

Spring 2011 National Sea Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Board Members: Byrne, Orbach, Rabalais, Schmitten, Simmons, Stubblefield, Vortmann, West, Woeste

Ex-Officio Members: Ban, Cammen, Pennock

Not in attendance: Harris

Tuesday, February 8

8:00 Introductions, review agenda, approval of minutes, etc. (J. Woeste, Chair, NSGAB)

Discussion:

Jeremy Harris will not be attending

Approval of agenda: John Byrne - approve, Harry Simmons – second. Carried unanimously

Review minutes from October 2010 meeting. Changes as noted:

Byrne – Jim Murray was official member of committee (pg 19)

Page 22 – what is a mortar? NOAA research is the “mortar between bricks”

Agenda says “Orbach asked if a woman could be on the nominating committee”

Page 26 – discussion about travel. It says “Harry needed refundable because he is a mayor” which isn’t true – because he’s a mayor he may have to leave due to a storm

Page 9 – Rabalias quote about “no conclusion other than to stay on course” – delete entire comment – no one remembers her saying that.

Vortmann – why do we need this detailed of minutes?

Ban – FACA requires “detailed minutes” but that can be anywhere between a summary and very detailed notes.

Group discussed whether they would like to have summary or detailed notes – agreement on summary

Motion to approve minutes as revised – Byrne, 2nd Schmitten

Passed unanimously

8:15 Chair’s update (J. Woeste)

Discussion:

Jim Murray has been sent out to Denver for the OAR Next/Senior Research Council meeting

8:30 NSGO report (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Presentation and Discussion:

- Budget – nothing much to discuss. We’re still waiting to see a budget. We’re planning multiple scenarios just in case.
 - President’s Budget comes out on Feb 14
- Changes in NSGO Personnel
 - Miguel Lugo left Sea Grant – his position is not being replaced
 - Chelsea Lowes has taken on Sea Grant Knauss Manager duties
 - Program Management has been parsed out among other Program Officers
 - Jim Murray will be retiring on June 30
 - NSGO will replace Jim’s position – though how will depend on what the budget looks like
 - Would like to do some IPAs as well

- Lauren Land and Amy Scaroni are on board and will be taking on the coordination of the focus areas
- Lisa Adams is staying on for a few months
- Evaluation
 - Site Reviews (SRT)
 - SRTs have received informal feedback – this process is much less stressful than the previous process, but NSGO has asked for “Lessons Learned.” SGA is concerned about the Performance Review Panel (PRP).
 - Assume that if there are big issues that we would be getting that feedback without a formal mechanism
 - Performance Review Panel (PRP)
 - Was scheduled for fall of 2011 – rescheduled for spring of 2012
 - Will target the first 2 years of the new reporting program
 - And looking at how programs did in relation to the other programs in the network – in the last 4 years (so it will be a 4 year review)
 - Weighting – 50% on the first 2 years of the reporting, 50% in relation to other programs
 - Annual review – not for evaluation
- Enhancing Sea Grant’s Partnerships with NOAA
 - “noaa.gov” email addresses have been secured for SG Directors
 - Interested in Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPAs) for Directors and Regional Leads
 - IPAs authorize temporary assignment of employees between Federal agencies and State, local, or Indian tribal governments, institutions of higher education and other eligible information.
 - Working more closely with NOAA regional Sea Grant liaisons
 - Sea Grant Advisory Board study of how to improve NOAA’s engagement with universities
 - Enhanced communications
 - Social media (daily news items)
 - Twitter
 - Facebook
 - Possibly Ning
 - National Sea Grant web site – undergoing revisions currently
 - External Newsletter for NOAA Leadership and Decision-makers
 - Monthly distribution
 - Board inquired if there was a NOAA-wide effort or just NSGO.
 - NSGO is trying to create a venue for disseminating State program information to the public, within NOAA/DoC and within the network
 - In the interest of time maybe at the next meeting we can have a tutorial on how to use these different social media
 - Fact Sheets

- Not officially approved by NOAA yet, so NSGO cannot hand them to Congress yet.
 - Tried to feature impacts from SG Programs
 - National Stories
 - The State of Sea Grant 2010 Biennial Report to Congress
- OAR Next
 - Once Climate leaves OAR, coasts and oceans should become a much bigger part of OAR
 - Extension and engagement needs to be better recognized within OAR
- National Ocean Policy
 - Came out last summer with 9 priority areas identified and now strategic action plans are being developed; drafts out soon and public comments being requested via Federal Register Notice
 - These plans are supposed to be what we are capable of doing with no increase in funding. Most things do cost money and that money is going to have to come from somewhere.
 - Board discussed the NOAA Climate Service (It's in the President's Budget) and whether it can go forward without Congressional support. (Cammen – believe it has to be “blessed” by the appropriations committee)
 - Also discussed if it is better for Sea Grant to be tied to the Climate Service or to OAR. (No resolution.)

9:15 SGA report (J. Pennock, President, Sea Grant Association)

Presentation:

- NOAA Inreach and Governmental Relations
 - NOAA
 - Governmental Relations
- Funding – particularly for small programs
 - NSGAB Allocation Committee
 - BMPs from Successful Programs
 - Focus on Role of SG to NOAA and Other Federal Agencies
 - Joint ERC/PMC Effort to Define Sea Grant Capacity
- New Approaches and Focus Areas
 - PMC Leading Effort to Design Approach to Develop New Ideas
 - Insure Focus on Internal Discussions of BMPs
- PIE and NIMS
 - Working with NSGO
 - Still concern over PRP
- Focus Teams
 - Need to integrate breadth of SG Network and Communicate
- Internal Organization and Communication
- Organization and Roles of ERC and PMC

9:45 Break – 15 minutes

10:00 SAB Brief and Biennial Report Follow-up Visits (D. West, NSGAB)

Presentation:

- Admiral West recommends doing the SAB every 2-3 years to keep Sea Grant visible
 - Biennial Report was well received
 - Next report in 18 months or less – will be very important since FY13 will be the reauthorization

Discussion:

- Board inquired as to the response from Congress or NOAA on the Biennial Report. Positive feedback has been received and it has been a tool to promote Sea Grant’s work within both groups. DOC commented on impact statements in the Biennial Report saying that they need further development in other parts of NOAA, but that it looks good as long as we keep pushing forward with it.
- A few weeks after the briefing, Mary Glackin (Deputy Under Secretary) called Craig McLean about how to involve Sea Grant more in NOAA. The report is a powerful message that was well done and is a great selling point for Sea Grant
- These kinds of reports are so helpful for new legislators who are coming in on an agenda to make government “work better”. It is going to be extremely useful to new legislators as they familiarize themselves with programs.

10:30 NOAA Climate Program Office and Sea Grant (Dr. Chet Koblinsky, NOAA Climate Program Office)

Presentation in Appendix A

Discussion:

- Board inquired as to the relationship between the Coastal Zone Management Program and the Climate Program Office.
 - Dr. Koblinsky said that information from the CPO generally flows through the NOAA Coastal Services Center and that they will soon increase focus to societal impacts of climate change.
- Board inquired how the CPO and future Climate Service will integrate with the United States Geological Survey.
 - Dr. Koblinsky said that they are working hard to make sure that the right agencies and people are connected prior to the Climate Service beginning.
- Board asked about synergy and partnership with Sea Grant.
 - Dr. Koblinsky said that the Climate Service will need to draw on Sea Grant expertise to integrate the programs and to avoid duplication of effort.
- Board suggested that the regional climate coordinators be requested to get in touch with the Sea Grant programs in their regions.

11:30 Discussion of morning topics

Discussion:

- Board expressed concern that Sea Grant is thought of as an extension program, but not research.
 - Dr. Cammen replied that there have been some grant opportunities that he talked about that some of the PIs from Sea Grant have been awarded. That is probably

the way that this funding is going to go. He added that Sea Grant is not a big player in climate research, but that outreach and extension are unique to Sea Grant within NOAA.

- Board discussed upcoming meeting with Dr. Lubchenco, NOAA Administrator. Topics suggestions included Biennial Report to Congress, Academic Affairs Committee, Advisory Board membership, Sea Grant Allocations Committee, regional coordination with NOAA programs

12:00 Adjourn for Lunch

Spring 2011 National Sea Advisory Board Meeting

Tuesday, February 8

**1:00 USDA Cooperative Extension Program and Climate Change (Louie Tupas, USDA)
Presentation in Appendix A**

Discussion:

- Board asked if Land Grant was having the same budgetary issues as Sea Grant, particularly with research and personnel.
 - Mr. Tupas said that Cooperative Extension has separate budgets for research and personnel. Because Sea Grant is smaller, it is much more flexible and can act much more quickly. USDA does not actually motivate the research much, it can only very indirectly influence what people do. NOAA can plan and guide the research much more efficiently. Natural resources research is competing with Family/Consumer, Nutrition, and Food production.
- Board and NSGO said that there will be a joint Land Grant/Sea Grant climate summit later in the year.
 - Mr. Tupas said that extension professionals need to catch up on basic knowledge and planning for climate and managing risks. He hopes to develop an advisory group that will accommodate both Land Grant and Sea Grant priorities and objectives

**1:30 NOAA and Academic Relations Committee (Andy Winer and Caren Madsen,
NOAA Office of External Affairs)**

(Presentation in Appendix A)

Discussion:

- Board said that there are already associations of universities that look at engagement – why come to Sea Grant?
 - Mr. Winer said that NOAA needs help making those connections, as opposed to cold calling them.
- Board said that they will need the support of NOAA leadership to take on this committee, particular to get input from all NOAA research enterprises. They also sought clarification on the objectives of the committee.

- Mr. Winer said that this is an opportunity to engage on issues that are mutually important. Then if there is another emergency (like the Deep Water Horizon spill), the relationships are already there. There is a problem with distinct groups working together; not cooperating, so a lot of opportunities were missed just due to trouble linking people in.
- Dr. Cammen observed that if if this oil spill had happened anywhere else, it may not have happened so well. GOM works very well together– particularly Buck Sutter. Those relationships were already established. You have to get these relationships set up before you need them. DWH was a rapidly moving crisis. CMSP (Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning) and catch shares are slow moving, serious issues that could use a similar solution. It is a good effort on your part to get this established now.
- The Board asked if the charge was to look at academic relationships only, or if they should to look at coastal managers or stakeholders.
 - Mr. Winer said that the NOAA Science Advisory Board reported on coastal managers and stakeholder engagement in 2008. They found that engagement was happening, but not in a coordinated manner. NOAA is now using NOP (National Ocean Policy) and CMSP to improve that engagement. Coastal manager engagement is much better than academic engagement. Academic area is sorely in need of some help.
- Board said that the NSF has a good relationship with universities (including university leadership) because much of their funding is from NSF. NOAA doesn't provide as much funding to universities
 - Mr. Winer replied that he hoped recommendations include the needs for NOAA leadership and academic leadership, for example. If we have the resources, how do we best use them to advance the goals of the AGM (Annual Guidance Memorandum.)

ACTION – Mr. Winer will provide Science Advisory Board report on engagement to the Sea Grant Advisory Board

2:30 Break – 15 minutes

2:45 **Committee updates**
-Allocation II (D. West, NSGAB) (45 min)

Discussion:

- Admiral West said that there was a weak response to the Allocation survey, even after additional plea at Sea Grant Week. The Board needs to make a recommendation on Allocation plan at the Fall meeting. The budget will not grow. The SGA has agreed that \$1.5M is the base for a viable SG Program.
 - The Board asked if the Allocation committee has thought through all options. Is this something that the Board should deal with our perhaps OAR? The Board has received input from the SGA and will need the Allocation Committee II to sit down and determine the ground rules to address these issues before the next board meeting, such as how do you define a Sea Grant program – there is a standard, but is it still the right one?

- Board suggested that the committee bring an action to the Board in the fall. Dr. Cammen should review committee task, and revise the charge, and the Board will address it in Fall.
- Dr. Cammen added that the Board exists to give high level and strategic advice and that the allocation issue should be approached at two levels. What do we do with a program if funding stays just like it is? At some point, when the Sea Grant re-authorization is up, the Board's decision can help give it a choice about what Sea Grant currently looks like, and what Sea Grant could look like. The Allocation committee needs to provide a couple of alternatives and then get a recommendation from the board.

Motion: Ask the allocation subcommittee to review Dr. Ross Heath's paper and to refine a matrix of problem, objectives and options and narrow those options and give a preferred option to this body for comments. Once approved, it would be submitted to the Director of the National Sea Grant College Program for final action at the next advisory meeting. – Schmitten, 2nd Orbach
Passed unanimously

- The Board agreed to add members to the Allocation Committee, and ask Dr. Pennock for representation from the SGA. The original Allocation Committee will be disbanded and a new one, with a revised charge from Dr. Cammen, will meet to make recommendations to the Board.

3:45 Gulf Oil Spill Restoration Efforts (Dr. Shelby Walker, NOAA)
Presentation in Appendix A

Discussion:

- The Board asked how the British Petroleum (BP) funding for the restoration effort was going to be dispersed.
 - Dr. Walker said that the BP Request for Proposals (RFP) is not yet out, but understands that BP will not require any review of the data. A council (10 representatives from the states, 10 from BP) will select the project for funding. BP is looking to address the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process with their funding. NOAA restoration report is looking at broader restoration.
 - Dr. Walker said that the NOAA Gulf Oil Spill Restoration team would appreciate suggestions for outreach and recommendations for the plan, including academic entities that would be helpful.

4:30 Discussion of afternoon topics

Discussion:

Academic Affairs Committee:

- The Board discussed the benefits and concerns of the new committee. It will bring some visibility to the Sea Grant program, but could also be seen as stepping on toes. Even though it is a Sea Grant advisory board, it is to provide advice to the Secretary of Commerce on "such other matters as the Secretary refers to the Board for review and advice."

- The Board will respond to Mr. Winer’s charge and appoint a committee once it gets clarification on several items:
 - Staff support
 - Line Office support
 - Announcement from leadership
 - Universities involvement
 - Budget
 - Timeframe
 - NOAA Science Advisory Board or National Research Council as an alternative

MOTION: Empower the Chair to go to Mr. Winer and accept the task subject to appropriate expressions of support both monetary and staff and an announcement from NOAA leadership. – Orbach, 2nd Simmons

Vote: 8 Yes, 1 No; Motion passes

-Futures II (M. Orbach, NSGAB) (15 min)

Discussion:

The Board agreed that the Futures Committee needs a more specific charge once OAR and Climate Service issues are resolved. Once the decision is made as to whether or not the Climate Service will break from OAR, the committee should act very expeditiously.

SUGGESTION: Bring back tomorrow for further discussion and deliberation.

4:45 Public Comment Period (15 minutes)

Discussion:

Ms. Ban, the Designated Federal Officer stated that she did not receive written comments and no members of the public came to provide comments.

5:00 Adjourn

Wednesday, February 9

(J. Brown)

8:30 Call to Order, review agenda and previous day’s discussions (J. Woeste)

Discussion:

Any additions to agenda? None

Carryover item from yesterday: Futures II committee – specificity of charge to committee needed.

- The Board discussed the nature of Futures I and Futures II committees. Futures I was about big ideas – sustainable communities, being built in via 2 focus teams. The Futures II committee is looking for more specific goals for the group, possibly recommendations on reorganization and the placement of Sea Grant. The Futures II committee should have a fair amount of flexibility – when events happen, need to be able to respond.
 - Board agreed that for the short term, the Futures committee is continuing in a monitoring role

Notes from Business Meeting from the Chair:

- Dates for Fall meeting:
 - Sept 28-29 – ask University of Rhode Island/Barry Costa-Pierce, Director of Rhode Island Sea Grant about hosting
 - Dates for 2012:
 - Will send out email regarding Spring Meeting dates once SGA has decided on their meeting dates.
 - Waiting to learn about Sea Grant Week decision for Fall
- Committee assignments:
 - Knauss Fellowship committee assignment – Dick Vortmann
 - SAB Liaison – Bill Stubblefield and Dick West will be asked to serve as representatives from the board, will decide based on agenda if participation is warranted. If in DC, one will attend, elsewhere in the nation, they will coordinate with Board for someone to attend

8:45 Sea Grant's Social Science Portfolio (Dr. Heather Triezenberg, NSGO)

Presentation in Appendix A

Discussion:

- Board stated that it is commendable that Sea Grant is taking lead in social science but wanted to know what efforts are going on in NOAA beyond Sea Grant
 - Dr. Triezenberg said that the main interactions are from NOAA Fisheries – economic and anthropological impacts, monitoring and observing vs. research. NOAA's National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) also does some, but challenge is obtaining funding. Coral program has a human dimensions strategy. NOAA social scientists meet regularly, and are interested in applying for Sea Grant funds. This is an opportunity for Sea Grant to integrate social sciences throughout NOAA. It is simple to look at economic impacts, harder to look at social/cultural impacts. Sea Grant has that local connection, plus university ties, to allow strong studies in support of management efforts on local scales. Social science is so important, because every decision always impacts people. Every decision also has tradeoffs beyond economics. Must have scientific understanding of people, not just fish and water. One of OAR's priorities is social science – but OAR has limited capacity, and it is mostly in Sea Grant.

9:15 NOAA's Educational Partnership Program (Dr. Audrey Trotman, NOAA)

Presentation in Appendix A

Discussion:

- The Board asked how many of 88 PhDs are working for NOAA and how many go elsewhere.
 - Dr. Trotman said she would find out. Her data is not yet broken down to just PhD, but could do so – each center tracks students for 5 years
- The Board wanted to understand what NOAA is doing to make itself more attractive to the EPP graduates.

- Dr. Trotman said that the EPP is an education program, but they don't do the hiring. Different NOAA line offices have different hiring philosophies, but that the EPP is looking at how to respond to these different hiring patterns, engaging with leadership. Center Directors meet annual – Drs. Cammen and Woeste are invited to meet with them this year, information will be given to Ms. Ban

9:45 Break – 15 minutes

10:00 Focus Team liaison reports

- Hazard Resilience in Coastal Communities (H. Simmons)

Discussion:

Lisa Adams has been working with the focus team; Lauren Land will be replacing her
Update in New Orleans about changes in the group
Projects

- National survey of coastal decision makers on climate change, 18 programs involved
- Coastal processes roundtable – 18 people attended, how to build capacity, developing listserv, professional network, want to bring external partners to form Center.
- Expert panel on intersections of Smart Growth, hazard resilience, and climate change, how to implement all 3 – June 2011
- 2011 Climate Summit – Sea Grant/Land Grant leadership to discuss how to expand internal capacity

Some topics that cross-over with Sustainable Coastal Development (SCD)

- Sustainable Coastal Development (M. Orbach)

Discussion:

Concern – sea level rise (SLR) is going to be the biggest challenge facing the nation, because law is set up based on static sea level. SCD summary does not mention SLR once, SCD must incorporate SLR – it is not just a hazard, it is a permanent state change – it is not going to go away.

- Dr. Triezenberg will give a brief update of activities
 - Initiated bimonthly calls with team and SCCD network
 - Working with NOAA CSC to develop improved land cover/use GIS database – fine scale
 - Developing SCD toolbox from programs
 - Expert panel on smart growth
 - Coastal tourism roundtable
 - Telling story better – working with network communicators on working waterfronts and on renewable energy
 - Team wants to invite experts to next meeting, to think big picture
 - Look at aggregate impacts, not just series of smaller impacts

The Board and Dr. Triezenberg discussed timeframes for various stakeholders and what forms frame of reference for sustainable.

For politicians, next election

Developers, length of development

- Constituent specific, but often not consistent or explicit
- Team “sustainable” does not have a agreed upon time frame
- Have a chance to address this explicitly in next strategic plan (1 year out)
 - Focus beyond your vision (look at 2050 or longer, look so far out you have to really brainstorm because the increments are too small.) Sea Grant needs to do more, bring the good science and historical data.
 - NOAA is dealing with global SLR, but not scaling down – that is needed to address community development issues
 - Sea Grant Strategic Planning starts January of 2012, national plan needs to be completed 6 months later, states 6 months thereafter
 - Discuss this at Fall Meeting

- Healthy Coastal Ecosystems (N. Rabalais)

Discussion:

- One area is restoration – needs to include SLR and other Future conditions, not clear that is being incorporated
- Gaps – regional scale, post-project evaluation, more research on baseline habitat status (big, done by parts of NOAA), education on EBM approaches
- New areas – AIS, oil spill research (not sure how much \$ SG should put into oil spill), overharvesting Asian carp, lionfish, and mitten crabs (this causes Rabalais)
- Concern – flurry of activity before meeting, things that sorted out did not show up, not getting traction, this team is not active between meetings – how effective is it operating with little activity?
- Obvious that much is going on, but how is it being organized

- Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply (R. Schmitten)

Discussion:

- Staff changes – new chair (Kim), new backup (Ban), new coordinator (Scaroni)
- National projects – Energy use in Fisheries just completed (added a day to accommodate the UN FAO), sponsored by National Marine Fisheries Service and NSGO
 - Purpose was to address direct and indirect energy costs for fisheries, and talk solutions
 - 90 presentations, 14 countries
 - Solar powered fishing gear, direct marketing
 - Community improvements in fuel efficiencies
 - Recycled cooking oil as a fuel (2 examples, one involving Jimmy Buffet)
 - Brown gas in fuel (distilled water) 1 gallon = 15 gallons of diesel

10:30 Focus Teams Discussion (Dr. Cammen)

Discussion:

- Focus areas from NSGO plan, weave together state efforts
- Provide big ideas, innovation, leadership on topics
- Get expertise from network
- Members function on behalf of whole network, not their programs
- Teams set their own agenda, with common expectations

- Membership is about 12 people, selected by NSGO Director and SGA President, term is life of plan
- Teams developed implementation plan
- Influenced NSIs
- Focus area research priority gaps
- Provide input on big ideas
- Focus network expertise, not exclusive clubs
- The Board asked Dr. Cammen about further integrating Sea Grant into NOAA – when you hold a workshop, do you invite relevant parts of NOAA?
 - Dr. Cammen replied that the Focus Team Chairs invite NOAA participants regularly and that all Focus Teams have representation from other NOAA offices.

11:00 Discussion of morning topics

Discussion:

Chair:

Thanks to Ann Andrus (NSGO) for logistical support

Sixteen undefined acronyms this morning – could we have a common acronyms list for new members. Ms. Ban will include Knauss (or other) acronym list in briefing book in the future

Clarification of strategic planning process

Began with National Research Council report

Members of Board, SGA, and NSGO came up with process

Byrne chaired the actual planning committee

Involved all of the Sea Grant directors in formulating the plan at Sea Grant Week

Next strategic plan is for FY14-FY18

Upcoming tasks that will involve the board

Strategic Planning 14-18

Biennial Report to Congress

Reauthorization of Sea Grant Act

Site visits will be done in June, Board would like report if available.

11:30 Adjourn