

National Sea Grant Advisory Board Semiannual Meeting

Wednesday, August 26 – Friday, August 28, 2009

Mayflower Park Hotel
Seattle, WA

Wednesday, August 26

Call to Order – Roll Call

Members

Dr. Peter M. Bell	Mr. Harry Simmons
Dr. John V. Byrne	Mr. Jeffrey R. Stephan
Dr. Robert A. Duce	Dr. William L. Stubblefield
<i>Mr. Jeremy Harris – not present</i>	Mr. Dick Vortmann
Dr. G. Ross Heath	Dr. Judith S. Weis
Dr. Frank L. Kudrna, Jr.	Rear Admiral Richard West, U.S. Navy (Ret.) - Chairman
Dr. Mike Orbach	Dr. John T. Woeste
Dr. Nancy Rabalais	
Mr. Rolland A. (Rollie) Schmitt	

Ex-Officio Members & Staff

Dr. Leon Cammen - Director, NSGCP – not present
Dr. Gordon Grau - SGA President
Dr. Darren Lerner - HI Sea Grant
Dr. Jim Murray - Deputy Director, NSGCP
Ms. Melissa Pearson – Staff, NSGCP

Review of Day's Activities/Approval of Agenda

Chair's Introductory Remarks - R. West, Advisory Board Chair

- Need nominating committee to select new Vice-Chair for term starting in January. P. Bell volunteer for this. Vote will take place on Fri.
- Review Current Committee assignments. On Friday will assess current status, reassign as necessary.
- Need to set Board calendar for Spring/Fall 2010 meetings. Brief discussion of various locations both inside / outside beltway. Discussion of holding Fall 2010 meeting in conjunction with SG Week in New Orleans.
- Review of past year: full Board participation via Executive Committee, newsletters/conference calls/committee email updates, meeting with SGA, participation in preparing and now executing the PIE

NSGO Report – J. Murray, Deputy Director National Sea Grant College Program

- National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) Staffing
 - Limited staffing in National Office. Have augmented staff with use of 2 Knauss Fellows to address Focus Team issues.

- Congressional Update
 - Dr. Cammen visited six congressional offices in July: Senator Inouye (D-HI), Senator Begich (D-AK), Rep. Pingree (D-ME), Rep. Bordallo (D-GU), Rep. Capps (D-CA), Rep. Whitehouse (D-RI)
 - Topics included: Update on Sea Grant's national strategic planning and evaluation process, state level accomplishments, regional planning efforts, and current network activities in climate change and renewable energy.
 - Dr. Murray met with Bordallo re. Guam
 - Additional briefings coming in the fall (including new offices not previously visited by Sea Grant)
 - NSGO putting out a weekly “Congressional Updates” newsletter

Comments

- Stubblefield – surprised by limit of Congressional visits. Need to be visiting more. Highlight Guam Sea Grant.
- Schubel – connect with the Board for points of contact with individual representatives
- National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) Budget
 - FY09 & 10 budgets. FY09 = \$55M, FY10 request = \$55.1M. Marks: House = \$59.1M, Senate = \$63.1M. FY10 essentially level with FY08. Includes specific amounts for Aquaculture (\$4.8M) and Invasives (\$2.0M). Details in Senate language.

Comments

- Vortmann – request committees and members be sent to the Board.

- Integrated Planning, Implementation & Evaluation (PIE)
 - Review of Timeline
 - National Research Council 2006 Report:
 - Strong National Strategic Plan (National Plan)
 - With state programs aligned to the National Plan
 - Principles of the PIE system:
 - All state programs strategic plans aligned to the National Plan
 - All program resources are planned for and counted
 - Emphasis on excellence not competition
 - Review program impacts not functional areas
 - Collaboration counts
 - Transparency
 - Stress program improvement
 - Funds allocated based on a scaled approach rather than a step function

Comments

- Orbach – appear not evaluating in time for next round of strategic planning, i.e. planning occurs before the evaluation of the previous cycle
- Bell – request further explanation of what occurs in each step of PIE plan.
- Clarification that programs without strategic plans should not be approved for the next round of funding. Question of exact steps at that point (no funds at all, funds for limited time frame, if so what time frame.)
- Weis – How many programs without currently approved plans? Murray – currently ~1/2, but the main date is 10/21/09, when programs come back with modified plans.
- Byrne – explain what was seen in strategic plan review, i.e. a range of plans from those with minor effort to those only missing a few items – programs know their status from round 1, including explicit statement from the National Office that

- funding will not go out for programs with unapproved plans.
 - All programs will be done in 2 months – the question is how many will be adequate, and if the plans will be compatible with the National Plan. Unclear what will happen with programs that submit but plans are inadequate.
 - Program Review Panel
 - Retrospective evaluation of impact of state programs relative to their strategic plans.
 - Every four years, following program site visits.
 - Comprised of annual reports and a four-year summary prepared by the state programs.
 - First PRP will be held in 2015, ~ two years after the completion off state plans.
 - Transitional PRP in 2011, taking Sea Grant from old PAT System to new PIE system.
 - PRP will review and evaluate by focus area.
 - Matrix rating based on a five-point scale on how the program reached their outcomes, objectives and performance measures.
 - Ratings in each focus area weighted based on resources allocated by the program.
 - Program receives an unsuccessful rating will be placed on probation.
 - Assessed at following NSGO Fall Review. The program will continue on probation until the next site visit or PRP review.
 - Site visits (discussed later)
 - NOAA Annual Guidance Memorandum
 - Sea Grant and Climate Services
 - Request advice on Sea Grants role in determining “what does a national climate service look like?” and how SG could best fit within it.
 - Renewable Energy
 - Allocation of Funds Policy
 - Old policy is out of date, and need to readdress this policy for current situation
- Comments
 - West – ask National Office to provide official request in writing for Board to look at this.
 - Bell – last allocation policy a joint effort between NSGO, Review Panel and SGA.
 - Schubel – review development of previous policy. Previous categories probably still reasonable, as they addressed the concern that there is no way for small programs to get more funding.
 - Kudrna – raise idea of documenting money spent within programs on aquaculture, invasives.

SGA Report - G. Grau, Sea Grant Association President and Director, Hawaii Sea Grant

- Current SGA Board: Grau (Pres.), Pennock (Pres. Elect), Anderson (Past Pres.), Voilland (External relations), Sylvain (PMC Chair), Havens (Sec/Treasurer), Targett, Wilson (at large).
- Another 18 months on this term. Clarify elected by full suite of Directors
- SGA is strong. A good mix of new / established members. More collegial than ever. Increasingly strong relations w/ NSGO and AB. Thoughtful, astute, committed board.
- Active Hill contacts, positive feedback. Staff of Congressman Faleomavaega (American Samoa) and Congresswoman Bordallo (Guam) met with House Appropriations staff – are working hard on SG behalf. Feedback of staff interest in climate education – wrote response

showing how Sea Grant do this, focus on grad education with integration into K-12. Increase in house mark. More later.

- Met with Spinrad – discussed issues of getting the NOAA request for SG up; Sea Grant as part of NOAA; National Sea Grant COLLEGE program – Sea Grant as part of 2 separate cultures, with different roles / strength, etc; SG as major Human Resource source **for** NOAA.
- The new administration provides new opportunities, especially in climate. Spinrad will attend the Sea Grant leadership meeting and the Fall SGA meeting.
- Will Dr. Spinrad champion Sea Grant? Best way to get SG's budget up is to have it raised from within NOAA.

Comments

- West – need Front Office to recognize a need to champion Sea Grant, and to see that is essential to what they want to do now. Quote from Lautenbacher “I wish I had known more about Sea Grant – I would have been more supportive.” The organization did not do the job to educate him.
- Byrne - We haven't done an adequate job of selling the unique part of Sea Grant – the extension component.
- Weis – Congressional champions are Samoa and Guam – that these are FAR away.
- Vortmann - being an asset is not necessarily relevant to the administration's need. The challenge for the Ad Board is to show how SG meets the Undersecretary's needs.
- Meeting w/ Mr. Dunnigan. Engaged on content and partnering. Climate opportunities. Maritime industry. Jobs creation. Coming to 1st day of Easton Meeting.
- Meeting with Margaret Cummisky, Staff Director, Senate Appropriations. Exciting and productive meeting. Discussed the situation relating to SG's relationship in NOAA. Shared Lautenbacher story – said 'darn right if he'd tried to get rid of SG he'd have been black and blue.' Sen. Inouye's view that the time is now. 4 foci – science aimed at addressing the challenges that face the PEOPLE of America's coasts. Sea Grant produces human resources – this makes SG unique among NOAA assets. Unparalleled capability of the intellectual power and scholarship of America's universities. Most positive / heartening conversation with any member / staff of Congress.
- Meeting with John Freece. Enthusiastically wishes to renew the energy of the NOAA/EPA MOU (Smart Growth). Re-establish the working relationship. New resources in an EPA/DOW partnership. New workshop focused on assisting coastal communities with model codes and ordinances.
- Sea Grant poised for growth: opportunities among challenges. Program reauthorization signed into law. New, favorable, 'coastal' administration and congressional leadership. New earmark rules.
- Upcoming meetings:
 - 9/17-18 – SGA leadership meeting
 - 10/13-15 SGA Fall Meeting. Workshop on sustainable coastal community development. Lubchenco to attend and speak at the reception on Tue evening.
 - Lubchenco requested meeting – to be set up.
 - Feb 2010 – Spring SGA in DC.
 - Oct 2010 – SG Week in New Orleans, likely week Oct 15th. Subsequent weeks to be hosted by Florida and Ohio.

Comments

- Kudrna – last year SGA's former lobbyist created a large flap. Has SGA successfully completed damage control? Grau – yes.
- West – Would like to have an SGA member join Biennial Report effort.

NOAA's Next Generation Strategic Plan - P. Doremus, Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator & Director of Strategic Planning, Office of Program Planning and Integration

- Presentation on current strategic planning effort.
- The Next Generation Strategic Plan (NGSP) will:
 - Inform and respond to priorities of the new administration, based on long-term trends, challenges, and opportunities facing NOAA and the nation
 - Engage and respond to stakeholders and staff
 - Frame NOAA's policy, programmatic, and investment decisions
 - Establish the basis for monitoring and evaluating NOAA's performance
 - The Strategic Plan will be updated every four years
- 3 Fundamental Questions for Stakeholders and Staff
 - What trends will shape our long-term future?
What long-term trends (scientific, technological, socio-economic, etc.) will be relevant to you, your community, or your organization over the next 25 years?
 - What challenges or opportunities will we face?
In light of the trends that you have identified, what challenges or opportunities will you, your community, or your organization face over the next 25 years?
 - What should NOAA strive to accomplish?
Given the long-term trends, challenges, and opportunities that you identified, what should the agency seek to accomplish in the next 25 years?
- Comments
- Need to put out message of how nation benefit from stronger SG
- Byrne – comment @ western region – as much difference 100 miles from the Coast as you will find. To look at that as a unifying unit doesn't make sense. Doremus - effectively operating mountain and coastal w/in western region. Stakeholder sessions that work the best are ones that are tagged onto other meetings, then bring folks in.
- Asked to accelerate thinking about strategic vision about mission goals. Looking right now about how some of the options may look – meeting in late Oct to size up what have, and see how steering committee can put options forward. Conversations early on high level architecture changes.

Wrap up Comments

- Introduce Penny Dalton and Pete Granger of Washington Sea Grant. Discuss Field Trip Agenda

Field Trip and Stakeholder Meeting

- Field Trip Sites
 - Seattle waterfront (innovative shorefront restoration) – Maureen Goff
 - Fishermen's Terminal (fisheries research and outreach) – Peter Philips
 - Hiram Chittenden locks (salmon restoration) – Graham Young, Kerry Naish
- Stakeholder meeting – Panel Format
 - Participants:
 - Kathleen Drew - Executive Policy Advisor to Washington Governor Chris Gregoire and co-lead on West Coast Governors Agreement on Ocean Health.
 - Linda Kirk Fox – Associate Dean/Extension for Washington State University Extension overseeing the state's Land Grant outreach operation.
 - Terry Stevens – Director of the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve in Mt. Vernon, Washington and a manager in the Washington Department of Ecology's

Shorelines and Environmental Assistance Division.

- Ken Chew – Member, Washington Fish & Wildlife Commission and former Associate Director, UW School of Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences.

Wednesday, August 26

Call to Order – Roll Call

- Board Member Jeremy Harris Present
- Darren Lerner attending in Gordon Grau's place

Review Agenda

Discussion

- Stakeholder Sessions on Wednesday
 - Comment made that it was more governmental partners than stakeholders
 - Discussion of who / how to determine who should sit on stakeholder panels
 - Stubblefield – most important thing heard was that the WA Governor would be willing to talk to people on the hill
- Minutes of Last Meeting
- Schmitten – at last meeting, tasked with reviewing list of potential Congressional champions. No single champion will be able to carry the program. To do the job, SG needs someone from each regional quadrant, plus Alaska and Hawaii. Some criteria going through – ought to be open to anyone with a passion for Ocean issues. Seniority is not nice, it is **required**. Plus up to be in the majority party. Critical to get house & senate committee lists to do a through job. Needs help to generate a real target list.
- Woeste, Byrne and West go to the Hill in Oct. Generation of this list should be task between now and then.

MOTION: to approve February 2009 meeting minutes, with the addition of Rollie Schmitten as in attendance. MOTION PASSED.

Swearing-in of new Members

- Swearing-in of Jeremy Harris, Mike Orbach, Harry Simmons, and Dick Vortmann
- Review of what it means to be on a FACA, to be a Special Government Employee, ethics, etc. Clarify that the Board can NOT lobby – that this is not the role of a FACA. Sea Grant Advisory Board is a Congressionally mandated FACA. As a FACA, NOAA can not direct the Boards activities, but out of courtesy, the Board should inform NOAA when they are going to the Hill.

Biennial Report – J. Murray

- Members: Byrne, West, Woeste. Are considering a 4th Board Member.
- NSGO Staff: Murray and Painter
- May add a SGA member
- The NSGO provides data, reports, staffing, etc., but it is the committee that generates the Biennial Report
- Audience for this report: broader than Congress – this is directed to all who care about SG. Could be marketing opportunity for SG.
- Theme: shaped by legislative language. Check with congressional staff to gauge relevant content.
- Clearance: Should advise NOAA leadership of the report (i.e. will send it up the controlled correspondence chain), but as a FACA report this does not require clearance.
- Clarify that this needs to be an impartial report.

Comments

- Orbach - need to be sure that NOAA leadership understand that sending it up is for information, but that the report does NOT need clearance
- Kudrna – Board used to meet with the Undersecretary 2x/year. Suggest formalize this, and suggest this report would be opportunity to meet with her.
- West - met briefly w/ Lubchenco in June, set stage to come back and brief her in Fall on activities. Ask if anyone would like to participate.
- Heath – suggest all requests for assignments done together at end of the meeting – suggestion accepted.

Strategic Plan Alignment Discussion

- Discussion of penalties for programs who are not successful, what Board should recommend in terms of withholding funding, etc.
- Murray – reality is there will likely be a few programs who still have problems on 10/20. The grants the omnibus come in on start coming to the NSGO in November. Discussions between the program and their PO will kick into serious action between 10/20/09 and 2/1/10 (the date money starts flowing.) NSGO generally does not have a complete years funding available to distribute at this time, and Programs with problems in their strategic plan will be in the back of the line for funding.
- West – need to remind everyone that the 10/01 deadline is a BIG deal – help is there if you need it, but that this is a big deadline.
- Murray – clarify that the goal of the NSGO is for everyone to succeed
- Stephan – fears that no matter what NSGO does, if there is even 1 problem program, then the NSGO will catch political heat, since this isn't in the regulation, and risk upsetting the programs who did work hard to get this done. Need to have a clear record of communications showing that the programs clearly knew this was the outcome of not completing the process.
- Orbach – make sure NOAA knows this is the plan as well. Board also needs to be clear on what their advice should be – i.e. does the Board want to know the plan in advance, etc.
- West – clarify that the role of the Advisory Board is to provide high level advice, but that they are there to help the NSGO. Once the NSGO decides on a plan, inform the Board. And this needs to be decided ASAP.
- Lerner – there is a spectrum of understanding amongst the Directors. SGA plans to address this.
- Schmitt – review letter Director Cammen sent out – the deadline is clearly bolded, and it includes a sentence that says plans must be approved for release of funds.

Site Team Review – J. Murray

- Site visits will be key responsibility of Board.
- Board feels that the Board Member should Chair these, as they have the clout to go up against University higher ups. An unfair position to put young Program Officers in.
- Orbach – ask about connection between site visits and program rankings. Murray – concept will be that a PRP at the end of the 4 year cycle will do a comparative look at impacts between programs. Site visit reports will be part of the overall ranking, but the NSGO is not asking the site visit team to provide any kind of ranking. Orbach – clarify that this report will be used as data, and that questions asked will align with questions from the PRP.
- Woeste – impression that this is a sort of Pass/Fail type visit. Murray – thinking is that there is no ranking, no Pass / Fail. But the Site Visit Report may point to an issue that causes a fail – however, the NSGO is NOT asking the Site Visit team to make that judgement.
- West – need to get these on Members calendars ASAP

- Rabalais – the task of recommending how Sea Grant funding should be allocated should go together with this.
- West – note that the Site Visit funding should NOT come out of the Advisory Board pot.
- Kudrna – comment that this is the only part of the PIE process that interacts face-to-face with the program Directors – this is a chance to explain the process to the institution.
- West – suggest the Site Visit Chair connect with the Program Director in advance to set the stage for the visit.

POST Presentation (Pacific Ocean Shelf Tracking Project) –

- Presentation on acoustic tracking of marine species. See <http://www.postcoml.org/> for more details.

Research Committee Report – B. Duce

- Looked at the 2006/2007 data. There was ~10% different from NIMS – but close enough to rely on NIMS for longer term trends
- Looked at the Citation index to assess publications.
- Orbach – clarify that the funding power of research v. extension reflects total funding to those components, *not* the buying power of a dollar in the different disciplines.
- Recommendation: “The NSGO, the NSGAB, the SGA, and NOAA should form a Task Team to initiate detailed discussions on the approaches to developing a stronger national focus for Sea Grant such that its success, and therefore increased research and overall funding, can be achieved. Considerations should include, among other actions, efforts to align with NOAA’s regionalization of its programs, increased emphasis on critical coastal research needs that serve the nation while preserving some level of research that serves local needs, and a consideration of ways to improve the mechanism for handling the research portfolio.”
- Orbach – sense of the first recommendation is not that SG isn’t going a good job, but that people don’t know it well and *also* that SG is not doing the right things.
- West – need to know where it’s coming from that SG isn’t doing the right stuff
- Duce – impression came strongly from the NMGS directors, as well as NOS and OAR lab directors, definitely from OMB, and some from former NOAA officials and the Hill.
- West – point out potentially biased input from some sources.
- Stubblefield – these folks feel extension side is done right, but that the research program is not national, doesn't respond well to emerging needs, isn't willing to accept guidance from OMB, NOAA, etc.
- Byrne – important to distinguish is this regards **quality** or **focus**, as focus will be a matter of perspective
- Stubblefield – some concern in NOAA and OMB that the quality is actually less
- Orbach – interesting that NOAA non-peer reviewed scientists are criticizing SG’s peer reviewed science.
- Heath – quality perception is probably 20 years out of date, but takes a LONG time to correct perception issues. Similarly going to take a long time counteract the perception that SG is a collection of local issues.
- Bell – reading the responses, got no sense that the research was of poor quality, believe it is that folks are not aware of it, or aware of it as a cohesive package. Need to make it look more like a national program.
- Orbach - discussion of uses of Report. Guidance of Board as look at programs, versus a report that will convey the message that SG is not doing good work or the right work.

- Harris – if SG keeps going as is, SG will be a dead duck. Will gain better support if aligned to national focus. **But** the strength of Sea Grant is the local focus. For example, as an outsider Hawaii Sea Grants efforts look like a Hodge Podge, but each piece is a critical item that fed directly into water management, aquaculture, etc.
- Don't think will be able to change the perception of Sea Grant unless it is rebranded around national priorities.
- If decide Task Force is critical, should involve other areas as well. Ideally in National Academies.

Motion that advisory board receive report (Heath). 2nd. Ayes have it unanimously.

Discussion:

- Vortmann - To what extent did OAR and NOAA buy off on SG strategic plan? Murray – began with national stakeholders meeting (at least ½ NOAA types), and at the end this was run up the NOAA chain of command. Can't give response as Leon was there for discussions.
- Vortmann - SG needs to be more relevant. If NOAA isn't buying off on Strategic plan, hard to get relevant
- Byrne – difference between national acceptance, and NOAA / Federal acceptance. Right that NOAA **had** to accept this
- Orbach – think SG strategic plan syncs well with NOAA, but question is if NOAA *leadership* thinks this.
- Murray – NOAA has been briefed, involved in Focus Areas, etc. Have had no negative reaction, and by design it was tracked to NOAA priorities from the beginning.
- Stubblefield - OMB is the 600 lb gorilla
- Vortmann - need to distinguish between presenting to leadership, and them buying off on it
- Kudrna - NOAA has serious problems within itself getting an overall sense of NOAA research.

IOOS presentation

Communications Report – F. Kudrna

- Orbach - anything done needs to be system-wide, or you can't distribute it.
- Harris – clearly the reason SG in declining situation is due to poor communications. Any national organization with extension network should NOT be in this situation. Need to make use of the assets that we have. Requires fundamental sea change.
- Byrne – CARET (committee on Agriculture, Research, Extension and Teaching). Need to recommend SG have equivalent organization
- Harris – likes the idea of “friends of Sea Grant”, but need a different name.
- Kudrna – clarify this is not a group that would reach out, but individuals would do this.
- Woeste – clarify that conceptually, “Friends of Sea Grant” and CARET are 2 different types of organizations.
- Murray – how can we utilize the group of 90 communicators?
- Stubblefield – you need a skilled, trained communicator in the main office
- Heath – clarify situation about the 5% cap on administrative funding in the NSGO funding
- Kudrna – understand limits on national office. Don't think 'Friends of Sea Grant' would fall to NSGO.
- Lerner – bring up that there is an effort underway within SGA about putting together a database of information on alumni.
- Orbach – emphasize what Jeremy said – need to get the RIGHT expertise. Example of Surfrider getting High Tech communicator to lead it.

- Stubblefield – this is focusing on mechanics. Without the message you're missing something. Thinks Sea Grant has not yet defined its message. Need to take this to next step. Hopefully these 3 committees will push the Board to that next step.

Discussion of engagement/outreach recommendations

- Use of interns in National Office
 - Weis– short term interns may require enough staff input for training, that it's not worth it.
 - Kudrna – use interns to take pressure off NSGO for NOAA required activities
 - West – this is all right, but can't see how we can get it done with existing resources
- About NOS thinking SG is too expensive - West will talk to Jack about this in a week.
- Schmitten - important to force SG onto table for discussions, as Big Programs can take all the focus
- West – clarify that the SOLE purpose of a HQ office is to make sure money is responsibly spent. Communications/Outreach is ALL secondary to this.
- Stephan – have to be careful about what we put out in terms of response to speakers. Need to check with participants about their comments
- Murray – raise question about whether it is appropriate to put in interviews credited to individuals.
- West – suggest take this stuff out.
- Byrne – this does require adjustments. Can say other recommendations that came in, and include the speakers in list of all individuals interviewed, without direct attributes

Move that Board receive the Report allowing for edits, including attributions, and redacting interview comments and appendices with other references. (Schmitten) MOTION – Submit report with recommendations and supporting documents. Motion to receive in this fashion (Kudrna). Seconded (Simmons). Unanimous Aye.

- Discussion of difference in receive v. approve of Board documents. Idea that Reports are taken in by the Board, which then has some time to review it, and can then send it in.
- Byrne – compliment 2 Committees on first rate reports

Futures Committee Report – J. Harris

- coastal communities adaptation to climate change
- presentation on impact of sea level rise on Hawaii. Discussion of time frame for this. Question if have observed real issues with sea level rise yet. Harris – not at this point – still at the cm's level, so not yet at inundation.

Recommendations to Board:

- Push from Feds that we need adaptation initiative, national strategy and plan. Need nationwide extension effort to work with huge number of stakeholders. HUGE opportunity for SG to make a mark, rebrand itself, establish SG as vital asset for NOAA and the federal government.
- Propose use SG extension to extend NOAA expertise and knowledge. SG can play critical role with coastal communities
- Original proposal: position SG with large 50-60M initiative for NOAA should there be a 2nd stimulus package. Current thinking – phase in development of this over 3 year.
Phase 1 – pilot project.
Phase 2 - \$5M for regional pilot project and capacity building.

Phase 3 - \$50M / National program (\$1.5M per program.)

- While this sounds like a large # to SG, it is enormously insufficient to deal with the problem. But this will allow SG to have a meaningful role in the big picture when it comes about.

Comments

- Orbach – did committee talk about the problem that many of these effects will not be seen for a long time? Harris – issue is that incremental effects starting already – the difficulty is what needs to be done now are assessments and planning. Orbach – Raise the point, because one of the most difficult issues is the fact that moving cities takes DECADES of planning. Vortmann – need to use this to communicate to city planners information to plan for the future.
- Byrne – to what extent does Hawaii consider a dyke system? Harris – for some cities that is the question – do we harden or do we retreat. This is a geographic question – harden isn't really an option for Hawaii
- Stubblefield – important point is that all communities / time frames will be different, and their needs to be framework in place to help city planners make the necessary judgment calls.
- Vortmann – is this something we think is sufficiently meritorious for SG to champion it?
- Simmons – North Carolina has already decided to utilize sea level rise as coastal planning, but don't know how to do this yet – SG can have a real role in this.
- Byrne – what about SG in Alaska addressing permafrost loss?
- Stubblefield – sea level rise is coastal, but climate change is global
- Vortmann – How easy is it to adapt this initiative into the SG strategic plan? Does this necessitate a complete re-write of that?
- Orbach – The kind and extent of impacts requires a whole new kind and level of expertise. In 50 years this will be THE event that takes up everyone's attention for a century. If we want to save something in the ocean, need to do it now, because once this starts, the ocean will drop off priority
- West – why should SG get this, as opposed to other federal entities? Harris –this needs to be a **cooperative** program. Chance to be team player, asset to NOAA, Team effort, etc.
- Murray – Leon goes to exec com on engagement – the way to shop this idea is through this committee.
- West – think it's important for Leon to talk to Margaret Springer directly, so she hears the idea from SG directly.
- Murray – The country is thinking of a national climate extension service – coastal is an important element, but the price tag is a lot bigger because of the need to bring in cooperative extension
- Kudrna – lots of natural links between this effort and the agriculture communities
- Harris – this is SG's corner of the issue where SG has the leading experts
- Schmitt – excited by the proposal as an opportunity to highlight SG in the short term. Think NOAA is a year, year and a half away from organized program of where to go. Climate change adaptation initiative is education, outreach, data collection – exactly what SG is.
- Woeste – If community has been conditioned to look to SG for this, then SG needs to perform, or else SG will lose. Depends on how much is asked of SG at what point. This concept is excellent, but also see that at this point in time, SG can be vulnerable.
- Harris – We clearly can't promise these types of activities with current resources. In talks with Leon, he will get **something** started in current year. Need to do this pilot project WELL to bring this forward to get these resources in future.
- As long as we don't step on other agencies doing extension, and say this is what we can do /

these are our strengths

- This requires a National Strategy
- Orbach – No community, big or small, can do this on it's own - this is why this issue will rise to the top. The other distinction to make: there is a big difference between the mitigation and adaptation questions. Adaptation is VERY practical – this is 'what do you do when the water comes up'. This is not science, it is land use planning.
- Kudrna – with restrictions on banks, loans etc., this will be a wake up call for communities
- Harris – if it were up to me, FEMA would redo FEMA flood maps based on the best projections of sea level rise, so that local communities would have a mechanism to restrict further mal-adaptive activities
- Orbach – other problem, is that this is a problem we don't know the answer to. There is a BIG issue of how we deal with the private property / takings issue. Simply don't know how we will deal with this question. Questions which could be good work for the Law Center.
- Rabalais – In LA, the response to Katrina included building an elevated highway system to 2 communities that **will** be inundated.
- Murray – would like to think through sequence of events that will get us to where we need to be in January to have a plan together
- Bell – is there a report that suggested that sea level will rise by 1 meter in the short term. Harris – maps draw on projection of 1m by 2100. Orbach – ICCC report – median projection of 1/2m by 2100, since being revised. Weis – underestimated rise because of underestimated ice rise. Bell – don't think it's unreasonable, but just think you need solid numbers to be able to sell it / for anyone to buy into it. Harris – don't think that will be a problem – congress is past that. While we don't want to base proposal on 1m rise, want to be able to respond based on whatever projections come out of FEMA.
- Byrne – Important to realize that SG is part of OAR which is part of NOAA. If you don't have attention of Administrator, it's not going to happen. SG **has** to get to Lubchenco on this issue.

Sea Grant Funding

- Need to build better constituency base that can speak up for SG

Sea Grant Image

- Need to choose people based on who SG can provide benefit to

Location of Sea Grant in Federal Bureaucracy

- Recommend not strike out and spearhead this, but should know where we want to be **SHOULD** a major restructuring happen, i.e. be ahead of the 8 ball on this

Sea Grant Brand

- Recommend name be enhance to better define the program, to give immediate impression that program is focused in on critical national priorities
- Vortmann – suggest incorporate 'university' in the brand
- Rabalais – wonder what the official name of Sea Grant is?
- Schmitten – NOAA has been stressing 'One NOAA' for 5 years. Think the simple change of including 'NOAA' would go over great
- Discussion of need for assistance in finding an effective name

Additional Comments

- Harris – proposed changes to report:

- (1) like to drop 'adaptation to' and change this to 'adaptation and mitigation',
- (2) change 'cities' to 'coastal communities.'

- West – The FY2011 budget process is already done, so won't get it for then, but could aim this at FY2012. Otherwise it looks like SG is asking for an add-on. Harris – suggest put in phases, without any reference to the year, with pilot phase starting as soon as possible.
- West – suggest Navy Port may be good location for pilot project.

MOTION: W those changes, move that we receive the report. (Vortmann) 2nd (Simmons). All ayes.

Discussion of all 3 Reports:

MOTION to accept all 3 reports and move on (Simmons). PB – 2nd (Bell).

AMENDMENT: Accept Research Committee report for passage on to NSGO as Board Report, but consider other 2 reports as reports to the Board for discussion tomorrow. (Orbach)

MOTION WITHDRAWN

MOTION to accept Research Committee Report for forwarding on to NSGO (Simmons). 2nd (Bell). All Ayes.

MOTION to accept other 2 reports as reports to the Board as hey were received (Simmons). 2nd (Bell). 15 Ayes, 1 nye.

Friday August 28

Nominating Committee – P. Bell

- Propose slate of John Woeste / Chair, Dick Vortmann / Vice-Chair

MOTION to accept slate (Bell). 2nd (Simmons). All Ayes.

Board Assignments

1. **SAB – no official assignment** at this point in time.
 - Frank Kudrna is still on the SAB, and though leaving the Board, volunteers to inform Board of SAB happenings.
2. **SRC - Ross Heath**
 - Spinrad definitely wants a representative from the Board. **Ross Heath is assigned.**
3. **SG Networks -**
Extension - Schmitten, Communications - Simmons, Education – Rabalais
 - Woeste – discussion of what it means to participate with Extension Council, participate as able. Meet 1x/year in person, executive group meets by telephone. Budget implication – if person attends session, it's 1x/year.
 - West – suggest rather than assign to individual, Board members should participate as locally available.
 - Stephan - clarify role of Communications liaison. Feel it is important for Board to interact with them. Level of involvement varies depending on Chair. The communications network made up of chief communicator from each of the SG Programs.
 - Murray – historically Nat was liaison to Education network. If have liaisons to the others and not education, should have someone to this.
 - Kudrna – believe need official liaison to all of these – attendance is a different matter, but someone should be assigned the role.
4. **SGA Liaison - Board Chair.**
 - West – this has recently been the Chair – we should formalize this. SGA likes to have 2 individuals come - suggest that Vice Chair participate as well if available.
5. **Focus Teams**
Seafood - Schmitten. Jeff remain involved for expertise. (change)
Ecosystems - Rabalais. Keep Judy involved for expertise (change)
Resilient Communities – Byrne (same)
Sustainable Communities – Heath (same)
6. **Biennial Report – West, Woeste, Byrne, Orbach.**
 - Discuss include 4th, potentially new member. Orbach volunteer for this - accepted.
7. **Knauss Selection Board – Orbach.**
 - Discuss worry over conflict of interest (due to Duke connection.) Clarification by previous participants that there is robust process for dealing with conflict of interest.
 - Kudrna – discuss issue that Fellows have little connection to SG – suggested before that process should include some kind of involvement with program.
 - Pearson – discuss new initiative of Programs reaching out to Knauss fellows.
 - Discussion of connection to Sea Grant as pre-requisite to admission.
 - Orbach – clarify that Fellowship is to focus on working on National issue.
 - Group discussion of the role of Knauss program, objectives of fellowship. Highlight objectives as (1) give opportunity to bright students, and (2) demonstrate that Sea Grant institutions produce students of use to the Federal Gvt (both branches).
 - Wouldn't hurt to have them submit essay on Sea Grant

- Kudrna – Sea Grant funding in trouble. These individuals are strong source of support to SG as a whole.
 - Clarification that applicants don't need to know about Sea Grant **before** they apply, but need to know about Sea Grant before they **leave**
 - West – will sit down with National Office to find out exactly what is happening with Knauss fellows at this point. Need to get them more ingrained with Sea Grant before they start the process.
 - Byrne – know a lot if you know a bit about the local program, and no way to get that in DC, ought to be connection in both places.
 - Stephan – agree with Judy, still think it's reasonable to ask applicants to submit a paragraph discussing the program.
8. **Funding Allocation Sub Committee – not tasked yet.**
- This is likely to be controversial. Murray review funding situation a bit (lg v. small programs.) Current allocation policy is obsolete – all geared toward increased dollars.
 - Orbach – basic question is if core \$ can be adjusted, what is NSGO plan for addressing that Q over what time frame?
 - Murray – that is the Q that is open for advice.
 - Orbach – when take the Q up?
 - Murray – talked to Leon and he wanted to raise it today and have a discussion. Leon is prepared to charge Board with looking at this question. The big question becomes how far to go with that. Purpose of bringing it up today is just to start discussion that will help inform NSGO on how to form a charge to the Board.

Discussion

- Discussion of communications amongst board – openness depends on Board members to send information. Board members can send info to Melissa for inclusion in newsletter
- Comment that critical for Leon to participate in later meetings
- Meeting dates for 2010
 - Reasons for a meeting in DC and one meeting in the field. Next Fall is SGA and SG week in Louisiana. Although we were just there and it defeats the purpose of the field, it makes sense. Heath – given this off situation, consider doing Field visit in one of the DC area programs, and then do LA in the Fall.
 - Orbach – disadvantage of going to DC while other stuff happening, don't get attention – argument for going when you can get access to people for *you*.
 - Spring meeting: SGA -2/16-17. West – don't have to be necessarily hooked on to SGA. Appropriations schedule doesn't matter. Orbach – like to see Agenda where have Spinrad, Dunnigan, etc. available to meet with Board – question is what is the best time for them.
 - Murray – important for Board to be at SG week. West – agree, **if** they engage all Board members in some meaningful process.
 - Harris – suggest need 3 meetings, and urge Leon to attend.
 - Schmitt – if we've attended SG week historically, would be noticed if didn't.
 - Discussion of relevancy of Board if NOAA not appear.
 - West – consensus need to do SG week, work to make sure the Board is more intimately involved. Woeste – in the past they have asked member of Board to assist in SG Planning committee – calls/etc. **West suggest he and Woeste work together to assist with SG week planning.** FK – Suggest make link to the Regional effort in the Gulf.
 - Byrne – San Diego was effective largely because Board drove agenda, and that was the

Strategic plan, and gave programs opportunity to interact with Board. As we're looking at next SG week, think it's important to look at Board items to help drive the Agenda, for example funding issue, as plan for meeting. Take a hard look at how Board puts significant elements in the Agenda for that week.

- Suggestion of summer as 3rd meeting to finalize report / field visit plans.
- West – suggest DC in Feb, summer meeting/field session, SG Week in Fall.
- Murray – selfishly, SG week allows us to piggy back and save staff time – would make 3 meetings more doable for our staff.
- West – ask programs if there is anything they can help with.
- Feb Meeting: dates of SGA don't work as well.
- Need delegation to Knauss Reception.
- **Feb dates – 2/23-2/24.**
- Look for volunteer to host next Summer's session.
- To save \$, ask fewer folks to go to SGA meeting.
- Summer meeting discussion – east coast / great lakes. Decide on NE. Orbach putting in suggestion for Boston area. Harris 2nd this. **Suggestions for hosts at UNH, MIT/Woods Hole, RI, CT – look for dates in Aug.**
- Woeste – discussion of government rate travel issue – need to go over method to get around buying government fare rate (i.e. method to get non-refundable fare when it is significantly cheaper) West – if you find that, get to NSGO and provide information, since they need to book travel auth within 24 hours. Stephan – process that works: go online, find price, gets .pdf, attach it in email to ad-trav, and authorization with signature saying authorize you to buy me a non-refundable ticket. Call with Nikola Garber to clarify procedures.
- Kudrna – for SG week, may want to have session getting input on allocation funding.
- Harris – statutorily, should give advice to Secretary – suggest getting in there to talk to him. West – use official chain first, then utilize personal connections to get in.
- West – will be heading to NSGO in a few weeks, and spending day with Leon. Question of what to do about Board feeling marginalized? Heath – seems to me if go that route, should broaden topic of discussion. Would make sense if this Ad Board were the FACA for **all** Coastal NOAA Programs. West – maybe unified FACA would help think through the issues. Kudrna – way to do this may be that OMB is not buying NOAA's response. That message needs to get back to NOAA.
- West – what does Board think about statement from Board that they have discussed the issues from OMB and Coastal issues, and that Lunchenco could consider using Board assistance on this issue.
- Rabalais – would this be more appropriate going to SAB? Kudrna – Could be done there, but good for this board to raise it. Discussion of SAB is limited to Science so not necessarily broad enough for this.
- Woeste – frustrated that Leon not attended last 2 meetings. No other indication that Leon not using the Board. Different than prior methods, but not convinced it's ineffective.
- Harris – Get response quickly from Jim, but do not get response from Leon.
- West – 2 issues: (1) frustration at being marginalized, (2) role of this Board in helping the Coastal Integration effort.
- Kudrna – suggestion is OMB saying wet programs uncoordinated. NOAA had all pieces get together, and response is to have coordination effort of yearly meeting – inadequate response. Since NOAA accepted that, it is appropriate to sit down with Administrator and say OMB not buying this, and we're willing to help with this.

- Harris – much more effective if advising some level above the SG Office about SG
- West – all our reports go to the Undersecretary – through the SG Director as a courtesy.
- Vortmann – but is there any interest on the part of the recipient?
- Orbach – Think need to pursue this in ordered way up the chain – not stopping on the chain, but so folks along the chain are aware.
- Can Murray respond how NSGO has responded to Board? Murray – Yes – Have been responsive. As to Leon’s absence, he couldn't be there during setting of dates – few weeks later saw them, and said this was the only week he was unavailable, but then no alternative dates were available from the Board. Think the NSGO has been very responsive to the Board. Can go back to Byrne Report, NSGO reported back out against the 18 recommendations – had implemented or made progress on all of those recommendations. Kudrna’s most recent NRC response report as well – this shaped the final PIE system. The Board Reports are definitely NOT blown off. In fact hoping can get to discussion of the 3 Reports to provide unified, prioritized advice that the NSGO can act on.
- Byrne – My perception is that the NSGO is responsive. Problem is when I look at our 3 Reports, not sure how much is of significant interest to the NOAA Administrator, though it is of high interest to NSGO and SGA

MOVE that Board accept recommendation of Futures committee to accept new Climate Change Initiative. (Harris) 2nd for Discussion. (Orbach)

- Harris designated to assist NSGO with this

DISCUSSION OF REPORTS

- Kudrna – 3 groups of recommendations from the 3 Reports. Key recommendations: from Research - forming a task team, from Futures - implementing a demonstration project, from Communications - looking for economies/cost savings, having a dedicated Communicator in the NSGO, making Murray’s time available to staff the upcoming engagement report. Put this collection of 5 recommendations on the table for discussion.
- Byrne – getting ahead of the wagon. Want to know what we're doing with these 3 reports. Assuming there will be cover memorandum that will rank recommendations of the 3 reports, and what we're hearing from Jeremy that his recommendation for Climate Initiative be raised to high priority on the list.
- Vortmann – and where do these reports get sent to? Byrne – first step they go to NSGO. Then some may be pushed further up the Chain – the Board needs to decide how far they want the reports to go.
- Orbach - impression if we accept this motion, then together with motions on other reports would cause writing of cover memo, which may or may not go with reports.
- Stephan – submit memo with reports, saying submit 3 committee reports, here are our top priorities
- Stubblefield – these need to be 2 separate actions: (1) Forwarding of reports, (2) sending of Board priorities.
- West – the Research report needs to at least go to Spinrad. Think should send to NSGO and Spinrad. Think Futures and Communications reports should go to NSGO.
- Stephan – for the Research committee task force recommendation, should the Board recommend to Spinrad who should do this? Consensus – yes. Board should recommend on best entity, not worry about cost.
- Kudrna – do 1 action. Begin with doom and gloom of declining resources. This is the major

issue of all the reports. In response to this 3 studies, list the priorities from here.

- West – who does this go to? Kudrna – start with Spinrad w/ cc to Leon. Share with SGA.
- Harris – respectfully disagree with that advice. It is why we did the studies, but don't sell the proposals that way. We need to tell them why these proposals are of value to them.
- Additional discussion of procedures for submitting reports, who they go to, and how to frame it.

MOVE the question. 2nd (Orbach). Ayes.

MOVE that the Report of the Futures Committee be accepted. 2nd (Schmitt). All Ayes.

- Discussion clarified that “accepted” means “accepted and forwarded”

MOVE accept and forward Communications Reports (Stephan). 2nd (Orbach). All Ayes.

Discussion of how to push priorities up

- Murray – NOAA takes SAB seriously. If Research report is trying to influence NOAA, then SAB may be way to go.
- Stubblefield – committee felt getting close to controversial, big issue that we don't have ability to tackle, so recommend it should be done by outside entity with resources.
- West – Board should leave it open enough that Spinrad has some latitude
- Discussion of recommendations from the Research report, and the creation of an independent cover memorandum to transmit with it.
- Discussion of the recommendation about increased funding looks. Remove clause about 'success lead to increase funding'. Add local and regional.
- Stubblefield – clarify made no attempt to look at broad picture – report focused on Research. But will include add contextual language.
- Language in introduction to show how came to recommendations
- Murray – add language to show this is to complement NOAA's research portfolio
- Issue of how review fit into any other review of NOAA research. Kudrna mention overall NOAA review not happening any time soon.
- Byrne – does this bother anyone that someone outside local program will tell local program what research they can do?
- Murray – all of this recent activity (alignment of strategic plans pulling the National Program together in line with NOAA's mission and goals, etc) is designed to put to rest the idea that Sea Grant operates off the radar.
- The main goal of this recommendation is to convey to NOAA that Sea Grant really wants to be part of the team

MOVE to approve the recommendation in the Blue Box (Harris). 2nd.

- Murray – can we say something like NOAA in cooperation with the SG Network? Heath – no – that's already been done. We want a higher level confirmation of this.
- Woeste – OMB never supported cooperative extension, think only thing can ever do is keep 'em off your back – OMB will **never** support cooperative programs.

AMEND motion to change 'reaffirm' to 'affirm'. (Harriid) Call the question. All ayes.

ACTION – send letter with intro to the Report (Harris will provide the Intro.)

- Murray – is there a preferred option? Consensus from Board is no – committee thinks that another outside Board should look at it.

COMMUNICATIONS REPORT

- Kudrna – out of the collection of recommendations from this report, would focus on the following:
 - For NSGO:
 - Communications: technology efficiencies to stretch staff
 - Adding communications staff (FT and Knauss)
 - Approach SGA communicators to establish Friends of Sea Grant.
 - Engagement – task Murray / free his time to fully respond to SAB's engagement report.
 - For Spinrad - recommend that he should sit down with other AA's and discuss NOAA wide climate extension plan. In discussions with Board leadership and Spinrad, pursue climate extension role for SG, and follow up discussions with Hayes and Dunnigan, concerns with partnering, etc.

MOVE to adopt identified recommendations as priorities for National office (Kudrna). 2nd. All ayes.

- Byrne – focus on funding. (1) Bring in someone who does marketing to focus on marketing SG, (2) establish something equivalent to CARET. Further discussion would be worthwhile.
- Heath - 3rd item – in many ways best opportunities for funding come from linking up with other agencies that do have money. Earlier recommendation had suggested Jim be freed up to do that development.
- West – another sources of folks for staffing needs in DC is policy internships at nearby universities
- Kudrna – had started conversation about limited funding, and wanted to get to what things SG should **stop** doing, or do at lower level, and haven't made any suggestions of what SG **shouldn't** do
- Murray – from NRC, recent thrust of new money was to build PO duties. NSGO very short staffed in that department – for example Murray is still running all Megan's programs.
- Walk through **ACTION PLAN FOR CLIMATE EXTENSION**. Board thinks plan looks good.

ACTION – Get Board on Lubchenco schedule for 10/20 or 10/21. Meet with Spinrad on 9/16.

- Review of items on upcoming Board Calendar.
- Murray – Congress has tried to give SG money in the past, and it got derailed at the SGA level. Issue that this is an extension dominant proposal. A number of members who will be concerned about where is the research. In the past, proposals like this have been undermined by lack of consensus. Critical to get SGA on board. Job for the SGA President.
- Woeste – think after initial demonstration project, identified gaps in expertise / info needs would lead to research funds to move it to next phase of implementation.

1:50 Move Adjourn. 2nd. All Ayes.