

## **National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Meeting**

Aug 12, 2016

Meeting Minutes

Conference Call

Friday, August 12, 2016

OPEN TO PUBLIC 3:00-5:00 PM EST

### **Roll Call:**

NSGAB: Dale Baker, Paulinus Chigbu, Rosanne Fortner, E. Gordon Grau, Judith Gray, Brian Helmuth, Amber Mace, James Murray, Rolland Schmitten, Richard Vortmann, Jonathan Pennock (*ex-officio*), Sylvain DeGuise (*ex-officio*)

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO): Rebecca Briggs, Brooke Carney, Jonathan Eigen (Designated Federal Officer), Julia Galkiewicz, Nikola Garber, Chris Hayes, Jennifer Hinden, Jonathan Lilley, and Elizabeth Rohring

Other: William (Breck) Bowden, Lake Champlain Sea Grant; Phyllis Grifman, University of Southern California Sea Grant; Kris Stepenuk, Lake Champlain Sea Grant; and Richard West, Ex-NSGAB Member

### **Welcome, introductions, review of agenda, roll call (Mr. Dale Baker, Chair; Mr. Jonathan Eigen, Designated Federal Officer (DFO))**

Mr. Eigen reported the NSGAB Charter was renewed until 2018. He will be speaking with the Department of Commerce General Counsel and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Chief of Staff on a formal process to approve subcommittees of the NSGAB. An update will be given at the next NSGAB Meeting.

Mr. Eigen noted Jennifer Hinden will be setting up an email account specifically for the NSGAB to use to cc any conversations sent via email related to the NSGAB. An announcement will be made once the email account has been set-up.

### **Public Comment Period**

No Public Comment

### **Lake Champlain Sea Grant-Letter of Intent (Dr. Jonathan Pennock, NSGO Director)**

Dr. Pennock reported on July 20<sup>th</sup>, the NSGO received a letter of intent from Mr. Breck Bowden, Director of Lake Champlain Sea Grant, stating that they would like to initiate the application process to move from a Coherent Area Program (CAP) to a Sea Grant Institution. Lake Champlain has been a CAP for four years.

The NSGO will set-up a mechanism for a formal application in which Lake Champlain Sea Grant can submit a proposal. The mechanism will include a Federal Funding Opportunity for all "qualified" applicants to submit an application. The NSGCP Director will charge the NSGAB with the responsibility of

reviewing the program's proposal and conduct a site visit. The NSAB subcommittee will make a recommendation to the NSGAB based on their review. The NSGAB will then make a recommendation to the NSGCP Director, who will make a recommendation to the Secretary of Commerce. The entire process can take up to or more than a year.

Some caveats for this include, getting the NOAA Administrator to approve all subcommittees. That means the recommendations for the subcommittee may need to go through the NOAA formal process which may take a while. Normally, the NSGAB Chair would recommend members of the subcommittee. Given the relationship that Mr. Baker has with the program, both from his work at New York Sea Grant and his role as an advisor for Lake Champlain Sea Grant, the NSGO would like to ask Dr. Mace, NSGAB Vice Chair, to take on the lead for this review. Her role will be to make recommendations for members of the review committee.

Comments, Q/A:

Mr. Vortmann asked Dr. Pennock to provide additional information on the different steps of program status. Dr. Pennock noted a CAP is mostly standing up the program with the intent of moving forward to a higher status. An institutional program integrates a research component. The base for funding is \$1M depending on the funding level of the NSGCP. The highest level achievable is college status. Programs must be at the institutional level for three years, and meet all standards of excellence. The base funding is the same as institutional status.

**Discuss and approve draft text of the 2016 Biennial Report to Congress on the State of Sea Grant (Dr. Rosanne Fortner, NSGAB)**

Comments, Q/A:

Comments were provided by Mr. Vortmann, Dr. DeGuise, and Dr. Garber via email to Dr. Fortner.

Dr. Mace commented on recommendation one (pg 5). Some readers may not be familiar with the recommendation, and the committee may want to reword it differently. The recommendation makes it seem there are no partnerships. Dr. Helmuth agreed with Dr. Mace's recommendation.

**Motion by Mr. Vortmann to approve the draft text of the 2016 Biennial Report Congress on the State of Sea Grant with recommended changes.**

**Dr. Murray 2<sup>nd</sup>, unanimous approval.**

**Discuss and approve the draft NOAA Sea Grant Extension Liaison Review Committee Report (D. Baker, NSGAB)**

Mr. Baker noted the charge for this committee was initiated by Dr. Garber in 2015. The committee consisted of himself, Dr. Murray, Dr. Mace, Mr. Michael Liffmann, Ms. Helen Cheng, Ms. Rohring, and Mr. Samuel Chan. The committee identified who the liaison positions, their location, and how many. The positions have been ad hoc, and funding was traditionally from three sources (NOAA lab, state Sea Grant program, and the NSGO).

Comments, Q/A:

Dr. Murray noted an overview of the liaison positions is potentially a very important tool for Sea Grant to use in promoting and maximizing its visibility within NOAA. There has been a significant amount of ad hoc progress towards developing some of the recommendations from the Byrne Report, but this provides an opportunity to work within NOAA and expand our abilities to partner with NOAA and their outreach functions. NOAA has a lot of outreach needs and Sea Grant has unique extension capabilities, and he feels a partnership could be expanded which is what is being highlighted in this report.

Ms. Rohring agreed. She felt this report, and the recommendations in the 2016 Biennial Report are very important for Sea Grant as we look at another budget year. Sea Grant is the right group for more boots on the ground approach. People are concerned with the word reporting based on comments, but she thinks impacts and accomplishments should include liaisons. She and Ms. Brooke Carney can sit down and create a one-pager on the impacts and information on liaisons.

Mr. Baker noted the Sea Grant Association, and the NSGAB will be kept in the loop on any updates moving forward.

Mr. Schmitten encouraged the liaisons to meet together and to have a modest amount of travel funds.

Dr. DeGuise recommended program match. He suggested that the NSGO funds come from the 5% administrative cap, which may be difficult. He also encouraged the NSGO to provide more clarity on applying. There are a number of those that were created on an ad hoc basis, but the outcome of that may appear to some that programs might benefit while others do not. He would like to see better language under recommendation two (pg. 9) as to how those partnerships are created and continually supported.

Mr. Chan noted all of the programs are hosted by a Sea Grant program except the current position in the NOAA National Severe Storms Laboratory (NSSL). Mr. Baker noted the committee feels all liaison positions should have a host office, and at the report suggests the positions and others that may follow would benefit from having a Sea Grant host. Not having a host decreases coordination with Sea Grant.

Ms. Rohring asked if the Board felt that the term "liaison" should be more succinctly defined. Mrs. Gray noted that the definition should be flexible and not over defined because every institution and lab is different.

**Motion by Mrs. Gray to approve the draft NOAA Sea Grant Extension Liaison Review Committee Report.**

**Mr. Schmitten 2<sup>nd</sup>, unanimous approval.**

**Discuss and approve the draft PIE II Committee Report (Richard West, Chair of PIE II Committee; D. Baker, NSGAB)**

Admiral West reviewed the recommendations of the report.

Comments, Q/A:

Dr. Fortner noted the report recommendations do not seem to result in a reduction of work. Mr. Hayes noted one of the major changes in the report is suggesting there be one panel instead of five. This affects the workload of facilitators and the panel as well as guidance on limiting the number of impacts.

Dr. DeGuise noted the Sea Grant Directors discussed the review, and the consensus was they are overall very happy with recommendations. He also feels the entire process is more transparent.

**Motion by Mr. Dale Baker to approve the draft PIE II Committee Report.  
Mr. Vortmann 2<sup>nd</sup>, unanimous approval.**

**Discussion of meeting topics and wrap-up (D. Baker, NSGAB)**

Mr. Baker reiterated that the Board would develop a sub-committee to review the Lake Champlain Sea Grant program for institutional status; would move forward with the Biennial Report to Congress, and that the Liaison Report and PIE II Committee Report were both approved by the Board and should be forwarded to Director Pennock.

**Motion by Mr. Dale Baker to adjourn the meeting  
Dr. Fortner 2<sup>nd</sup>, unanimous approval.**

**Meeting Adjourned**