

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Spring Meeting
March 6-7, 2018
Meeting Minutes

Washington Plaza Hotel
10 Thomas Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Monday, March 6, 2018

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC – 8:30 am – 4:45 pm EST

**8:30am – Call to order, welcome, review of agenda, approval of minutes, Chair’s update
(Amber Mace, Chair - NSGAB)**

Elizabeth Rohring (Designated Federal Officer) read an official statement explaining her role to the group.

Roll Call

Members of the Advisory Board:

Dale Baker, Peter Betzer, Paulinus Chigbu, Judith Gray, Michael Orbach, Rosanne Fortner, Brian Helmuth, Jim Murray, Dick Vortmann, Amber Mace, Gordon Grau

Jim Hurley – President of Sea Grant Association (SGA)

Jonathan Pennock – NSGO

Elizabeth Rohring – NSGO

Donna Brown – NSGO

Opening Comments

Dr. Mace expressed her desire to focus on the size and capacity of the existing board and how to utilize the Board’s expertise and capacity. She also noted that RDML Tim Gallaudet is unable to meet with the NSGAB, but Dr. Stu Levenbach will attend on his behalf during the SGA meeting.

Agenda

Mr. Baker made a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gray. All were in favor (voice vote).

October 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Orbach made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the October 2017 Advisory Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Judith Gray. All were in favor (voice vote).

Chair's Update (Amber Mace, NSGAB)

Dr. Mace provided an update on some of the activities of the Board over the past six months. They have been trying to get meetings with RDML Gallaudet and other leadership within NOAA but with no success. They will continue to work with NOAA to schedule these meetings, as well as meeting with Secretary Ross and the NOAA examiner at the Office of Management and Budget.

National Sea Grant College Program Update (Jonathan Pennock, NSGCP Director)

Dr. Pennock delivered an update about the National Sea Grant College Program budget challenges, but as of today Sea Grant is operating through the continuing resolution until March 23rd. The NSGO and SGA are working hard to introduce Sea Grant to RDML Gallaudet and other new NOAA leadership. There have been two government shutdowns but they were very short. The NSGO has submitted a package of new board nominees – 5 slots (replace 3 slots which are now empty and replacing those who are leaving...Dick Vortman and Mike Orbach). The quadrennial site reviews are coming up and the NSGO will work hard on completing this process.

Accomplishments –

- Knauss Fellowship continues to be a showcase of what Sea Grant does.
- Program officers reviewed all omnibus proposals. It should be noted that only 8 of the proposals came in with no problem - the others had to be given more guidance. The NSGO met the deadline of February 1st.
- The program officers also had to review 460 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) actions. NOAA has a new procedure for NEPA, with more scrutiny, but NEPA has had a positive impact on the environment, so it is important that Sea Grant reviews all actions for potential environmental implications.
- NSGO released three federal funding opportunities including aquaculture
- Hurricane responses has been great. Spent a significant amount of time of what goes into rebuilding after such disasters (money/time)
- We have 6 programs officers now

National Office –

- Nikola Garber returns from Leadership Competencies Development Program details in early June.
- Amanda McCarty has left Sea Grant to move to the Northeast Fisheries Science Center; Donna Brown joined in October as a contractor, and Christos Michelopoulos who has started a detail with the NSGO as the Acting Deputy Director has a wealth of information about NOAA, and will serve here until Kola returns.

- Leadership Team – Jon Eigen, Joshua Brown, Elizabeth Rohring, and Brooke Carney are now part of the management team working to fill all the gaps.
- Chris Hayes left NSGO and we hired Chelsea Berg to filling that gap – she also works with Jon Eigen on focusing on operations and grants. Jon Lilley is the Program Officer on the eastern Great Lakes and Chelsea is the Program Officer for the western Great Lake states.
- Dave Chorney has been with the NSGO for two years and is moving to the Weather Coordination Office in NOAA headquarters. He was working with Dorn Carlson as a competition manager - Chelsea will be working on this roles as well.
- Eva Lipiec also left to work for the Congressional Research Office, so the NSGO hired Maddie Kennedy to work on Knauss Fellowship and Beth Diamond to support Sea Grant in Aquaculture grant processing.
- The NSGO has two new Knauss fellows – Aixa Aleman-Diaz, who is our resilience fellow and Katherine O'Reilly who is working on communication.

Question and discussion

Mr. Vortmann - NOAA will never run like the private sector? Spending a lot of time doing the same things over and over. Dr. Pennock pointed out the stresses of not having a full staff. He thought he would give himself 9 months to a year to learn the office but 50% of his time is having to focus on staffing and process.

Dr. Grau - How does the Board help and further engage constituents in regards to coastal tourism and resilience? Sea Grant needs to bring in planners and architects. It seems that Sea Grant needs to grow to accomplish this. Dr. Graus said that it is time to focus on what Sea Grant can do well *internally* rather with the hope of new money. Dr. Grau said that he didn't see any of those things on Dr. Pennocks list of updates.

Mr. Baker – What limitations do you have in bringing in Federal employees? Dr. Pennock said that the zero budget impacts that as well. Ms. Gray said that the Board needs to continue working with Congress to get the administrative cap lifted once they are back in the budget. Dr. Orback mentioned that it is difficult to hire in a zero budget environment. Dr. Mace agreed that it is difficult to attract and retain them because of opportunities elsewhere. Dr. Murray said that a priority is to get a senior aquaculture specialist that could work with those on the Hill and higher levels at Department of Commerce. Dr. Pennock said that he is not sure how to attract such talent.

Dr. Mace – This is an opportunity to reach out to congress to have these important conversations. Mr. Vortmann was concerned by the failed effort with Sec. Ross and that the Board needs to reach out and have that discussion again. Dr. Mace said that they should focus on how Sea Grant helps to achieve the NOAA and DOC strategic plans. Ms. Gray said that the

conversation should include the NOAA budget examiner so that they can hear what Secretary Ross and the Board discusses.

Dr. Murray said that the ideal time to meet with leadership is when Sea Grant has a budget from congress. The Board should wait until June and schedule a full court press with the Biennial Report to Congress in hand and address these commerce goals.

(End of Session)

10:38am Break

11:00am Biennial Report

Dr. Fortner - Our last report had 44 pages of content – too big to expect anyone on the hill to read thoroughly and it's hard to find anything. The team wants to crystalize the new report so that it would be easier to find content, etc. We will do a Sea Grant by the Numbers, focus areas objectives, and an overview of what has happened in those areas. Highlight things that are of great interest to Department of Commerce and our constituents. We'll also include highlights of Sea Grant over the past two years and the Fellowships, particularly Knauss. We will have 2018 recommendations and the NSGO's response to the 2016 recommendations. We will schedule a conference call with the BR committee to agree on scope of recommendations and other thoughts.

Questions:

Mr. Baker - Will there be a vote before this is completed? Fortner – Content will get to board members sometime in May and we will have a public call to approve the content.

Dr. Grau- Sea Grant should focus on economics, education, and the aquaculture in Wisconsin.

Dr. Hurley – The SGA is having a briefing in June. We could have a Board member join us for those visits.

Dr. Murray – We need help from NOAA Office of Legislative Affairs – who's our point person to organize for that week and can we work with someone from that office regarding logistics?

Ms. Gray volunteered to assist with the planning of Hill visits for the report.

Dr. Mace – We should identify a team for this event.

Dr. Betzer volunteered to attend.

Dr. Grau offered to visit his senators and representatives in Hawaii and would like information prior to the meeting.

There was a discussion if the Board members, special government employees, can go to the Hill to discuss Sea Grant (beyond the Biennial Report). Ms. Rohring said that they can go as a private citizen and say whatever they want, however they can't go in as a Board member and lobby for Sea Grant. Ms. Gray reminded everyone to inform the NSGO if you're planning to talk to your congressional office because they will inform NOAA of those visits. A. Mace – Come up with a plan prior to these visits if you plan to set up a meeting in your home state.

11:30am *Visioning & Regional Projects Update*

Dr. Joshua Brown - Organizations Involved: Representatives from the various offices within NOAA – OAR labs, Fisheries, one Sea Grant director from each region, etc.

Dr. Grau - Are we getting outside input?

Dr. Brown – We stayed just within the Sea Grant network.

Dr. Pennock – We know this is something that needs to be done but we are not going to be able to take on these ten things like aquaculture we're just looking for ideas in order to move forward. Maybe the board can get involved with the Communities of Practice that develop from these. Right now, we're looking for something that would be implementable in order to move forward on these topics.

Dr. Grau – Our goal should be to be a one million/ten million dollar program so there are things we should/need to do moving forward in order to accomplish that.

Dr. Murray – How do we move forward? A critical part of this is to think through who and how we are going to market this – if we have great things to present – who's tasked with making this happen?

Ms. Carney – Many of the vision teams include external folks who are not affiliated with Sea Grant but work with Sea Grant.

Dr. Mace – We need to identify the roles of the Board in this process.

12:10pm **Lunch Break**

1:30pm ***Opportunities with the NOAA Weather Enterprise (Mary Erickson, National Weather Service - NWS)***

Weather Service Priorities

- Ms. Erickson started the conversation by pointing out how NOAA makes it a point to touch every county of the US each day and Sea Grant is well connected to all of them to communities.

- Social science work that the NWS has done shows that 94% of decisions made are made at a local level.
- In 2017- 16 billion dollar events totaling \$306 billion in damages – a US record.

Challenges: How do we meet all the demands in the coastal communities?

- Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017 – makes Risk Communication a priority and NOAA needs to ensure its risk information is actionable, consistent and available.
 - Weather ready ambassador program – we need to work to get 100% of Sea Grant programs involved because it helps in conveying this information.
- Collaboration is necessary in building the weather and water enterprise – as is social and behavioral science
 - We need to ensure we are working to integrate the Social and Behavioral Sciences into our work. Customer demand is really driving and pushing in the direction of social sciences. We hear from communities regularly and they express to us that what requirements they have will help them in this process.
 - Water – major priority being able to capitalize on what’s happening now – even though there are lots of challenges with water quality.

2:00pm Working with OAR’s Office of Weather and Air Quality (John Cortinas, Director, Office of Weather and Air Quality- OWAQ)

- Previous 3-5 years of OWAQ research has been linked to weather service, but OAR leadership is very intent on all OAR programs working together
- Current foci of OWAQ
 - Hurricanes – weather service has supported work on the hurricane testbed including human resource constraints.
 - Social Science – working closely with Sea Grant Coastal Storm Program was the largest amount of time spent on working with other OAR offices.
 - Developing training materials for NOAA employees has been a priority and most important
 - Weather Act of 2018 is also something we find to be very important – focus on meteorology, etc. – incoming leadership has stated that one of their goals is the weather act.
 - Looking for Advice – See where you can make those connections...social science, universities connections, extension and outreach are important to how we make a weather ready nation.
 - We’ve also brought in stakeholders in various areas -- so they have formed a Joint Technology Transition Initiative (JTTI). This will help us move research to

operations with external/internal communities. They have also applied focus in providing more education to the academic community which is a first step in trying to educate our academic community. Academic institutions are all a part of Sea Grant, so the bottom line is we need to continue to work together in order to be successful.

Questions:

Ms. Gray– We need weather service employees in every county of the nation now that consolidation has taken place there has been much change.

Ms. Erickson – We need to involve branch chief’s in central/national headquarters in order to get that information out. She has had talks with regions and fields and reached whomever in weather service regarding those issues. We have involved our regional headquarters in the Western, Pacific and Alaska regions so that all forecast offices will be covered.

Dr. Mace – What would that look like for a Sea Grant and NWS partnership?

Ms. Erickson – They could attend stakeholder workshops, someone from weather service can attend if they’re holding the meeting so that they can be involved in building that relationship by simply stating “we have this issue and are aware of this opportunity, are you interested in working together?”

Dr. Cortinas – We need to understand at what level you want collaborations to exist. We can work with Sea Grant and their stakeholders , work with NWS Integrated Warning Teams and similar opportunities. Regional Collaboration teams are a part of NOAA to provide support for regional issues, such as our cooperative institutes.

Dr. Pennock – Sea Grant is involved in these efforts – and we’ve also been speaking with the Regional Team leadership on these various subjects as well.

Ms. Erickson – Are Sea Grant state-level employees? NWS actually authorizes state forecasting offices to interact with folks at all levels (tribal states, state planners and managers, etc) as well as local levels.

Dr. Murray – We need to make sure that leadership at the headquarter-level needs to collaborate – doing this can lead a better program.

Dr. Cortinas – Still trying to get their arms around weather forecast economic impacts. Sea Grant might be able to help with that.

Ms. Erickson – Working with people who are disadvantaged in different ways, challenged from sight/vision, access to information, etc. – Sea Grant could help with NWS and try to establish some community based solutions.

Dr. Orbach – What about how climate change is causing flooding from hazard sea level rise – how do your researchers deal with this?

Ms. Erickson – We are focusing on what’s happening and occurring now.

Dr. Cortinas – NOAA is responsible and there are still law’s on the books that says NOAA IS responsible for this.

Dr. Hurley – The SGA has found that by engaging the universities they work with they can build great coastal connections. Happy to work with NWS and OWAQ on this.

Ms. Erickson – We have stated two programs for this-- The Innovators Programs and the National Water Center.

Dr. Cortinas – We have Sea Grant involvement with the National Water Model at National Water Center). For us, the days of creating, improving models within NOAA alone is gone. We *have* to engage the community to understand their needs.

2:30pm **Break**

3:00pm **Future and Vision for Sea Grant (J. Pennock – NSGCP and A. Mace - NSGAB)**

Dr. Pennock – How do we achieve and best utilize the talents of the board to reach our goals, etc. What is the most useful and effective way we can work together.

Ms. Carney – Three main objectives

1. Discuss what and could the board be doing
2. Design mechanisms for better engaging the boards
3. Key action steps. What could and should we be doing?

Dr. Betzer – We should be approaching our legislators in our state.

Dr. Grau – More time to think and engage with one another in the Board. A lot of these meetings are good to have people come and talk to us but it takes up time, and we need more time for thoughtful discussions that can lead to more constructive ideas.

Mr. Vortmann – What does the legislation say our role is?

Ms. Rohring - Here’s the language in the charter taken from the legislation: *The Board shall advise the Secretary and the Director of the National Sea Grant College Program, and meet with*

the Secretary as appropriate on matters related to the responsibilities and authorities set forth in the Act. Additionally, these topics are addressed: Sea Grant topics the Board should address include: developing strategies for utilizing the Sea Grant to address the Nation's highest priorities regarding the understanding, assessment, development, management, utilization, and conservation of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources; the designation of Sea Grant colleges and Sea Grant institutions; and such other matters as the Secretary refers to the Board for review and advice. The Board shall report to Congress every 2 years on the state of Sea Grant.

Dr. Orbach – We need to be more aggressive with suggestions/advice.

Dr. Murray – Sea Grant is the most reviewed program in the government. Also we need to follow the money. We could be helpful with an eye to new advisory board members with knowing how to promote and sell Sea Grant to the government which in turn will market the program better.

Mr. Vortmann – Advise the NOAA administrator – We've never had the chance to do that – making them aware of the board's role in all of this.

Dr. Murray – There are a number of difficult decisions that the NSGCP Director has to make and sometimes he needs cover and some of those he has to go to the board – they advise and give advice but that gives him an opportunity to point the finger at those individuals.

Dr. Pennock – In my view one of your roles is to support the National Office.

Dr. Fortner – Sea Grant is unknown where I live – there is a need to come and give a Sea Grant presentation- pass out brochures that describes Sea Grant because people don't know who or what we are so we need more local awareness (Ambassadors of Sea Grant).

Mr. Baker – We seem to get too comfortable in the things we do...Biennial report, etc. but there is a need to think more outside the box.

Dr. Grau – We're only covering 95% of the coastal community, we don't address developers, real estate people, etc. How do we grow the program? Engage the development community – we need more people on the board that would be able to do this. Explore new markets.

Dr. Mace – So it sounds like basically what everyone is saying is that we need to create more opportunities.

Ms. Gray – Identifying opportunities and problems.

Dr. Helmuth – Look at the success stories in order to bring to the national level.

Ms. Carney – What have you seen the board do that have been successful and what do you think is missing??

Ms. Gray – Participate more on the Sea Grant wide teams

Dr. Mace – Make sure there is good communication in what we do and active involvement in what we're doing.

Dr. Murray – I think one of the problems is that we will go home Thursday and not think about Sea Grant a lot until the next meeting, so we need to define specific tasks that are under our legislation to bring Sea Grant accomplishments to NOAA and DOC leadership. Thinking of more routine operationalizing would be good for the board.

Ms. Rohring – The Board used to do a lot of white papers and reports. Is there anything positive that came from these reports? If so, we should continue to use the Board in this manner.

Dr. Betzer – I've been on 5-6 reviews of programs and have seen some things get accomplished – the frustration is that no one I've spoken to is aware of what the Sea Grant has done and there's something wrong with that picture. Not sure how the board can help collaborate that. Think we're missing an opportunity may it be social media, television etc.

Dr. Murray – the board can put together a committee in order to make this a more visual program.

Ms. Carney – Think of long term and short term goals. How can the board be more productive? What can we do to be more fully engaged in a short time-frame?

Dr. Mace – Think about how we engage with Congress or any extra time we have should be focused on that. Each board member should think about what they care about and opportunities that engage you and other opportunities. How are we going to deliver on these high priority items within the next two years?

Mr. Vortmann – We're an advisory board – we aren't in the government structure; we just lend advice.

Dr. Orbach – Other advisory councils I've been on have meetings and the most successful councils have spent time outside the boardroom socially and have gotten more things done. It's important that members of the board are familiar with all of their state Sea Grant boards, too. We can get more into white papers, but members of the board should be well connected with their own state advisory boards.

Dr. Grau – This is the NSGCP which was designed to engage America’s universities along the coast – one thing we can do is to engage w/university leadership and that has not happened to a great extent for many years.

Ms. Carney – What are some processes in order to better engage with the Board?

Dr. Grau - When not meeting in Washington maybe have a structured retreat with a facilitator. If you want to engage the Board you have to create the opportunity.

Ms. Gray – I’d like to participate in the NOAA regional team meetings. Have the NSGAB involved in these meetings.

Dr. Mace– This all sounds great but we need to keep in mind our travel cap.

Mr. Vortmann – Question directed to Dr. Pennock -- what does he want from the advisory board?

Dr. Pennock – We’re trying to define that. There are some things expected in the legislation so we don’t want to get too far from that. We also don’t want each board member doing their own thing. It’s obvious we do need advice, so we need to look at how we are functioning as an office as well as a state program. A number of you were asked to come and participate in various meetings but because of the travel cap it sometimes cannot be done.

Ms. Carney – So it seems like there are very similar comments going around. Visioning reports, retreat, taking the 10 visioning documents and choosing a few of them. We’ll put more into the action items tomorrow.

4:15pm Site Review Team Update – (J. Pennock – NSGCP and S. Holmes – NSGO)

Dr. Pennock and Ms. Holmes provided an overview of the timing and details for the Site Review Teams

- Up to a three day review of the site visit. May end at noon on the second day.
- The reviews may take up to a year (mid-October through May).
- Evaluation committee – sub-committee needs to be set up.
- All the findings of the site reviews will become public.
- These are program evaluations/not personnel evaluations.
- The NSGO will be providing trainings for the Directors, Program Officers, and Board members on conducting the site visits.

4:30pm Discussion of day's topics and wrap-up (A. Mace – NSGAB)

Dr. Mace thanked Sea Grant for pulling a wonderful meeting together, job well done with the briefing book especially “3 things you must know” we covered a lot of territory:

- We will record our meetings and record minutes.
- We heard about priorities of NOAA's Sea Grant plan and opportunities
- Learned about the budget continuing resolution
- Didn't hear much about advisory board nominations
- Heard a lot about the challenges with expected staffing and turnover rates, etc. what the board can do to help with the national program offices
- Biennial Report Discussion
- Need to work with the national office to set up outreach visits, etc.
- Visioning efforts - a lot going on and how we can weigh in as a board
- Presentation from NOAA weather colleagues – opportunity for the NWS, OWAQ and Sea Grant to work together.
- Robust discussion as to what role the Advisory Board should serve.

4:48pm Public Meeting Recessed

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Spring Meeting

March 6-7, 2018

Draft Meeting Minutes

Washington Plaza Hotel

10 Thomas Circle, NW

Washington, DC 20005

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC – 8:30 am – 12:00 pm EST

8:30am Call to Order and follow-up from previous day's meeting (A. Mace, NSGAB)

8:45am Economic Impact Reporting Update (A. Krepp, NSGO)

- Ms. Krepp provided background and framework for the Economic Impact Reporting project. What we can do better is improve upon what we did last year.
 - Make a modest investment, take a practical approach, use the existing data that we have and look at this as a way to build capacity. This is a very applied focus.
- What do we get from this work?
 - We hope to end up with a tool box because this is about building capacity.
 - We hope to end up with methodologies, decision-guides, policies.
- Timeline – this will end with Sea Grant week in Portland.
- Things we've learned along the way
 - Keep it simple and keep a practical approach, don't make it too complicated,
 - Be consistent, but retain flexibility, not everything needs a number

Questions –

Mr. Devoe (SC Sea Grant) – Can we all capture the number of the labor we're providing? We get a lot of funds – how are we leveraging those funds? We need basic guidelines.

Dr. Mace - The topic of leveraging is really important. What's the investment?

Ms. Krepp - That is outside of the economic impact project, but is captured in our PIER reporting.

9:22am Planning, Implementation & Evaluation (PIE II) Update (J. Pennock – NSGCP and S. Holmes – NSGO)

Dr. Pennock and Ms. Holmes provided an update on the PIE II work. Problem of the first PIE was the overwhelmingly large size of it. What's involved with pie? Annual reporting, site review team visits (which comes up every 4 years), evaluation process, NSGO review, independent review panel.

Previous NSGCP Director asked Board to lead PIE II committee and make recommendations on our evaluation system. Resulted in a report from the Board including input from SGA. We've made changes in planning and implementation, but we need to finalize what we do for evaluation 2014-2017 performance review, then with the 2018-2021 cycle. Small changes from 2014-2017 evaluation, but there are a few things that we want to wait to implement.

Key points

Recommendations:

1. Utilize and integrate all evaluation tools
2. Maximize collaboration and transparency
3. Be based on 'Standards of Excellences
4. Streamline to minimize costs and effort
5. Focus on continuous program improvement

Overall, there are three high-level changes in the evaluation process:

1. The Performance Review Panel (PRP) has been eliminated in the 2014-2017 four-year evaluation process. The Site Review Team (SRT) Visit now includes those performance components that were reviewed during PRPs.
2. There is now an Sea Grant Advisory Board Evaluation Committee that will ensure consistency between SRTs.
3. There is now an Independent Review Panel (IRP) that will provide an external evaluation of the effectiveness of the NSGO and the NSGCP overall.

For 2014-2017 - Site Visits will:

- Be the primary evaluative element of the PIE process including both Standards of Excellence and Performance/Impact
- Be carried out between Oct 2018 and April 2019
- Be co-lead by the Program's FPO and an NSGAB Member with 3-4 additional external members

- Be limited to 2-3 days (feedback) of presentations & discussion
Include opportunity for program response

The PIE II also recommended an Evaluation Committee

For 2014-2017 the Evaluation Committee will:

- Be charged with assuring that Site Visits were carried out in a Fair and Equitable manner and making recommendations to the NSGCP director if adjustments are required.
- Be composed of all members of the NSGAB who participated in one or more site visits.

For 2018-2021:

- The process is expected to be the same but there will be a process to de-brief and improve as necessary following the 2014-2017 review cycle.

Finally, there will also be an Independent Review Panel

For 2014-2017 the IRP will:

- Be charged to provide an external evaluation of the effectiveness of the NSGO and the NSGCP overall during the four-year review cycle.
- Be comprised of members from the NSGAB Evaluation Committee, NOAA, other State/Federal Agency Officials, and leaders from academia/industry.
- Submit a report to the NSGAB that describes their findings concerning the effectiveness of the NSGO and NSGCP.
- Upon approval by the NSGAB the report will be conveyed to the NSGCP Director and State/Consortia Program directors.

Questions –

Mr. Vortmann – How does this work in his world? Have several “companies” spread out across the country. Annually do you have to evaluate who gets what? Do you have to make those evaluations, etc. Future plans, for coasts, etc. Does you and your staff visiting that site compared to the existing plan and replacing it with what you’re doing now? Bottom line – do the parent company decide who gets the money? You don’t do evaluations or set compensation but maybe it’s good to submit your evaluations and recommendations. This would be a far more effective model than what has happened 2-3 years ago.

Dr. Orbach – You’re talking about a corporate top down model, the person at the top has the power to control the whole system – that’s not the way the Sea Grant program is set up. The Sea Grant program supports a big process not based on profit motive but peer review. People

that know about the things you do, judge the quality of it – outreach, communications, etc. Bring in people to do peer reviews. Principle of peer review generally is an important part of the way Science does it.

Dr. Pennock - There are multiple advantages of the site reviews. All of us have the opportunity to go out and work outside the Sea Grant office.

Dr. Orbach – What do you think will happen if a discrepancy is found?

Dr. Pennock - We would ask for as much input as could be given and ask to change the score because we need to make sure it's fair. We will have a mechanism through which the programs can respond and I will make the final decision based on the recommendations of the Board's evaluation committee.

10:20am – Future and Vision for Sea Grant Follow-up – Mace

Topic: Role of evaluation committee, who makes the determination?

Dr. Pennock - The Evaluation Committee will become a standing committee of the board and all members will be involved in the reviews and this will allow all members to function under the proposal.

Dr. Mace - How does the evaluation committee feed into the IRP (Independent Review Panel)?

Dr. Pennock - The evaluation committee will identify if there are any inconsistencies in our site review process. They will work from briefing books, site visit reports, letters from the Director and any other relevant information that will help ensure the process is transparent and meaningful. This information will be shared with with the IRP to help with the overall Sea Grant review.

10:00 – 10:15 Break

10:49 - Future and Vision for Sea Grant - (Brooke Carney, NSGO)

Ms. Carney said that she has created a record of the topics they've discussed. She and Ms. Rohring will use it to help guide plans with the Advisory Board and to bring up at the next meeting. She reviewed the ideas and potential activities for the rest of the calendar year.

11:10am – NOAA and OAR Updates (Ko Barrett – DAA for Operations (OAR))

Ms. Barrett provided and update on NOAA, OAR and other information for the Board.

- We still don't have a NOAA Administrator but RADL Gallaudet has been very enthusiastic. Neal Jacobs who just joined us last week is going to be more of a NOAA dry side (weather) person, but we welcome him to NOAA. Below them are 4 senior

advisors– Stu Levenbach (Chief of Staff), Brandon Eisner, Taylor Jordon (former Sea Grant fellows), and Eric Noble. Sea Grant has been NOAA’s largest program focused on Aquaculture. This provides great visibility and accomplishments since aquaculture is part of DOC’s strategic plan.

- OAR Updates –
 - We have a Chief Financial Officer in place now (David Holst)
 - We know that Sea Grant has been losing some staff and want to get positions filled. Sea Grant sits in Climate, Weather and Oceans so it is hard for existing staff to participate in all those programs. We’ll work with Dr. Pennock on this.
 - We’ve been working on a “Futures Exercise” – what would the OAR of the future look like? We hired consulting firm to help to see what we would look like in the future and we came up with four outlooks which gave us a glimpse of how to structure our office for the future.
 - Federal Scientists Roster – how do we keep on the cutting edge of the future. But research from partners who would then provide rapid research guidance for the future. Partnerships is key for all future stakeholders.
- Just came back from Alaska and Sea Grant came up so many times in those conversations.

Questions:

Dr. Mace – How can the Board help fill the Sea Grant Aquaculture position?

Dr. Pennock – That is really up to Workforce Management to find someone who has that sweet spot of skills, charismatic, strong advocate for Sea Grant.

Dr. Murray – Is there a role in the short term for the board to promote aquaculture?

Ms. Barrett – Absolutely. Alaska sees the need to look at the pros and cons because they have a wide view of fisheries, etc. and not just aquaculture alone. We’re interested in any advice you have for negotiating the various transitions to aquaculture.

Dr. Mace– Thanks to OAR leadership for working to get the nominations for the 5 board openings that need to be filled.

Dr. Orbach – The 2018 budget had NOAA down a lot – what’s the thought on 2019 budget and where are the other cuts being seen? Grants programs, NOS, Satellite programs, weather service, etc?

Dr. Pennock - in FY18 OAR what hit the hardest. We don't have any information to share on the upcoming budget.

Dr. Orbach – Targeting of grants programs, can you give any information on that?

Ms. Barrett – If you talk to NOAA leadership they may be able to give you their perspective.

Dr. Pennock – The Board is look at Sea Grant years from now and how they can be more effective moving forward. From an OAR perspective is there anything the board can do for OAR leadership and are there any gaps that needs to be filled?

Ms. Barrett – We are working to bring more diversity and inclusion (D&I) in to STEM and into NOAA. We started advisory group on D&I and got lots of input from labs. We've gotten a lot of perspectives which has been great. Want to change the profile of our portfolio to match the profile of our stakeholders.

Dr. Mace - We've had interest from our Board to serve on the D&I action plan - Paulinus Chigbu and Gordon Grau.

Mr. Vortmann - You mention getting more D&I into NOAA, but what about those who we serve?

Dr. Mace - We talked about that with our NWS colleagues yesterday - how do we get information to those who might not have the same access as others?

Dr. Grau – High school students can do internships to become more familiar with science and get them interested.

Dr. Betzer - Start earlier - 8th grade like the women's oceanography program we've done for 20 years.

Ms. Barrett - NASA does it well - we could model what they do.

Dr. Brown - Washington Sea Grant works with NOAA to hold the annual

Dr. Briggs - How can the board help make the Knauss fellowship more diverse? We need to recruit better.

11:45 Discussion of Meeting Follow-up and Wrap-Up (A. Mace – NSGAB)

Dr. Mace - Anything else before we adjourn? Glad we heard from the SGA< the economic impacts, PIE II conversation and it feels as though Sea Grant has really made some progress. Our priorities have been documented through Brooke's facilitation help - working with the administration and restoring the Sea Grant budget. This felt like a very positive meeting -

glad you have the bandwidth to have conversations about future strategies, gaps in our research or other work, etc.

Ms. Rohring - How long should our meetings last? We need to coordinate with SGA and speakers. I'm happy to work with the Board executive leadership to make sure we have time to have these conversations about our future.

Dr. Mace - Also want to thank Mike Orbach and Dick Vortmann for their years of service on the Board.

Others shared stories about their work with Mike and Dick, and the valuable contributions that they made throughout their tenure with the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 am.