

Highlights of September 28 & 29 National Sea Grant Advisory Board (Board) Meeting

1) Board Committee Assignments:

Executive Committee (as of 11/4/11)

Chair – Nancy Rabalais

Vice Chair – Rollie Schmitten

Past Chair – Dick West (as John Woeste is term limited)

Member-at-large – Bill Stubblefield

NOTE – Patty Birkholz and Frank Beal were sworn in as Board members by Craig McLean during the meeting.

Biennial Report to Congress 2012

Committee - Dick West (Chair), Frank Beal, Mike Orbach

NSGO and SGA will assign representatives as well

Sea Grant Reauthorization Committee 2012

Committee – Rollie Schmitten (Chair), Patty Birkholz, Harry Simmons

Leon Cammen will work with committee on recommendations

Strategic Planning Committee 2012

Dick Vortmann is willing to serve on the committee

NSGO & SGA will identify representatives with committee leadership to be determined at a later date

Futures II Committee

Mike Orbach (Chair), Jeremy Harris

NOAA Strategic Plan

Rollie Schmitten, Mike Orbach and Jeremy Harris were asked to analyze the NOAA strategic plan and prepare a draft response for the Board. Time became a limiting factor, As a result, Mike volunteered to study the document further and provide suggestions for the chair's use in responding to the draft.

2) Board Representatives to Sea Grant/NOAA Committees

NOAA Science Advisory Board

Dick West/Bill Stubblefield

Senior Research Council

Dick West

Sea Grant Week 2012

Harry Simmons

Focus Teams

Healthy Coastal Ecosystems – Nancy Rabalais
Hazard Resilient Coastal Communities – Harry Simmons
Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply – Rollie Schmitt
Sustainable Coastal Development – Mike Orbach

Education Network – Nancy Rabalais

Communications Network – Harry Simmons

Extension Network – Rollie Schmitt

3) Allocation Committee II

The Board unanimously passed a motion to recommend the allocation principles and framework. The Board recommends continued use of the Board as you develop a detailed allocation policy for the future. Dick West, Dick Vortmann, and Bill Stubblefield to be engaged in this process.

4) NOAA Data Sharing Policy

The Board requested that Jon Pennock draft a letter to the Board regarding the NOAA draft data sharing policy. The Board will then respond and send to NOAA Leadership

5) OAR Next Generation Strategic Plan

Craig McLean, AA for OAR discussed the OAR Strategic Plan. John Byrne and Bill Stubblefield will review the plan and provide feedback to the Board. The Board will send input as to how the plan impacts the Sea Grant program to OAR leadership.

6) Senate Budget Bill

The Board Chair will contact the Chair of the NOAA Science Advisory Board to discuss the language in the Senate budget bill. The Board expressed concern that the legislation requires NOAA to justify its research as a condition of funding.

Important Dates:

SGA Meeting – October 11 & 12, 2011 in Baltimore, MD

SG Knauss Placement Week – November 14 – 18, 2011 – Silver Spring, MD

NOAA SAB Meeting – November 29 & 30, 2011 in Washington, DC

SGA/AB Meeting – March 5 & 6, 2012 in Washington, DC (SGA discussed adding an additional day for a NSGO/SGA/AB “retreat” to discuss Strategic Plan)

Sea Grant Knauss Reception – TBD but during Spring AB meeting in DC

Fall AB Meeting/Sea Grant Week – September 15-21, 2012 in Alaska

**National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB)
Fall Meeting
September 28 -29, 2011
University of Rhode Island
Graduate School of Oceanography
Narragansett Bay Campus
215 South Ferry Road, Ocean Technology Center
Narragansett, RI 02882**

Minutes

Wednesday, September 28

Attendees:

Board: Frank Beal, Patty Birkholz, John Byrne, Jeremy Harris, Mike Orbach, Rollie Schmitten, Harry Simmons, Bill Stubblefield, John Woeste (Chair), Dick West, Dick Vortmann

Absent: Nancy Rabalais (Vice Chair)

Ex-Officio Attendees: Elizabeth Ban- National Sea Grant Office (NSGO), Leon Cammen -NSGO, Jon Pennock-Director, New Hampshire Sea Grant/President, Sea Grant Association (SGA)

Allocation Committee II Attendees: Paul Anderson-Maine Sea Grant, Joshua Brown-NSGO, Bob Duce-Texas A&M/Former NSGAB member

Other Attendees: Ron Baird-University of North Carolina/Former NSGO Director, Nikola Garber-NSGO, Meredith Haas-Rhode Island Sea Grant

8:15 (Woeste) Call to order – approval of agenda, approval of minutes

MOTION:

Approve minutes as corrected (Byrne, 2nd Schmitten)

Vote: Unanimous approval

Minutes available:

[http://www.seagrants.noaa.gov/leadership/February 8 9 2011 Minutes Final.pdf](http://www.seagrants.noaa.gov/leadership/February%208%209%202011%20Minutes%20Final.pdf)

8:20 Allocation Subcommittee Presentation, Recommendation – West

Allocation Committee-II Chair

Presentation (see Appendix – ACII.ppt)

- General concern over declining buying power of Sea Grant (SG) and for the future of the National Sea Grant Program. The capacity to be effective is also at risk, especially for small programs.
- The growth appropriation assumption is no longer valid in light of budget challenges, and OMB and the Hill have stressed that SG research should be more responsive to emerging regional and national issues.
- The current allocation scheme not equitable for today's environment and the board agrees that there needs to be a general policy framework for guidance to address issues of

budget decline and develop a process for allocation of funds. The allocation policy will need to allow state strategies to accommodate changed federal and state funding.

- This issue is sought for immediate address in the face of annual reports and reauthorization in the following year.
- It is apparent that there is a large discrepancy among individual Sea Grant programs in relation to funding sources. The most important aspect to note is the power of leveraging within this programs and their ability to find outside funding sources to support projects that may have not otherwise existed without the assistance of Sea Grant.

- Allocation Principles (As presented by ACII):
 1. Maintain national network
 2. Preserve SG model: Education, Research, Outreach
 - Funding to states: statutory limit – not state can receive more than 15%
 - Need driven, competitive, merit based. Stable funding to manage program, institutionalizes regional research, program director retains discretion
 - For national programs – national strategic investments – competitively available programs; fund functional national office. Phase in new policy – no to exceed two 4-yr planning cycles (8yrs)
 - ACII Recommended Allocation Policy framework:
 - **State (75% fed funds)**
 - Base to program (50% fed funds)
 - “fair and equitable needs-based distribution of funds to state programs”
 - Regional competitive research (15% fed funds) ** new
 - Merit pool (10%)
 - Total state budgets should strive for 40% or more research
 - **National (25% fed funds)**
 - Competitive national programs
 - Fellowships
 - National strategic investments
 - NSGO

Discussion:

- The Board would like to understand the definition of “needs” to determine allocation and appropriation of funds to justify the use of public money.
 - Needs & Merit -two important factors: need to maintain flexibility and determine amount to set base for states and maintain merit and national funding.
 - “Fair and equitable needs-based distribution of funds to state programs” the biggest issue to address.
- National integrity does not imply that all state programs remain. But maintenance of programs in every state is a good point with Congress.
 - Which allocation principle is to be maintained if situation changes? Need to plan for largest potential budget cuts.
 - What will be the impacts of Sea Grant’s strategic plan by passing new allocation policy?
 - Need to maintain flexibility and determine amount to set base for states, and maintain merit and national funding.
- The Chair suggested three issues to think about as SG moves forward with a new allocation policy:

- 1) One program per state
- 2) What does network and programmatic structure look like in the future?
- 3) Is there anything about SG that needs to be changed (what things do we need to be doing looking ahead to advance probability of funding) and will Board help with this?

MOTION:

Recommend that the Board approve the following NSGP allocation policy and forward to National Sea Grant Program Director per his request to maintain a viable national SG network (Vortmann, 2nd Byrne)

Vote: Unanimous approval

- ➔ Board supports working with Director but stresses that its role is NOT to implement framework
- ➔ D.West., R.Vortmann, and B. Stubleman to be engaged in process along with NSGO

Further Discussion (not included in Board recommendation)

ACII Response to a major decrease in SG funding

- **National Principles remain**
- **National actions in priority order**
 - Eliminate national programming
 - Reduce proportionally across network
 - Discontinue programs when dollars are not sufficient
 - Eliminate functions at remaining programs
- NSGP funding allocation:
 - Develop a model that meets to recommended ACII Allocation Policy Framework; Begin by FY14 budget; Complete change incrementally over two 4-yr cycles
- No action requested of the board.
- First cuts in national programming but not in way as presented – not eliminating all functions.
- The Board would like further clarification on the following issues:
 - States with two programs
 - Programmatic structure of SG in the future?
 - What aspects of SG need to evolve to advance future financial support at federal level?
- The Board agreed that the ACII committee had completed its charge and did a complete and thorough analysis. The Chair thanks the Committee members for their hard work. The Chair also thanks Bob Duce for agreeing to participate and Ross Heath for doing much of the initial research on this project.

MOTION

Discharge the ACII committee (Simmons, 2nd Byrne)

Vote: Unanimous approval

10: 15 Break

(Moved to earlier time)

10:30 Chair Update (Woeste)

- Endorsement from the top to build academic relationships with NOAA; proposal initially longer term and needs for quick look and response [from NOAA?]; budget cut threatened initiative for immediate future – conversation on hold with Andy until next fiscal year.
- SG one of many players for NOAA consideration during times of budget cuts.
- Clear that NOAA, in terms of being on the agenda with Commerce is a problem and also a problem with Sea Grant.
- Diversity of board members? Package of nominees with changing guidelines; 35 new candidates since last round and committee met to make recommendations and list alternates; 5 positions open = 5 recommended and 15 alternatives
- Nominations: SGA involvement to filter nominees? Do preliminary work to vet through nominations?

Nominating Committee

- The Chair asked Stubblefield and Vortmann to be on the nominating committee with him.
- ➔ Recommended slate:
 - Nancy Rabalais- Chair;
 - Rollie Schmitt- Vice Chair;
 - Past Chair- Dick West;
 - John Woeste is term limited, so Dick West will continue to serve as Past Chair
 - Member at Large –Bill Stubblefield

MOTION

Approve the Nominating Committee's recommendations for Executive Committee (Simmons, 2nd Beal)

Vote: Unanimous approval

(Moved to earlier time)

10:45 National SG Program Update (Cammen)

Presentation (see Appendix –National Sea Grant College Program Update)

- Mission: to enhance the practical use and conservation of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes resources to create a sustainable economy and environment
- Economy aspect important for inroads into DOC and Congress
- Budget reductions: projections from federal funds not directed at SG – represents overall reductions;
 - 2012 – travel and conference restrictions
- Key activities of SG's strategic plan: identify NOAA's goals and objectives, and map focus areas back to NOAA's framework
 - Healthy Oceans:
 - SG – Healthy Coastal Ecosystems (HCE); includes tools and technologies for restored ecosystems.
 - Resilient Coastal Communities and Economies
 - SG – Sustainable Coastal Development (SCD); including working water fronts.
 - Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply (SSSS)

- Hazard Resilience in Coastal Communities (HRCC) – includes climate change adaptation and mitigation.
- Social Network Analysis of SG – connections to regional teams: SG is well connected
- Performance Measures (GPRA – NOAA accounting measures)
 - Resilience and tools, technologies and services offered by SG to NOAA.
- Opportunities:
 - Areas of Innovation
 - Advance green and blue technologies
 - Social Science
 - Aquaculture
 - Small business innovation research (SBIR)
 - Future Directions
 - Social Science integration into research
 - Working waterfronts
 - Climate adaptation assistance to coastal communities
 - Coastal and marine spatial planning
 - High priority issues
 - Funding cuts to program
 - National SG office becoming too small to carry out required functions

Discussion

- Should SG be a line office in NOAA and not hidden in OAR?
- SG is great at leveraging federal dollars. So important to NOAA operations, we need to do what we can to make SG a line office within NOAA

12:15 Lunch

1:15 SGA President Update (Pennock)

- Fall Meeting in Baltimore in October 11-13
- Spring Meeting in DC in March 5 & 6
- SG Week 2012: contract for Sept 17-21 in Alaska
- Next agenda items:
 - NIMS/Pier issue and integration into strategic plans for programs; streamline process;
 - Focus Teams assessments – what’s working, what’s not? Process for bringing on new focus areas (coastal tourism and climate change not under focus groups now) and linking with strategic plan.
 - Programs commission committee - revising advocacy policy for SG; very complicated for extension; Need a clear policy to stop difficult situations
 - Research coordinators assessment of online review and reporting processes to look at best practices and looking to streamline.
 - NOAA data sharing policy: how do we make this data public quickly? Share data but retain flexibility to keep from public until fully vetted
 - Partnerships with the board – allocation committee and strategic plan committee good engagement. Reauthorization effort and Grimes and looking for representation from various groups a positive influence.

Discussion:

- Data Sharing:

- Policy exists only for grantees, not NOAA scientists
- need flex language and we'll have "special award conditions" for our grantees
- RFP you were allowed to specify what the time period would be so if you didn't specify it would be 90 days. Someone in the grants office needs to be convinced why it should be greater than 90 days. The default should be 2 years
- Structuring partnerships between cooperative and academic institutions, and SG networks?

Recommendations

- ➔ Board recommends draft letter by J. Pennock on Data Sharing Policy for Board to send to NOAA Administration

1:45 Board Activity updates

Senior Research Council (West)

- SAB and NOAA connection building? Research review etc.
- OAR perspective and climate labs; OAR policy planning committee to include climate labs; language likely to restrict research in this year and depends on next election.

Cooperative Institutes/SG Meeting (West)

- Evaluation of CIs and what they are.
- OAR report incorrect about graduate awards.

Knauss Fellows (Vortmann)

- 110 finalists, 53 finalists chosen. Extremely impressive candidates. Amazing accomplishments.
- Efficiently run process. Difficult (week long) Staff handled well.
- We need someone to serve next year
- Problem that some candidates do not meet SG director or familiar with SG; orientation and application requirements; what is the pay back from these individuals?
 - Extension/Communications annual meeting: Knauss Marine Policy – On-boarding program from Texas Sea Grant to immerse SG Fellows into regional and national program; candidates went out into the field; put them on a website and methods of tracking
 - Board should have them present at next meeting in DC.

Scientific Integrity Conference Call (Schmitt)

- President memorandum for Scientific Integrity Task Force – already started and research council formed an NROC committee? Dec. 2010 OST policy guidance; April 2011 NOAA develop euro specific scientific integrity policy?
 - Establishes several functions; grantees accountable to home institution
 - Principles of scientific integrity; NOAA scientist speak freely and personal viewpoints once cleared or clear?
 - NOAA website and chat room on scientific integrity; draft procedural handbook.
 - Fall final release of policy

Futures II: (Orbach)

- What now? Sea Grant within NOAA? There needs to be other shoes dropping.
- Congress prohibited Climate Service, cancelled potential effects from OAR.
- With uncertainties within NOAA and with budget, science in NOAA in general, too unsettled to develop plan.
- Need guidance from Board. Futures I committee guidance was great and SG has responded

2:45 – Break

**3:00 Planning, Implementation, Evaluation Review (PIER)/NSGO Website Update (Garber/Ban)
Presentation (See Appendix – PIER_NSGOweb.ppt)**

PIER

- Changes in planning to include strategic elements; link impacts, projects, and accomplishments to plan for each program.
- Implementation: project and funding information included, as well as classification codes.
- Evaluation: includes metrics and performance measures.
- Strategic Plan objectives for each state to show targets and activities.
- Partnerships a new function that is attached to impacts and accomplishments for state Sea Grant projects, and this can show regional implications and collaboration across programs.
- Briefing reports will hopefully come out of this system in the future.
- Each program will be able to plug in their information as will the national office – this is the goal for the future.
- Want to use system to evaluate impacts and accomplishments and determine how those are used.
- No date set when to evaluate.

NSGO Website

- PIER will be a part of national website
- Feature live items: programs need to send impacts and accomplishments
- Concept: dynamic, frequent updates, news from the programs
- Feature stories: scheduled updates and work with communicator's network
- National relevance to local stories

4:00 Allocation and Futures Committees revisit

The Board agreed that no further discussion of either committee was needed.

Discussion of other topics:

- SG within NOAA? Future of climate service in NOAA? Structure for climate service in NOAA? Will SG be better in another section of NOAA or as separate LO?
- Senate language and mark related to OAR and pulling climate labs, but what will OAR be? Scattered? Put labs in line offices?
- If OAR is disbanded where do we land? NOS? NMFS?
- Strength of extension in SG and need by NOAA
- SAB should address the language in the budget – Chair will contact SAB Chair to discuss concerns.
-

4:15 pm End of Session

Thursday, September 29, 2011

Attendees:

Board: Frank Beal, Patty Birkholz, John Byrne, Jeremy Harris, Mike Orbach, Rollie Schmitt, Harry Simmons, Bill Stubblefield, John Woeste, Dick West, Dick Vortmann

Absent: Nancy Rabalais

Ex-Officio Attendees: Elizabeth Ban- National Sea Grant Office (NSGO), Leon Cammen -NSGO, Jon Pennock-Director, New Hampshire Sea Grant/President, Sea Grant Association (SGA)

Other Attendees: Ron Baird-University of North Carolina/Formal NSGO Director, Joshua Brown, Nikola Garber-NSGO, Monica Allard Cox, Michelle Carnevale, Alan Desbonnet, Steve D'Hondt, Susan Farady, Meredith Haas, Jen McCann, Heather Rhodes, Julie Wyman -Rhode Island Sea Grant

8:00 Call to Order, review agenda and previous day's discussions (Woeste)

- Official record of committee members' appointment times to be sent to Board
- Changes in Commerce and NOAA leadership, positions, and organizational chart in Briefing Book
- Changes to agenda as Senator Whitehouse has canceled.
- Rules concerning pay/expenses; Kola will address during break

8:15 Planning, Implementation and Evaluation (PIE) and Performance Review Panel updates Sami Grimes-NSGO via telephone Presentation (See Appendix – Grimes_PIE.ppt)

Strategic Planning Process and timeline for 2014-2017

- Process begins this Fall: National and State program planning happening simultaneously.
- One national plan
- National and state plans completed by Dec. 2012.
- October 2011 – Appoint National Plan Steering Committee & Membership
- Nov. 2011 – Steering Committee reviews
- Nov.-Feb. 2012 – National and state stakeholder forums
 - March-May 2012 – Draft National Plan and Comment Period
 - July 2012 – Finalize Draft

Discussion:

- SG connection to National Ocean Policy. Wherever policy goes SG needs to keep pulse. Is an item on agenda for steering committee to review.
- Draft being revised in response to public comment.
- Need for evaluation of existing strategic plan by those that have conformed to it and look for feedback.
- Is plan still valid and need to look at possible changes in new plan, and can aid into developments.
 - Grimes – people on focus teams looking at this currently in terms of where are we going in the future, and another item for steering committee.
- Where is the main leadership for developing plan?
 - Cammen – Steering Committee expected to have most of leadership role, but not necessarily make decisions which would be by the National office. Board and National office should not take on process by itself; it should be a bottom-up process.
- Evaluation to see if we've met goals established in last plan?

- Grimes– Focus teams look on an annual basis at accomplishments of plans. The other method is the Grimes to look at goals met.
- Biennial was not a critical look last time. Where is that?
 - Grimes – Focus teams look at those details to determine progress and accomplishments of goals, and to see where the gaps are, as well as the role of SG in these focus areas.
- When do these focus areas get integrated into national framework?
 - Cammen – complicated factor of SG means we don't have the luxury to look back when we're in the middle of a plan while having to plan the next one. Performance-based look on 4-yr plan has to follow performance panel 4 years from now, which is two years after this 4-yr plan is finished.
- In an ideal case in a serial planning process – what basis of data do we have aggregated to look for as basis of new plan?
 - Cammen – Annual focus team report
- Need for modify new plan and requirement to report to Congress every year; maybe in concert with Grimes. Grimes can be a tool to rely on as a tool to show progress if there can't be a full evaluation in four years.
- Tracking state to national strategic plans, and look back to Grimes when reporting to Congress.
- Two dimensions:
 - 1.) Have you achieved the goals in plan?
 - 2.) Has the plan satisfied organizational needs?
- Take off what is assumed is achieved in Grimes, and demonstration scope of national impact of program and to what extent = progress mark. What extent has it been communicated to NOAA; an effective instrument for communication SG's message etc. Doubt focus teams would deal with these – not the organizational questions.
- Use Grimes as a true critical look; if focus teams record available data, suggestion to national office to supply data as program as a whole the biennial committee can use in addition to the focus team reports. Leon – good role of the board to take on.
 - Cammen noted that this is a draft process and intends to present this at SGA meeting which will be deadline for additional comments.

Evaluation

- Site Review Teams: last one June 2011
- NSGO/SGA will collect feedback from site reviews to see if successful and beneficial to programs.

Discussion:

- Lessons learned?
 - Grimes – have a few to gather but will complete after feedback questionnaire

Performance Review Panel (PRP)

- Reviewing program's progress by June 2012 and impacts from 2008-2011.
- Transitional review panel.
- Evaluation demonstrations accountability to Congress, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), DOC and NOAA, and other federal dollars
- 5 PRP working groups.
- Reports from the PIER database and optional brief program survey.

- PRP Reviewers include board members, SG etc. Responsibilities include primary and secondary review for a subset of programs and will be responsible for filling out the evaluation from prior to the PRP review. All other members will serve as tertiary reviewers.
- Progress toward plan:
 - PRP working groups will first assign a rating on program's progress.
- Overall Impact:
 - Working groups will make an additional assessment of each program's overall impact within the focus area.
- Schedule: June 2012
 - Wk 1: HCE and HRCC working groups
 - Wk 2: Finalize reports
 - Wk 3: SCD, SSS, and other groups held
 - Wk 4: Finalize reports

Discussion

- PRP is key difference in new evaluation process. Some programs have not had an impact evaluation in a decade.
- Process in organization of panels is consistent with other processes and should be received well.
- How much time is required of participants before June?
 - Grimes – need to review prior reports and know information. 2008-2011 impacts and accomplishments, and annual report material needs to be reviewed. May be about 5 hours per program to review.
 - Cammen – a panel member will only look at one focus group aspect for each program. Several days of reading time.
 - Pennock – been involved the whole way and understand uncertainty with first iteration. The board needs to assess review process and costs put in to the amount of reviews done. Spending so much time in review to satisfy Congress. Time lost in doing good work. Current system out of whack to find a way so we can do good work. Time spent on reviews daunting as a director of a program.
 - Congress set up two National Research Council (NRC) reviews and has an interest in SG reviews.
 - What is the relationship in timing with PRP schedule and Grimes: June and Fall. Review would be prior to Grimes. Set up so annual report for each program, if done, and give to PRP. Annual reports, if done adequately, all programs have to do is write a 10-pg report. Makes annual reporting function more useful and incorporated into evaluation.
 - Rollie: high effort for site reviews and confused as to value of effort. SRT process and results, and PRP relationship?

Annual NSGO reviews

- Next annual review will look at recent annual reports and SRT reports. (Jan. 2012)
- Annual review following the PRP (fall/winter 2012).
- PRP will not see SRT reports but review accomplishments and goals.

Discussion:

- Is there any guidance for level of review required?
 - Grimes: Looking for comments by Oct. 14 on proposed process. Still looking into functionality of PRP

- Review of data from subject areas and product 10-pg; suggest a synthesis paper to highlight how objectives were met that may satisfy requirements in order to reduce strain on reviewer. Point of consideration.
- Work with Grimes and streamline as best we can. Good feeling from site visits; suggests the same team to work with national program officer to develop synopsis of paper review.
- NRC primary recommendation wanted a consistent set of eyes looking at all the programs. Need to keep in mind.
 - Cammen- previous system evolved into 4-5 day reviews with different people looking at each program. Trying to develop common standard. It was a massive effort and wanted to simplify process – shorten site visits, common set of eyes. NRC also wanted national office more involved in reviewing program, but we needed continual flow of information. Set up annual reviews that programs have to do. Now only a 10-pg synthesis required.
- The Directors should provide input and evaluate the process after it has been completed.
- How does this tie to allocation?
 - Cammen - Have a score coming out of this evaluation and a rating for programs on success of site reviews; score will be used to divide up merit funding. Total merit funding = \$4M.
- PRP will be important as a backup for re-allocation funding phase; and there's got to be a way to grade programs against one another.
 - Cammen- If a budget cut we need something solid. Site visits were good in evaluating programs and where improvements need to be. There needs to be some competition to drive programs, and to say that we have a powerful competitive program overall.
- Program review process anxiety grounded in new PIER system;
 - Big issue is getting consistent with plugging in data and grounding a stable review process.

9:50 Break

**10:05 Welcome to the University of Rhode Island Graduate School of Oceanography,
Steven D'Hondt, Interim Dean and Professor of Oceanography
Presentation (See Appendix – DHondt_URI_GSO.ppt)**

**10:45 Rhode Island Sea Grant highlights Barry A. Costa-Pierce, Director
Presentation (See Appendix – Costa Pierce_RISG.ppt)**

**Ocean Special Area Management Plan Initiative Jennifer McCann, Rhode Island Sea Grant Extension
Director
Presentation (See Appendix – McCann_SAMP.ppt)**

12:00 Lunch

**12:30 Craig McLean, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research,
via telephone
OAR Next: Future strategic plan**

- is independent of Climate Service
- Publishing renewed version after comments from OAR.
- Reorganization issues: Climate Service in relation of OAR and a global reorganization of NOAA in relation to Commerce.
- Interest in combining trade and economic roots of Congress, but no one knows what to do with NOAA; won't see any moves to remove NOAA and will remain in Commerce.
- House report – NOAA cannot use any appropriate funds to create a Climate Service line office. Senate asks NOAA for a plan about what OAR will look like. Need to submit a more robust plan for OAR. Still in continuing resolution. OAR will continue to look the same.

Discussion:

- Board suggests he called SAB leadership and indicate their role in lead of advising.
- Senate language constructive; but selective language seems to challenge OAR and overall context appears to support OAR.

OAR AA Recruitment

- Recruitment: OAR AA position currently advertised. Closes Oct. 5 for candidate nominees.

Discussion

- What can board do to enhance movement from interim to permanent position?
 - McLean: Would not discourage board involvement in providing support for OAR.
- Deputy Undersecretary will be retiring. Important to maintain relationship. A subordinate position will be created underneath.

New members Oath of Office (administered by Craig McLean)

→ Frank Beal and Patricia Birkholz

- Chair thanked the AA for his time.

1:15 Biennial Report to Congress – assignments and goals (Woeste)

- West (Chair), Beal, Orbach
- Cammen to assign 1 NSGO staff person
- SGA to designate a representative

New Committee Assignments (Woeste)

- **2012 Reauthorization Committee**
 - Schmitt (Chair), Birkholz, Simmons
 - Cammen to provide recommendations to Committee
- **SG Week 2012**
 - Planning for SG Week has not started → Harry Simmons as designated representative.
 - Given budget restraints, AB should consider its attendance in AK
- **Sea Grant Strategic Plan**

Discussion:

- 4 focus areas and cross-cutting issues addressed in current plan.
- Use of professional write in previous Plan.
- Original Committee: NOAA, SG, SGA, Board members
- Will there be an implementation plan this time where state programs are aligned with the national program?
 - Cammen – There will be one plan that includes strategy and implementation to ease the burden on programs
- Board representative?

- Cammen: process worked well last time; appropriate for board member to be chair of steering committee; need to know which board member.
- Concern over conflict between advisory capacity and management role of implementation
 - Alternative options: board member as a chair or someone not on board but contracted and presented to the board
 - Cost of contractors expensive.
- Cammen: it is a good plan; will be new focus areas suggested and sifted; most of the text is appropriate.
- Any arising issues since plan?
 - Climate example as move to focus area.
 - Ocean hazards and not just coastal hazards?
- Timeline:
 - Committee appointed by October;
 - Steering Committee Draft November – March and begin stakeholder meetings; create draft plan within time frame.
- Cammen: Need to find another chair for the committee.
- Chair: The Board can identify someone to look at existing plan and come back to board with short report to define size and nature of job.
- Cammen: Will discuss with SGA - want to make sure there isn't a perception that this a national office plan.
- **Knauss**
 - Schmitt
- **Minority Serving Institutions/Diversity Committee**
 - We don't set the standards for diversity, but the Board should look into policies
 - NOAA institutional policy should not guide our work as most Sea Grant employees do not work for NOAA
 - Been language that there is a Board subcommittee. Given current culture of things, the Board attending to these matters will serve the Board well.
 - The Board should submit a policy
 - Orbach and Harris will do a review of current diversity statement and then Board will disseminate to the programs

Discussion:

- Is there a report for the whole of SG in terms of diversity? Needs analysis to make this meaningful.
- NOAA diversity committee in regards to recruitment; getting data is all voluntary. There are difficulties legally to call programs and ask for reports.
 - Cammen: Program assessments? Do look at diversity aspects, don't control them but look at them. Encourage applicants for Knauss and students across the program.
- Most SG employees not NOAA employees and therefore do not govern.

2: 15 Break

- **Sub Committee on OAR Strategic Plan**
 - Alter language to emphasize SG's influence?
 - Proposing more time to review document and NSGAB Chair should draft a letter to group and send on behalf of the board.

Board Actions:

→ Chair will draft a letter for review to be sent to OAR.

○

Focus Team Reports

- No teams have anything to report.
- Concern that no one has anything to report when it was made clear they were critical in annual reports and evaluation.
 - Cammen: proposals to initiatives to fill in gaps within focus teams; responsible for monitoring progress; will ask teams for advice on next strategic plan
 - Ban: Focus Teams provided updates in August – this is just a two month update.

Network Reports

- Simmons: Communications → would like to attend larger meeting, maybe SG Week, and be more engaged.
- Extension: Schmitt → Discussed Texas Sea Grant On-Boarding presentation from Extension & Communication Conference – would like to see them present at our Spring Meeting.
- Education: Rabalais (absent)

Discussion:

- Board should discuss assignments with Rabalais. As Chair, she should not be on so many committees
- Board needs to be cautious about taking on any more assignments due to lack of active members.

NOAA Science Advisory Board (SAB)

- Need to know times of meetings, specifically public.
- Ban to discuss with Cynthia Decker, DFO of SAB

Public Comment Period

- Ban confirmed no attendees for public comment period. Received one public comment which was provided to the Board and will be included in minutes.

3: 00 Dr. Ames Colt, Chair, RI Bays, Rivers, and Watersheds Coordination Team Presentation (See Appendix – Colt_RIBRW.ppt)

Chair thanks Dr. Colt for his time and work with Rhode Island Sea Grant

3:30 Meeting adjourned

DRAFT