lubchenco scheduled to speak, Senators Inouye and Landrieu invited.
- Clarify that SG Week is aimed at the entire SG Network, with between 300-400 individuals in attendance, with lots of presentations, trainings, etc.

NSGO Responses to recent NSGAB Reports

Communications
A. Painter, NSGO

- #1: Recommendation to look at technology options to increase efficiency. Moving in that direction. Hosted 80+ conference calls last year to reduce travel. Also utilizing web based meeting technologies. Run SBIR through WebEx. Also tried some video conferencing – met with limited success. Are limited by some federal restrictions to make this stuff work. Give lots of credit to John and Mike for social media sites, and getting these hosted by network since we are unable to host them directly.
- #2: Recommendation that we hire 2nd communications position. Unfortunately with staffing resource limits, we are unable to do this at this point. Are finding some work arounds: utilizing Knauss fellows, working with new public affairs staffer Linda Joy, working with SG Communicators network to develop national stories / impacts – welcome ideas from Board as to how best to market these stories

- #3: Recommendation that the Director engage in personal visits to SG programs. Both the Director and Deputy Director will be attending a number of the site visits
- #4: Recommendation to engage SG Fellow. As mentioned, utilizing Focus Team Fellows in this capacity. But not able to take on 3rd fellow to work specifically on communications, in part because Fellows need to focus on programmatic (rather than administrative) work
- #5: Friends of SG. Don't think this was directed at NSGO. Agree that this would be very useful, but not appropriate for NSGO to commission this.
- #6: Think this recommendation is directed towards Advisory Board as opposed to NSGO. NOAA policy and editorial guidelines encourage brevity in national / regional focus. If it doesn't have national / regional emphasis, than it won't go out the door.
  Woeste – cuts both ways – work done by Universities needs to be highlighted as coming from them, can't erase ID of folks who did the work.
  Byrne – one of the things we've aimed to do is make NOAA more aware of SG – suggest might start to get some different mileage out of this if instead of 'State' Sea Grant, it was NOAA supporting X university. Follow up discussion later.
- #7: Review of past reports. We still use the Whitman plan – still relevant. Given resource limitations, feel resources better directed at moving forward. (Have responded to all past recommendations – have enacted ones NSGO felt could take on under resource & other limitations.)
- #8: Starting this, would welcome input from the Board on this effort. National messaging is a group effort.
- #9: NIMS. Working with SGA's advisory council on this.

Research
D. Carlson, NSGO

- In general, recommendations cover 5 areas: interaction with NOAA leadership from program managers and up; helping programs maintain, improve & sell research partnerships; helping programs find ways to maintain strength and quality of research portfolios in face of budget constraints; promoting SG to universities and NOAA; removing unnecessary administrative burdens.
- #1: Leadership of NOAA – put together team to look at national focus of SG and specifically research portfolio. Agree this would be good idea. Have done a lot of work to address national focus of SG. Too early to say we're done, so strategy of response is to keep doing this. Not working on task force specifically – NOAA is currently working on looking at this – whatever they find, we will apply to SG.
- #2; help NOAA find better ways to utilize strengths of SG. Agree that this is important, and we are trying to do what we can to help this happen.
- #3: SG develop more meaningful partnerships with NOAA labs and improve communications. Agree this is appropriate effort. Current NSI's have actively tried to

focus on areas of interest within NOAA – develop FFO in conjunction with other NOAA programs to get proper priorities. Make case that the shift of funding to SG doesn't mean not doing NOAA focused work.

- #4: NSGO be more aggressive in promoting contribution of SG. This is done currently.
- #5: value of regional partnerships. To us this reads as recommendation to state programs.
- #6: NSGO agrees
- #7-#8: deal with budget constraints.
- Discussion by Board members of lack of response to the information in the Appendices of the report, which were rationale for the recommendations. Clarification that the NSGO was not asked to respond to appendices. Suggestion by Board to wait and see how the new OAR organization shakes out / how the strategies suggested work out over the next year.

Futures – J. Murray, NSGO

- Pilot projects in Climate Adaptation. Let's discuss major issues:
  - Concern about time constraints of only 6 months –
  - Concern about having a link to the strategic approach –
- Liffmann – many shovel ready projects;
- Harris – concerned projects will not be part of a long term response; maybe providing an example in the information sent out to programs; this will help be one overall project; ideas that come out might be for micro-project; show how would go to a bigger future idea.
- Cammen – think we are talking language problem; think there was enough buzz words; trying to guide folks in that direction; maybe sending out ideas or for examples.
- Murray – should we ask for a discrete step one;
- Byrne – one or two page pre-proposal, then if on target, ask for a full proposal. Saves SG programs and NSGO time.
- Cammen – was going to give example in the SGA conference call on Friday. We want to demonstrate something for a National project. We only want a one page proposal.
- Nancy – 3 pages, ok 2 pages. Some might not work, some will work.
- Cammen – we will take group of experts to form a national group of experts that other programs can tap into.
- Woeste – could programs bring in someone with expertise to bring a program along?
- Simmons – first steps is the biggest problem for many communities/
- Murray – Mike/Leon/Murray – take a shot a rewording to capture ideas and run by Futures committee members.
- Stubblefield – have to be careful with reviews.
- Cammen – this $1 million is going into the merit pool. Will stay in the merit pool in FY11.

Knauss Recommendations – M. Lugo, NSGO

- Update briefing book with the final version of the SG Knauss response
- Work with Gordon on SG Knauss alumni stories

- Promoting "shadowing" of other fellows to learn what each other is doing
- Field trips – not for now

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10
Attendance: Rabalais and Birkholz not present

Call to Order, review of Agenda

THE VIEW FROM THE HILL
K. Sarri, US Senate Committee on Commerce, Science & Transportation

- Committee has jurisdiction over ocean policy issues. This congress, theme took up is the idea of the blue economy – value of ocean and coastal communities to economies.
- Holding hearings on this, and on national ocean policy.
- For us (Cantwell, Snowe), this means starting with a strong NOAA
- Framework on spatial and marine planning has come out since this hearing
- Unsure how ocean policy will come about, but there is a focus on it
- Despite attention given to this issue, not being backed up by the budget – this is of concern. As look at addressing major ocean issues, putting a lot of mandates / responsibilities on people, but without backing it up with the necessary resources

DISCUSSION

Byrne – Every administration wants a new ocean policy. What do you see as elements of a national policy? Perspective that there has been a real evolution in regards to what an ocean policy is.

Sarri – That was one reason to hold the hearing – to ask this question of what are the guiding areas. I think starts at the federal level with a strong agency dedicated to working on these issues. Acknowledge importance of these issues (supportive of organic act for NOAA within Commerce). Whatever we decide for this policy, needs to be concrete .

West – Personal opinion is that it is going to take congressional action to make ocean policy happen

Sarri – Agree. There are a few challenges: Even though wealth from oceans and communities on coasts, don't get a lot of traction on senate side for ocean issues. Up until 3-4 years ago, got a lot of work done through unanimous consent, now have republican steering committee, no unanimous consent, so every bill requires significant time on the floor. If you don't have a block of voices calling for action, it is very difficult to bring a bill for action. Part of why pick up blue economy theme, to get folks to understand they are impacted by coastal issues even if they don't live near them. Also trying to do drum beat for budget support of NOAA. Other effort to do better on this is to get Administration to bring bills to us. Concerning that a little over a year into presidency, and haven't seen one bill transmitted from the Administration.

Orbach – sense that good management schemes exist - the challenge is putting everything together. Don't see good chance of congressional action on this. Sense that folks are waiting to see what comes out of these administrative initiatives.

Sarri – agree folks are sitting back to see what happens. One good thing about administrative initiative is whole idea of regional partnerships, although there is a little concern around regional partnerships. A lot of work needs to be happening at local level, but no clear idea about what regional grants will look like. If get the funding, who will it go out to, how assess it was successful, since not in existing programs, how know it is working, etc? Concern about building up expectations, not supporting it with resources, and ultimately winding up in a worse position.

Stubblefield – agencies came together on climate for common message – has this been done with oceans?

Sarri – trying to, but not there yet.

Sarri – issue with America Competes bill being limited to physical science and not include NOAA – 'blue collar' science – need education to get a better understanding of what NOAA is / does

Stubblefield –mention difficult to get heartland democrats to buy into ocean policy. A few years ago effort to ID hooks – is this still being pursued?

Sarri – yes.

Woeste – thanks from Board for speaking.

FOCUS TEAM LIAISON REPORTS

Safe & Sustainable Seafood Supply

J. Murray, NSGO (for R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

- Energy use in fisheries symposium (spurred by high cost of fuel). Currently putting together International symposium in Seattle in November, 2010
- Working on issue of 'Local catch'
- Input of focus team in development of aquaculture NSI. Team put together subcommittee that provided report to Leon on how to spend this funding
- National impact & synthesis stories – grouped into 5 cateogires (education/outreach; spatial planning' minimize bycatch mortality and …..)

Sustainable Coastal Communities

R. Heath, NSGAB

- In good shape at beginning because of previous SCCD initiative
- Efforts will be augmented by coastal communities climate adaptation initiative
- Extension – strong. Research & Education less so. No new financial incentives, no tradition of multi-state collaboration, social science hiatus at NSGO. May want to focus on pushing multi-state efforts.

- Leadership changes: Mike Liffman → social scientist (new hire), John Jacob → Vicky Carrusco, Josh Brown (Knauss Fellow) → Lisa Adams (Knauss Fellow)
- Overview: (1) balancing working waterfronts and coastal dependent uses with other development concerns; (2) community sustainability (defining carrying capacity, alternative energy and resource conservation to meet this, importance of management and policies to meet needs); (3) building local capacity for sustainable decision making.
- What issues should FT highlight nationally?
- What are we missing? Research on economic impacts of working waterfront and SG's impact; carrying capacity research (need for pilot projects); not taking full advantage of university SCD expertise (architecture, planning, econ.); National successes not yet being propagated (documented?); need clear communication WITHIN network; climate change adaptation/mitigation
- Where are we going? Marine spatial planning (15 stories – 11 programs); watershed planning (20/30 new staff); sustainable planning for limiting resources (e.g. water, open space, energy); alternative energy/conservation; ….
- Deliverables?
- Potential action steps: national technical support panel; convene partners to develop land use database; coastal development indicators; 'translate' climate change information

DISCUSSION

- In past areas of focus, Sea Grant has been big player (ex. commercial fishing); with some of these climate change issues, SG will be much smaller player since these are such big issues. SG will need to focus on partnerships / linkages
- West – do we WANT SG to be go-to place for adaptation to coastal climate change?
- Cammen – that may be over-reaching, but yes – along those lines.
- West – if so, then this should be verbalized as a goal
- Cammen – that is where we're going. Small fish in big pond – recast as small fish in barren lake. There is tremendous need that is NOT being met – not that we are out there competing with others.
- Orbach – think this could be reald opportunity to grow SG, but if we do that, have to SAY we are doing that, and budget needs to dramatically increase to accommodate this.
- Simmons – demonstrate how this is already happening
- Harris – important issue isn't to have these experts in SG already, *BUT* the ability of SG extension to pull these outside experts in to discussions / work on the issue

Hazard Resilient Communities – J. Byrne, NSGAB

- Discussion of coastal issues and threats to coastal communities. Discussion of National Sea Grant Center for hazard resilient coastal communities – provide education and training for officials / local folks.
- List activities / recommendations

- Need to determine social & economic impacts of these. Thing often overlooked is psychological implications of hazard threats
- Results of annual meeting: a # of stories being picked up in 5 areas
- A number of other agencies also recognize these problems, and are beginning to work on solutions – partnership issues critical here

NOAA CLIMATE SERVICE
M. Glackin, Deputy Under Secretary
BACKGROUND FOR NOAA CLIMATE SERVICE

- Huge demand for climate information. How does NOAA adjust to meet this demand?
- Cite multiple internal & external reports related to climate services
- To meet the rising demand for climate services, NOAA move from climate research focus to a framework that better meets needs for climate service products
- Challenge is to take this on while maintaining leadership in research & observations

VISSION, MISSION, GOALS AND OPERATIONS CONCEPTS

- Vision: informed society anticipating and responding to climate and its impacts (exs: flood ready community, prepared for weather extremes, renewable / green energy information, supporting private sector industry as happened with weather service, enhancing national security)
- Mission statement: inform mitigation and adaptation decisions needed to respond to the impacts of a changing climate. Support decision makers regionally to globally on every time scale. (This will be revised to reflect science / research mission)
- Goals: continue to build, evaluate and evolve NOAA's Core competencies in 3 key areas: deliver sustained & effective services; promote partnerships; advance climate science
- NOAA's role in National Strategy: NOAA provide information internationally, nationally and regionally. NOAA recognized as leader among international community
- NOAA commits to providing critical assets in science and service to a Federal partnership. Climate observations & monitoring →climate change research and modeling → assessments of climate change and impacts → information delivery and decision support
- NOAA Climate service leadership (areas where we are the main center of federal expertise): living marine resources & ecosystems; coastal regions; water
- NOAA's enabling contributions to climate services: energy, transportation, agriculture, health. Expect this list to grow. While these are 'sectors', they are not neatly delineated – lots of overlap
- Federal regional climate service enterprise: connecting science, services and people.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROPOSAL

- Design criteria for NOAA's reorganization:
    - Goal 1: establish a climate service: establish climate leadership; enhance climate program coordination; promote user engagement on climate

    - Goal 2: strengthen NOAA Science: establish science leadership; enhance cross line science coordination and engagement
    - Goal 3: implement the Administrations' priorities: promote efficient implementation and operation; position NOAA to meet current and future challenges to NOAA's critical mission functions and long term strategy
- Proposed NOAA Climate Service / Science Serving Society
- Bulk of resources to create climate come from OAR. Slide of what is left in OAR.
- Looking at how to deal with these items, and also how it should look going forward. Currently have a tally – will probably look different when submit actual reprogramming package

STRENGTHENING SCIENCE

- NOAA's Science: innovation through integration
- Looking to have more top level direction on focus of scientific effort
- Focus on need to understand linkages of social and natural systems. Need for a more holistic approach.
- Engage NOAA's science leaders and partners to strengthen NOAA Science: support NOAA's Scientists and Science Leaders; Strengthen NOAA Labs and Science Centers; Enhance Science partnership programs

NEXT STEPS

- Continued engagement with partners and stakeholders to develop implementation plans
- Recruitment of regional climate leads May /June
- Evolution of climate portal
- Submission of a reprogramming package to Congress in Summer; implementation target for October 2010
- NOAA Science workshop – may occur this summer, though may get pushed back
- For more information: www.noaa.gov/climate; climateservice@noaa.gov; www.climate.gov

DISCUSSION

Harris – have served on NRC panel, clear that huge bulk of adaptation will fall on local governments. Hope that NOAA recognize that SG Extension service is one of greatest assets for dealing at this scale and transmitting NOAA information to these local decision makers.

Glackin – couldn't agree more. Anyone dealing with climate change is also dealing with other stressors & problems, so we need to deliver information in an integrated way. We already have SG out there talking to folks / understanding their problems, so we really need SG in understanding the regional science, and Extension out there transmitting results back.

Stubblefield – why some labs left in OAR (ex wet labs) which have as much to do with climate change as some of the ones that came out?

Glackin – rationale for that is that we do NOT have a centralized focus enough on ecosystem research, so even though labs have strong climate work, left to provide building block for this focus on ecosystems science

Stubblefield – proliferation of coastal programs – on the net positive, or is this dilution of resources?

Glackin – NOAA hasn't yet taken the steps it needs to take – some other problems (satellite, etc.) have drawn attention away. Reauthorization of CZA could help with this. So programs developed for good reasons, but NOAA is fragmented.

West – raise issue of NOAA exclusion from America Competes Act. Is leadership of NOAA aware of this / weighing in?

Glackin – argument being made now is that this has to be kept to physical science (so push back on this). Through America Competes that NOAA gets broad authorities for Education, which we MUST keep. But Board efforts on this are encouraged.

West – President's letter on investment and research historically not mentioned NOAA, this should be addressed.

Glackin – think it's going to be VERY hard to get plus ups in 2012.

West – more than plus-ups, this is about long term education of policy makers about role of NOAA.

Grau - understand rationale of keeping reorganization neat and clean, but could be good opportunity to think about how Sea Grant best serves US citizens, how it best advances NOAA's mission, etc. Would like SGA to be part of what is considered as this moves ahead.

Glackin – very welcome of any written input.

ENGAGED AT LAST: REVITALIZING NOAA EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

A. Winer, Director of NOAA External Affairs

- Position had been allowed to wither – trying to revitalize this office within NOAA.
- Looking Back: 2008 SAB Working Group on Engagement provided comprehensive set of recommendations for how NOAA can improve in this area (indictment of current activities)
- Agency Response: extensive review of document; Dec 2008 - engagement strategy; September 2009 - detailed written response. But lack of central galvanizing point within agency.
- Question of how things change under new administration: embracing engagement. White House renamed Office Public Liaison to the "office of public engagement and intergovernmental affairs."
- Strategic approach: come up with ability to knit together existing efforts so folks are working together. Put together in set of recommendations "Revitalizing NOAA External Affairs"
- Did inventory of the tool box – determine what products and strategies exist to promote common agency-wide messages
- Key Actions: significant expansion of the NOAA Regional Collaboration framework as an engagement network at the local level; agency-wide engagement training program to be established in 2010; coordination of outreach, communications, education via the

ECE, Constituent Affairs Network, Communications Committee and Regional Teams; evaluating the impact of engagement by monitoring the NOAA Climate Portal, Facebook, and using the Kellog rubric; Executive Committee On Engagement meetings (SG represented there); Best practices reviewed regularly; engagement added to SES annual performance plans (15%); in process of setting up central customer relations management system; funded series of regional pilot or demo projects with partners – NOAA mini grants: FY10 were SG focused projects; full implementation of NOAA External Affairs Plan adopted by NOAA Leadership

- Strengthening External Affairs: create career Deputy Director of External Affairs and add staff – institutionalize this position, so career position; customer relations system (Database); support for exhibits program; expanding NOAA Speakers Bureau; External Affairs web site; integrated and strategic approach to communications, intersecting with education, line offices, extension, regional teams; agency-wide planning for engagement
- Current staff structure - 9 people (database admin currently vacant)
- Vision: provide communications policy input; organize stakeholder meetings and events; identify potential problems and develop proactive strategies; deploy leadership to events and engagement opportunities; interact with others in DOC and Fed family; develop engagement elements in AGM priorities; link and communicate constituent positions to NOAA priorities
- Philosophy and Mission: Evolve into a creative force within NOAA that markets the people behind our science, service and stewardship missions; be the incubator for creative ideas that will inform the public and stakeholders; develop strategic partnerships and outreach efforts that will help our constituents feel that they are co-owners of the enterprise as well as the missions and goals of the organization; be responsive to stakeholder needs and convey their input to NOAA leadership

DISCUSSION

Harris – NOAA has never realized asset of SG and SG extension service – not even always recognized as part of NOAA. suggestions for ways to build / develop that relationship.

Winer – invitation back to this group, lets figure out how to get together to figure this out

Harris – when SG issues press release about initiatives, NOAA often deletes mention of university and often of SG – this detracts from the partnership

West – one of problems OMB has is that they bring program over but without identifying partners. External Affairs needs to get involved with budget process, and keep partners identified.

Winer – didn't emphasis it, but were involved in budget process

Byrne – auspicious time – seeing better integration of SG activities with NOAA agenda. Value of SG extension – not a substitute for what NOAA needs, but an adjunct. NOAA has arcane structure, and solutions to different problems come from different areas.

Orbach – way to get funding to address specialized needs outside the beltway?

Winer – unlikely to be more funding, but working at regional level to get folks who can meet some of those needs. However this is one of the areas in need of attention

Orbach – some benefit to retraining individuals to take on additional requirements, but at certain point need to dedicate specific funding for specific resources

Winer – will be assessing this, especially as requests for help come up from the regions. Part of conversation that still needs to take place between HQ and regions.

UPDATED ALLOCATION OF FUNDS POLICY: A CHARGE TO THE BOARD

L. Cammen, Director, NSGCP

- When SG started, only 5 programs, and they were 5 major oceanographic institutions. Idea that as SG expanded, bring in universities from other states. At beginning there was no assumption of only one program / state. Over time brought in additional programs, but the growth in funding didn't occur at the same rate. Result: more programs = less resources / program. Over time allocation of base funding to programs has grown out of a series of complex decisions: peer review, competition, etc. Sea Grant is at the point now where it is striking that some programs are significantly larger than others. This is a problem without a solution- there is no single 'best' answer.
- Bottom line: ALL programs are underfunded.
- New legislation in 1998 set up performance based funding allocation. At that time reviewed process for allocating funding – not just between funding, but between programs v. national initiatives etc.
- Generation of an initial allocation of funds policy in 2003. As did this, 2002 legislation came out with mandate for competitive awards. Policy had 4 areas for funding: programs base, merit funding based on performance, national strategic investments (now includes regional), national program development. Report said should review this strategy prior to the next reauthorization, which did not happen.
- 2008 reauthorization looks slightly different. No longer says award funding based on rankings, but still needs to be based on performance. What this means is all programs can be operating at the top level – remove need for fine gradations among great work.
- Other issue is size of the various programs. Getting to the point (inflation, stable funding), where there are programs that are on the edge of viability – there is a minimum funding size below which a program is simply not effective.
- It is time to go back and revisit the allocation policy. Time to take a real look about how we are allocating funds, not just amongst programs, but to these other initiatives.
- Last time Sea Grant did this, it was set up and mandated by the Director – not a Board Activity. Preference now is to do this as a charge to the Board to get advice on this issue.

DISCUSSION

Stubblefield – may want to consider a more regional approach as opposed to state programs. Not suggesting SHOULD do this, but may need to consider this under current funding regime.

Suggest give hard look at difficult questions beyond just allocation of funds. And SGA would need to be integral partner with this.

Cammen – agree. Have sent around draft charge. Built into this is that it is open ended. When I talk about allocation of funding, it includes these considerations – don't HAVE to continue with current operating model. However, the bigger the change, the more justification is needed and the more push back will result. Hope to have draft in place by SG week, with final version by Spring meeting 2011.

Woeste - Director asking to charge Board with reviewing this. Ask Board to review charge, and decide whether to accept charge or not. Also address Directors proposal for procedure to move forward – let by the Board with 2 Board, 2 NSGO, 2 SGA.

West – clarification that 2nd bullet means looking for a plan that provides sufficient funding for any plan suggested.

Byrne – this committee will provide advice as to what they believe the right policy to be, but policy decisions are up to the program director.

Stubblefield – well served to expand make up to include someone from NOAA.

Cammen – as part of last reauthorization, legislation explicitly gives the Board the right to set up subcommittees without restrictions on membership.

Orbach – not comfortable accepting this until clear on a few more items. No time to go out to constituents by Oct. If this is envisioned as a thought exercise, then should bring a number of alternatives to the Oct. meeting, then move forward from there in a consensus building exercise, aiming for some final recommendation by the spring – would be more comfortable with this.

Cammen – that sounds very much like what had in mind. Think asking a lot to come in with a single recommendation by Oct – had imagined there might be a couple of different options. Reminder: the more we change things, higher the bar to actually make it happen.

Orbach – intended that Board lead this exercise – what does that mean?

Woeste – chair of committee would be Board member. Board Chair appoints Committee Chair.

West – totally support this. However need to be concerned that this not preempt the new PIE process.

Byrne – motion is to accept the charge. Think should respond one way or another to requests from Director – think this is appropriate charge. Think should accept this, but not necessarily agree to accept the Implementation suggestion.

Stubblefield – See the 1st objective as pretty straightforward. But #2 is more complicated.

Orbach – timing as presented here, go public with this discussion in middle of PIE process – wonder if this create more consternation than necessary – need to think about whether this is an issue

Cammen – not looking for system to evaluate performance

West- consider pulling bullet #2?

Vortmann – the Board has the option to consider whatever the want from what we are charged with

Stubblefield – removing item #2 limits the scope of the study.

MOTION to accept the task, allowing for future tweaking to the charge. (Simmons, Heath - 2nd). MOTION CARRIES, not quite unanimous. (motion passes the idea of doing this.)

OTHER BOARD BUSINESS / FOLLOW UP ACTION ITEMS

UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS

- Summer 2010 Board Meeting.
  MOTION to change proposed meeting in RI to a publicly advertised conference call (Simmons, Orbach)). No discussion. Unanimous aye.
- SG week, New Orleans, Oct 14-20
  - Suggest Sat 16th / Sun 17th for Board meeting
  - Think in terms of full day on sat and sun AM – all network meetings will be sun PM
  - Sat PM will be concurrent sessions for SG week
  - **Carry over resolution for Manny Hernandez until SG week**
- Spring 2011 meeting
  - Set for March 8-9, 2011 (Tue-Wed). Leaning towards a meeting in DC, but final location to be decided at a future point.

NOAA AS A SCIENCE BASED AGENCY

- **MOTION – Board Approve chairman write memo that relays sense of Board of NOAA as a Science based service agency. Send up the line through NOAA with copy to Kris Sari (Woeste, Byrne). All Ayes.**

FUTURES COMMITTEE

- Harris to send 1 paragraph synopsis of Futures Committee Report to Woeste to transmit to Mary Glackin.
- West – Futures committee report was very useful and helpful, but need a follow up document that does not give impression that this is a request for money. **MOTION to continue Futures Committee in its efforts to further define the role of Sea Grant in NOAA's mission (West, Harris). All ayes.**
- Stubblefield – current future committee is definite as Board as a whole – are we generating a sub committee? Yes. **Woeste will appoint sub committee.** Thinking 3 people, would appreciate volunteers, as well as for the Budget allocation issue.
- Suggestions for members of Futures sub-committee: representative from SGA and Eileen's office – proposal for this to be Grau and Eileen. Additional Board members include Orbach and Heath.

RESOLUTION FOR DICK WEST

Whereas: During the past 2 years the National Sea Grant Advisory Board has contributed significantly to securing the enactment of the Sea Grant Act of 2008 and to enhanced governance, programmatic performance in the National Sea Grant College Program.

Be it Resolved: that the National Sea Grant Advisory Board, hereby, with great pleasure and sincere appreciation, acknowledge the leadership and many significant contributions made by Rear Admiral Richard West during his tenure as Advisory Board Chair.

MOTION (Woeste, Byrne). Unanimous passage / all ayes.

NSGO and SGA express thanks and appreciation for hard work.

ADJOURN PUBLIC MEETING