

**National Sea Grant Review Panel  
Meeting Minutes  
Galveston, Texas  
April 26 & 30, 2003**

**Action Items:**

**Dr. Ron Baird and the Sea Grant Review Panel (SGRP) Chair, Dr. Peter Bell, should make a Sea Grant presentation at an upcoming NOAA Science Advisory Board meeting to facilitate exposure of Sea Grant within NOAA.**

**Dr. Bell will designate a team of site visitors from the Panel to review the application of the University of Maine to be designated a Sea Grant College.**

**Jeff Stephan will draft a letter to John Rayfield, House Committee on Resources, to express the SGRP's sincere thanks for his significant contribution to the Sea Grant program. The NSGO was charged with framing the letter for presentation.**

**National Sea Grant Review Panel  
Meeting Minutes  
Galveston, Texas  
April 26 & 30, 2003**

**Saturday, April 26, 2003**

**Sea Grant Review Panel (SGRP) Members Present: Robin Alden, James Arrington, Peter Bell (Chair), Robert Duce, Elbert Friday, Ross Heath, Manuel Hernandez-Avila, John Knauss, Frank Kudrna, Nathaniel Robinson, Jerry Schubel (Chair-Elect), Jeffery Stephan, Judith Weis, and John Woeste**

**Panel Members Absent: Geraldine Knatz**

**Ex-Officio Panel Members: National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) Ronald Baird; Francis Schuler (Designated Federal Official)**

**NSGO Staff: Emory Anderson, Leon Cammen, Arminda Gensler, James Murray, and Edward Murdy**

**Other Attendees:**

**SGA: Jennifer Greenamoyer, External Affairs Director  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Science Advisory Board  
Member, Art Maxwell  
Brian Miller - Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant Program**

**Opening of Meeting (Bell)**

- ▶ *Approval of Minutes* – the October 22-23, 2002 meeting minutes were approved with one change on page two, the correct acronym for the “Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research” is SCOR.

***Introductory Remarks***

- ▶ Discussion of where Sea Grant is today? Passage of the reauthorization bill means that Sea Grant will remain within NOAA and the language of the Act authorizes substantial increases for Sea Grant.
- ▶ Executive Committee update - The Chair recognized Jeff Stephan for his service to the Executive Committee, particularly during the recent Sea Grant crisis. Mr. Stephan has completed his term on the Executive Committee.

### *Issues taken up*

Departure of Ben Sherman, Director of the Sea Grant Media Relations Office, provides an opportunity for the panel to evaluate the National Media Center and other Sea Grant national communications projects.

- ▶ Ron Baird requested the Executive Council to put together a task force to study and advise on the issue on Communications and media issues.
- ▶ The Task Force is composed of Robin Alden, chair; Amy Broussard, Associate Director, Texas Sea Grant, and Jeffery Stephan, SGRP member, who will act as liaison to the communicators.
- ▶ Ron Baird assured the task force that he will help provide support from headquarters, as needed.

### Two new applications for Sea Grant status: University of Maine and University of New Hampshire

- ▶ From 1976 through 2000, the Universities of Maine and New Hampshire conducted the **joint Maine/New Hampshire Sea Grant College** program. **UNH and UMaine requested separation of the joint program** with each program dropping back to institutional status. Each university is seeking Sea Grant College status.
- ▶ The first step of the process is submission of a written application to be designated a Sea Grant College.
- ▶ Upon positive review of the submitted application and Ron Baird's agreement, the state program is eligible for a site visit by a Panel subcommittee.
- ▶ If the recommendations proffered after the site visit are followed, there is a good chance the new programs will be designated Sea Grant Colleges by the Secretary of Commerce.
- ▶ At the time of the last meeting, both Maine and New Hampshire had submitted written applications. The University of New Hampshire proposal was sufficiently well developed that a site visit was organized.

### Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Meeting

- ▶ Ron Baird met with OMB; OMB is no longer considering moving Sea Grant to the National Science Foundation (NSF).
- ▶ OMB is interested in the Program Assessment Team (PAT) evaluation process and Dr. Baird has invited OMB to participate in a PAT review to observe the process.
- ▶ OMB would like to see Sea Grant included in more NOAA initiatives.
- ▶ Dr. Knauss stated that the history of Sea Grant is that of a free-standing program, one which happened to be located within NOAA. NOAA supports only the NOAA agenda.
- ▶ Dr. Schubel said Sea Grant needs to acknowledge NOAA, and that Deputy Commerce Secretary Bodman wants to support Sea Grant.
- ▶ Dr. Bell noted that NOAA views Sea Grant differently than it did last year, before the proposed transfer to NSF, and we need to take advantage of this new awareness.
- ▶ Dr. Woeste noted the need for the branding of Sea Grant as a NOAA entity, and to publicize this branding among network communicators and the newly created task force.

## *NOAA/National Sea Grant Program Update (Baird)*

### Introduction

- ▶ Major changes in the works for NOAA and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR)
- ▶ Dr. Baird thanked the NSGO staff for doing a great job in these uncertain times and often under considerable duress during the period when a transfer to NSF was on the table.

### Sea Grant's Budget Situation and Outlook:

- ▶ In FY 2003, the National Sea Grant Program's budget was reduced by \$2 million to \$60.4 million. That forced Sea Grant to delay the start of Fisheries Extension grant program in order to fund previous commitments to multi-year grants.
- ▶ The FY 2004 President's request for Sea Grant is only \$57.4 million perhaps due to the fall out from the NSF debate and the growth in homeland security and national security budgets.
- ▶ Don't expect to see a lot of NOAA growth in the years to come:
  - Program growth is a zero-sum game; Sea Grant growth means someone else is not.
  - Sea Grant must be aware of this tight fiscal environment and sharpen competitive skills, turn bold ideas into creative initiatives.

NSGO grant processing NOAA's Grants Management Division is out of the control of NSGO and apparently very understaffed to handle NOAA's increased grants workload. NOAA is taking step to improve the grants process including developing a grants online system.

### NOAA's Changing Structure:

NOAA is undergoing major organizational changes and it is difficult to predict where it will be two years from now. Changes in top-level personnel are occurring NOAA-wide, and the OAR line office is without appointments to its top management position.

- ▶ New program office and a new line office are being created
  - Program Assessment and Evaluation Office will be headed by Bonnie Morehouse.
  - Mary Glackin will be the new AA for the Program Planning and Integration Office, which will be charged with achieving NOAA's new matrix management program
- ▶ Large corporate infrastructure is being created
  - Matrix programmatic management is being implemented
  - Performance measures are being developed
  - Budget performance is being measured
  - Increased cross-talk among line offices is being emphasized
  - No major changes in current line offices; no Coastal Oceans Program/Sea Grant merger

### Sea Grant and NOAA

- ▶ New organizational structure within NOAA provides opportunity for Sea Grant
  - Sea Grant must be proactive about seeking funding within the NOAA budget process
  - Sea Grant has about six months to start planning on how to integrate into this process

- The FY 2005 budget will be a matrix budget;
- The linkages fostered by the Sea Grant could prove useful for NOAA
- One of Sea Grant's strengths, and one of NOAA's unmet needs, is regional planning
- Sea Grant excels at education and outreach
- ▶ Sea Grant Reauthorization was signed into law November 26, 2002
  - Sea Grant is reauthorized by this legislation until 2008
  - All new procedures implemented since 1998 are incorporated into the law
  - Contains a 70% increase in authorization
  - New monies must be awarded to programs on a competitive, merit-based system
  - Programs must be rated in at least five groups with 25% limit on top two
- ▶ A Sea Grant Strategic Plan is being developed
  - The plan will note how Sea Grant supports NOAA's mission goals
  - Sea Grant programs have national focus and local implementation
  - Increased reporting to show progress will be required
  - Need to present "science as product"
  - A review of the programs within NOAA will occur, and their strengths' examined
  - Innovative funding strategies will be pursued
- ▶ Discussion
  - Overhead has increased substantially, which will limit the NSGO filling vacancies
  - 50% of all new NOAA money has been designated by the VADM Lautenbacher to go to extramural research; Sea Grant could facilitate much of this
  - Art Maxwell, NOAA Science Advisory Board member, stated that the SAB was very positive about Sea Grant
  - Art Maxwell reported that the VADM Lautenbacher is oriented towards management and very concerned about NOAA's mission
  - Joe Friday said the VADM Lautenbacher stated that filling the AA in OAR is a priority
  - Friday also stated that the retention of OAR as a line office was facilitated by national science-minded organizations (including CORE, AGU, and SGA) petitioning against its dissolution.

***Sea Grant Association President's Report (Stickney)***

- ▶ Stated that his term began January 1, 2003
- ▶ Jon Kramer, Director, Maryland Sea Grant Program, is president-elect
- ▶ Thanked Peter Bell for his assistance as he begins his job
- ▶ Introduced Jennifer Greenamoyer, External Affairs Director for CORE, who represents the SGA on legislative issues. He said that she was doing a great job for SGA, and that they were to extend her one year contract
- ▶ Reported that Drs. Bell, Kudrna, and Stickney met with VADM Lautenbacher
  - Informed him about Sea Grant's activities:
  - Sea Grant is unified
  - Sea Grant can deliver NOAA's science to the public
- ▶ Stated he felt there is a good relationship among SGA, NSGO, and the SGRP

- ▶ Worked at learning the laboratories better and attended Senior Research Council (SRC) meetings
- ▶ Made strides improving the working relationships among SGA members, feels that there are strong, enthusiastic directors in the program
- ▶ Expressed his desire to build SGA relationships
- ▶ Expressed SGA's concern about the ranking of the individual Sea Grant programs
  - Most directors saw PAT process as way to bring all programs to excellence
  - Concerns about direct competition among programs, perception of a 'zero-sum game'
  - Looks forward to the future National Research Council review of the PAT process
- ▶ Informed the Panel about the continuing budget difficulties at the state level
  - Budget cuts at the state level are significant
  - Issue of match with national programs may become more difficult
- ▶ Wrote letter to Secretary of Commerce Evans to support the FY 2004 support
- ▶ Expressed concern about Sea Grant's status within NOAA
  - Sea Grant may not integrate easily into the matrix management system, based on comments from the Senior Research Council meeting
  - Sea Grant must convince NOAA that we fit into NOAA's mission goals
  - Need to increase the effectiveness of Sea Grant marketing
- ▶ Sees a new push for international programs, fifty state program, and the need for more ports and harbor specialists within the Sea Grant program

#### Discussion on SGA Issues

- ▶ Dr. Schubel stated that as we look to the future we should play to the strengths of the Sea Grant program to illustrate what we can do for NOAA, an example being our ability to identify user groups and skills in regional networking.
- ▶ Drs. Stickney and Knauss discussed how we could strategically place ourselves in the context of current issues, such as the interest in the coastal ocean observing system.
- ▶ Dr. Heath raised the issue that one role of Sea Grant is to translate data into useful products
- ▶ Dr. Schubel noted that Sea Grant could have a role in coastal governance issues
- ▶ Dr. Stickney said that Sea Grant could work at forecasting oil and gas deposits
- ▶ Dr. Schubel noted Sea Grant should position itself to respond effectively and be on top of the interest generated by the upcoming release of the Ocean Commission report
- ▶ Jennifer Greenamoyer noted that she was participating in an Ocean/Coastal Roundtable on key issue within the Ocean Commission report
- ▶ Art Maxwell stated we should work to note Sea Grant fits within NOAA, and that Sea Grant is especially adept at both formal and informal education, that Sea Grant could partner with the Coastal Ocean Program (COP), and that Sea Grant could develop itself within the field of environmental prediction

#### **Break for Lunch**

### *Science Advisory Board Update (Maxwell)*

- ▶ Explanation of the structure and purpose of the Science Advisory Board (SAB)
  - SAB has an authorized membership of 15; thirteen positions are filled currently
  - The board normally meets three times a year, current meeting topics are thematic or problem oriented
  - The board operates by creating panels and working groups to perform reviews of NOAA laboratories and on thematic areas of import to NOAA, such as climate monitoring, ocean exploration, education, social sciences, etc.
- ▶ SAB interested in education
  - the board patterned its outlook on education on Sea Grant
  - thinks the idea of an education crosscut is a good one
  - the new NOAA organic act would include education provisions
- ▶ SAB has met with the OAR Senior Research Council (SRC) – a good interaction
- ▶ Discussion
  - Joe Friday raised the issue that there was once a proposal for NOAA labs to be evaluated independently, similar to the review of the NIST reviews
  - As the crosscut appears to be here to stay, Sea Grant should become visible part of the process
  - SAB does not evaluate the Sea Grant program, as the SGRP exists
  - **Ron Baird and the Sea Grant Review Panel Chair should make a Sea Grant presentation at an upcoming NOAA Science Advisory Board meeting to facilitate exposure of Sea Grant within NOAA.**

### *Program Evaluations (Schuler)*

#### Program Assessment Team Process:

- ▶ Dr. Schuler gave a presentation on the PAT evaluations
  - First cycle evaluated 29 programs between 1998-2001
  - Second cycle will be much like the first, but will incorporate changes recommended by the Toll and Metrics Committees, and the requirements listed in the Sea Grant Reauthorization Act
  - Will remain a vehicle for improving Sea Grant Programs
- ▶ Toll committee Report findings
  - Were very positive relative to the PAT process
  - Recommendations included creating a Metrics Committee to provide programs a set of evaluation marks for elements of the benchmark criteria
  - Full panel recommended continuation of grading system, but later recommended the overall PAT grade be eliminated and replaced by the use of a ratings sheet covering subelements of the four benchmark criteria

- ▶ Metrics Report - selected indicators were chosen from input provided by the SGA, SGRP, and NSGO
- ▶ Sea Grant Reauthorization requires the NSGO Director to rate programs based on their relative performances in no less than five categories, and at most, 25% of the programs in each of the top two categories
- ▶ PAT Briefing Books will be smaller and less burdensome. Guidelines were discussed and a recommendations was made (Schubel), seconded and unanimously approved.

*"The panel places a premium on brevity with reports of twenty-five pages or less preferred; reports shall not exceed 35 pages, excluding an appendix of up to ten pages including indicators and other issues of import at the option of the Sea Grant Program.*

*The following items may also be included as additional appendices and do not fall within the page limits. Once again, brevity is preferred.*

- List of investigators/projects
- List of publications
- Strategic plan
- Implementation plan
- Specific responses to PAT chair requests for additional information

*Supplemental materials may be distributed at the review, but should not become part of the review material forwarded to the NSGO."*

- ▶ Public Notification of upcoming PATs and Best Management Practices were discussed
- ▶ NSGO Final Review will occur annually following the PAT
- ▶ Merit Funding will retain 1<sup>st</sup> cycle merit funding allocation framework and superimpose "bonus" funding for highest rated programs

### Merit Based Funding

- ▶ Use 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle PAT review scores, as well 1<sup>st</sup> cycle ratings for all programs not reviewed this year in order to allow all programs to be eligible for merit based allocations
- ▶ Dr. Kudrna stated that this may be conceptually a good idea, but it is not an easy problem
- ▶ Dr. Schuler stated that the NSGO was welcome any good ideas on how best to allocate the merit funding and meet the legislative requirements
- ▶ Discussion of the weighing of the evaluation criteria
  - Dr. Schuler said that the weights are the same as they were in the first cycle of PATs in order to maintain consistency
  - Dr. Heath said one way to potentially modify this process is to conduct a normalizing process, similar to what the NIH does
  - Further ideas on the matter were welcomed by NSGO
- ▶ Discussion of the presence of Sea Grant Directors on PAT evaluations was discussed- the value of having a director present is high

### *NSGO Staff Updates*

### University of New Hampshire Sea Grant College Application



- ▶ On Site Visit to evaluate University of New Hampshire (UNH) Sea Grant application, to be named a Sea Grant College has been completed
  - Dr. Heath, chair of the on-site review committee, submitted the signed report, “Report on the Site Review Team Evaluation of the Application for Sea Grant College Status from the University of New Hampshire”, to the Panel
  - The report, dated April 7, 2003, included the recommendation that the Secretary of Commerce designate the University of New Hampshire as a Sea Grant College.
- ▶ Dr. Heath made a formal motion to accept the report recommendation that the University of New Hampshire be designated as a Sea Grant College. The motion seconded, and passed unanimously by the Panel
- ▶ Dr. Baird stated that the Secretary of Commerce must approve the designation

### University of Maine Sea Grant College Application

- ▶ The University of Maine application was submitted April 12, 2003. The reviewers unanimously agree that the application has met all the requirements for an on-site visit
- ▶ Dr. Baird has sent a letter requesting an on-site visit
- ▶ **Dr. Bell will designate a team of site visitors from the Panel to review the application of the University of Maine to be designated a Sea Grant College.**
  - Ms. Alden stated it would be important to do a similar review to that done for the UNH
  - Dr. Duce suggested including one of the UNH review team members
  - Dr. Murray indicated the likely time for the review would be September/October

### New Programs (Schuler)

- ▶ Congressional requirement to report on bringing new programs along
- ▶ Vermont is almost ready for Coherent Area Status
- ▶ Pennsylvania is doing well
  - is an extension "project"
  - has parlayed funding into significant state funding, which has allowed them to add personnel and a mini-grant program
  - did not apply to aquaculture NSI
- ▶ US Insular Pacific
  - American Samoa has a very good relationship with the University of Hawaii
    - UH extension agent on station at American Samoa Community College
    - Aquaculture, especially, is going well
  - Guam
    - Successfully competed in national competition (Fish Habitat Grant)
    - Drs. Baird and Schuler met with the President of the University of Guam, Harold Allen. The meeting was productive.

### National Communications (Murray)

- ▶ Need for communications
  - A retreat was held last September in Shepherdstown, WV on Communications
  - Stephen Whittman, Program Information Specialist at Wisconsin Sea Grant, was brought in to lead effort to develop a communications plan (submitted March 10, 2003)
  - Communications Leader position in the NSGO is being advertised
  - Sea Grant web site is being developed

### Fisheries Extension (Murray)

- ▶ Idea for fisheries extension originated from Senator Gregg's office as a way for Sea Grant's strengths to complement the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) outreach needs
- ▶ Fisheries extension was not included in the FY 2003 budget language and could not be funded because of the out-year obligations from last year's NSI competitions
- ▶ There is a 2003-2004 competition, the selection panel meets May 29-30 to select proposals which may be funded in 2004

- ▶ The Fisheries Extension Program is directed toward improving fisheries management, conserving marine resources, addressing socioeconomic issues, educating resource users, and promoting sustainable fishing practices
- ▶ Fisheries extension is a high priority for SGA as they meet with Congress

### Sea Grant Database (Cammen)

- ▶ NSGO has had a Sea Grant project database since 1995 available internally
- ▶ Now this searchable database will be made available to the public on the SG Web site
- ▶ Sea Grant programs will have the capacity to add project summaries, project reports, impacts of the funded research
- ▶ This additional capacity will be designed and implemented by an IT contractor
- ▶ Dr. Baird closed with the thought that this is going to be an iterative process. It is time to start out. The database will be useful, but it will be a work in progress for quite a while

### New Panel Business

- ▶ Note Gallup Organization's publication "Federal Advisory Committee Stakeholder Engagement Survey Results" put forth by the General Services Administration Office of Government wide Policy
- ▶ Jeffrey Stephan moved that the panel should send
  - This motion was seconded, and passed unanimously by the Panel
  - **Jeff Stephan will draft a letter to John Rayfield, House Committee on Resources, to express the SGRP's sincere thanks for his significant contribution to the Sea Grant program. The NSGO was charged with framing the letter for presentation.**
- ▶ Set date for the fall SGRP meeting
  - Panel meets November 12-13, 2003
  - Travel on November 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>
  - Executive committee meets on the evening of November 11<sup>th</sup>
- ▶ Dr. Bell stated that he would not be present for the April 30, 2003 (Wednesday) meeting of the NSGO staff and the SGRP, and so requested that Nathaniel Robinson serve as acting chair.

**NSGO & National Sea Grant Review Panel  
Meeting Minutes  
Galveston, Texas  
April 30, 2003**

**Wednesday, April 30, 2003**

**Panel Members Present: Robin Alden, Robert Duce, Elbert Friday, Frank Kudrna, Nat Robinson, Jeffery Stephen**

**Panel Members Absent: James Arrington, Peter Bell (Chair), Ross Heath, Manuel Hernandez-Avila, Geraldine Knatz, John Knauss, Jerry Schubel (Chair-Elect), Judith Weis, John Woeste**

**Ex-Officio Panel Members: (NSGO) Ronald Baird; Francis Schuler (Designated Federal Official)**

**NSGO Staff: Emory Anderson, Leon Cammen, Nikola Garber, Arminda Gensler, James Murray, and Edward Murdy**

***Opening of Meeting (Robinson-Acting Chair)***

- ▶ **Introductory Remarks**
  - Need for a 'work plan' for the panel
  - Develop points to share with the General Assembly at the close of Sea Grant Week

***SGRP Work Plan Discussion (Robinson)***

- ▶ **Need to concretely define what impacts and benefits would accrue with full authorized funding**
  - Information in 'one-pagers' too vague to be sufficient
  - E.g., NWS - with \$50 million they will increase the lead time for predicting storms
  - Need to identify what will not happen if additional funds not provided
- ▶ **Role for panel in this process**
  - Panel may help prioritize, by choosing which projects to focus on
  - Panel is not so closely involved that they cannot be objective in evaluating
  - Need a consensus process (Cammen)
- ▶ **Need to develop plan for Sea Grant to fit VADM Lautenbacher's idea for a SG that is NOAA-centric**
- ▶ **Identify examples where SG strengths (e.g. the climate change working group could profit from SG's extension services and identification of coastal stakeholders) complement NOAA's mission, then ask for additional support for these ideas (e.g. request additional FTE positions to do the new task**
- ▶ **Nat Robinson and Dr. Baird stressed the need for strategic thinking**

- ▶ **Leon Cammen stated the panel should consider funding ideas that are not mainstream, such as encouraging interagency initiatives through bottom-up partnerships on topics that are not fixed in the NOAA mission**

### *Discussion of Panel's Function*

- ▶ **Robin Alden stated the panel's role is to act strategically, and not operationally. The panel can document needs, focus thought, and identify to NOAA not only what increased funding would buy, but what the impact of not having this funding would be.**
- ▶ **The panel can be effective within NOAA and the Department of Commerce by meeting with higher level officials to gain their perspective on Sea Grant and to communicate on issues of importance to Sea Grant.**
- ▶ **Jeffery Stephan stated the panel must fulfill its specific, legislatively-mandated responsibilities that includes oversight for implementing the recommendations of the the Duce, Byrne, and other Panel reports as they are completed**
- ▶ **Panel must support and assist in addressing existing problems within the NSGO that may impede Sea Grant from achieving its full potential such as NOAA overhead and taxes**
- ▶ **It was noted that these overheads and taxes were increasing but the budget for Sea Grant is being cut in FY03and that NSGO's ability to fill vacancies was being limited.**
- ▶ **Jeffrey Stephan stated that the Panel should look for opportunities to make continued comments, and place on the record, the staffing shortage in the NSGO. Specifically, he wished to state the office is currently understaffed, that Dr. Baird has undertaken additional responsibilities beyond Sea Grant within OAR, and to note that SES positions in the office have been reduced from three to one. This is especially important when considering the current expectations of performance and operation. Additionally, the issue could be especially problematic if one considers NSGO's future after Dr. Baird retires.**

### *Discussion of What the Panel Could Improve.*

- ▶ **Need for strategic performance plan (can prioritize here), with a timeline**
- ▶ **Increase rigor of panel meetings**
- ▶ **Increase timeliness of information and document turnarounds**
- ▶ **Create a list of ongoing check-offs as to the implementation status of Panel recommendations**
- ▶ **The Panel's executive committee needs to communicate more frequently with the full panel**
- ▶ **Assist in focusing the network on concrete, detailed documentation of impacts. Performance measures, in their current state, are very fuzzy, and would be improved if quantitative values were included in them (Leon Cammen stated these measures will become more specific)**
- ▶ **Improved communication and opportunities for input among panel members by instituting regular teleconference calls – perhaps at two month intervals**
- ▶ **Meetings with high level officials should be conducted. During the first meeting, a written plan of action should be presented. At the follow-up meeting, an agenda**

with the results should be shown. Dr. Baird stated we must do “business,” and not be “touchy-feely”

*Report Out to the General Assembly (Robinson)*

- ▶ The SGRP will pursue several strategies to foster growth of the Sea Grant budget.
- ▶ The SGRP invites the Sea Grant community to provides ideas of what they would like the panel's help.
- ▶ The SGRP welcomes discussion with the Sea Grant Association as we work towards developing strategies to achieve the \$103 million authorization.
- ▶ The forward-thinking presentations have helped provide a boost to the community in this year of difficult national and state budget cuts.
- ▶ Dr. Baird encourages the forward thinking. The VADM has pointed the way, and this, coupled with the desire to develop a work plan and an interest in engaging the rest of the network and panel, should allow us to change the plan into action. Dr. Baird sees this as a ‘future-looking time’ and a ‘get with it time’, and that it is time to take risks and go forward.

*Followup Suggestions:*

- ▶ Executive committee should review what was discussed today, and it should be shared with the general panel, as only six panelists were present.
- ▶ Implement regular conference calls among panelists (every two months?).
- ▶ Develop annual specific work plan, with timeline, calling for strategic thinking and incorporating the ideas presented here.
- ▶ Panel could direct the NSGO to become more NOAA-centric.
- ▶ Nikola Garber will work to post on the Web the powerpoint presentations of VADM Lautenbacher and Dr. Baird so that they will be available to form the foundation of the work plan.