

**National Sea Grant Advisory Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Cleveland Marriott downtown at Key Tower  
Cleveland, Ohio  
September 11-12, 2022**

**Sunday, September 11, 2022**

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC – 9:30am – 4:00pm ET

Ms. Stirling (Board Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting and officially called the meeting to order. Thanks to everyone who has traveled here today. It's nice to see everyone in person. We've been meeting virtually, but have never missed a beat. Thanks to Elizabeth and Susan for all their hard work. Ms. Stirling then turned the meeting over to Ms. Holmes (Designated Federal Officer (DFO)) for a DFO briefing and Roll Call.

Ms. Holmes read an official statement explaining her role to the group and took roll call of the members of the Board. Ms. Holmes thanked everyone for their diligent work in preparing for the meeting, discussed the ground rules of the meeting and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The agency appreciates your time and diligent work and the Board wishes to thank our NOAA colleagues for their participation in the meeting also. We have a full agenda and will try to keep the time to the agenda as much as we can. We are testing a new hybrid meeting platform, so please be patient as we address any issues we might encounter. We ask that you respect the decorum of the meeting or will be asked to leave if needed. She then turned the meeting over to Ms. Stirling (Board Chair) who went over the agenda for the meeting and then called the meeting to order.

**Roll Call**

*Members of the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (Board):*

Dr. Peter Betzer; Dr. Carole Engle; Dr. Deidre Gibson; Ms. Judith Gray; Dr. Brian Helmuth; Dr. Jim Murray (Vice Chair); Ms. Kristine Norosz; Ms. Deborah Stirling (Board Chair).

*Board Ex Officio Members:*

Ms. Summer Morlock, Assistant Director for Programs, National Sea Grant Office (NSGO); Dr. Susan White, President, Sea Grant Association (SGA).

*National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) support staff in attendance:*

Ms. Susan Holmes, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Board, National Sea Grant Office; Ms. Donna Brown, Project Administrator, National Sea Grant Office; and Ms. Elizabeth Rohring, alternate DFO, National Sea Grant Office.

**9:30am – 9:40am: Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair)**

*Agenda*

Ms. Stirling gave an overview of the agenda and asked for a motion to approve it.

Motion to approve the September 11, 2022 agenda: Dr. Peter Betzer

2<sup>nd</sup>: Dr. Carole Engle

Vote: All in Favor

Ms. Stirling - We will now consider a motion to approve the June 2022 meeting minutes. Does anyone have any comments or questions in reference to the minutes?

Dr. White - I have a couple of edits that need to be made which I have noted. She then handed the edits over to Ms. Holmes (DFO) who agreed to make the necessary changes.

Ms. Norosz - After reviewing the documents a correction also needs to be made on page 11 where I am referred to as "Dr." instead of "Ms." Norosz. Those edits were also accepted by the Board.

Ms. Stirling - Asked if there were any other questions or comments and stated that she also had some very minor edits that she would submit to the Board. She then proceeded to ask for a vote to approve the June 2022 meeting minutes with the necessary edits that need to be made.

#### *June 2022 Meeting Minutes*

Ms. Stirling asked for a motion to approve the June 2022 meeting minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes from the June 8, 2022 Board meeting: Dr. James Murray

2<sup>nd</sup>: Dr. Peter Betzer

Vote: All in favor

Ms. Stirling - Thanked everyone for their votes and turned the meeting over to Ms. Holmes (DFO) for the public comment period.

#### **9:40am: Public Comment Period (Ms. Susan Holmes, DFO)**

The Board did not receive any written or public comments prior to the meeting. If there are any members of the public who are in attendance who would like to submit public comments, you are welcome to do so. Please note that public comments are limited to three minutes per person. *There were no public comments.* Ms. Holmes then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Stirling (Board Chair) who then turned the meeting over to Dr. Murray (Vice Chair) for a welcoming of the new Board members.

#### **9:40am – 10:10am: Welcome New Board Members (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair and Dr. Jim Murray, Vice Chair)**

Dr. Jim Murray - I am privileged to introduce Dr. Nancy Targett to the Board. She unfortunately could not be in attendance today. Her bio is in the briefing book and I think you'll be impressed. She is a Distinguished Professor Emerita and Dean Emerita at the University of Delaware(UD), College of Earth, Ocean, and Environment (CEOE). She has more than 38 years of experience in higher education and served 10 years as Director of Delaware Sea Grant and Dean of CEOE. Then, as Acting President at UD, she guided the institution through a 15-month period of transition. Dr. Targett also served as Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of New Hampshire. At UD she led the team that formed First State Marine Wind (FSMW), a joint venture between the University and Gamesa Technology Corporation that built a commercial scale wind turbine on the marine campus. She served on the FSMW Board of Directors for six years. Dr. Targett also served a three-year term as the Chair of the Board of Trustees for the Consortium of Ocean Leadership, six years on the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and three years on the Ocean Studies Board. While at Delaware Sea Grant (DESG)

as Director she held multiple elected positions for the Sea Grant Association (SGA). Dr. Targett was named an Aldo Leopold Leadership Fellow in 1999 and in 2016 received the Order of the First State from then-Governor Jack Markell in recognition of her contributions to the State of Delaware. Dr. Targett received her M.S in Marine Science from the University of Miami, and her Ph.D. in Ocean Science from University of Maine. She's great to work with and a problem solver. She is a great addition to the Board and will roll up her sleeves when needed. I'm happy to have her on the Board.

Ms. Stirling - then introduced Dr. Deidre Gibson to the Board. Dr. Gibson is the Chair of the Department of Marine and Environmental Science at Hampton University. She is a broadly trained Biological Oceanographer with research interests centered on the trophic ecology, reproductive biology, and population dynamics of zooplankton, but more specifically, gelatinous zooplankton, and currently oyster restoration. Her research harbors an emerging emphasis on identifying mechanisms through which climate change and anthropogenic alterations of habitats affect gelatinous zooplankton and other aquatic organisms. While at Hampton University, she has served as Principal Investigator on several National Science Foundation (NSF) and NOAA grants that continue to train the next generation of African American marine scientists. Dr. Gibson earned her B.S. in Oceanography from the University of Washington and Ph.D. in Marine Science from the University of Georgia/Skidaway Institute of Oceanography. Ms. Stirling then asked Dr. Gibson if she would like to speak about her background and interest in the kind of work that Sea Grant does.

Dr. Gibson – I'm originally from Louisiana and spent a lot of time with my family fishing. I never thought about Marine Science as an avenue to explore so I did a lot of exploring as I entered college and finally decided that Marine Science is what I wanted to do. I received a bachelor's degree in oceanography – moved back to Louisiana and became a technician at the University. Did a lot of work there and realized that I might have what it takes to go on for my Ph.D.. I was accepted at the University of Georgia and Ph.D. there in Oceanography. From there I decided to stick around in Savannah and during that time as a graduate student participating in the multicultural program. I was then introduced to Ben Shucker at Hampton University and came there on a NOAA grant. I was hired as a researcher in 2002 at the NOAA Living Marines Corporate Science Center. I've done a lot to change the culture at Hampton University in multicultural programs that African Americans were interested in and worked on several NFS projects and programs, including the Center for Ocean Science Excellence. Before I retire I want to make sure that Hampton University is a player in that work.

Ms. Stirling - Stated that she knew she would come through and appreciates her comments. I can see where you can plug into just about everything the Board does. Ms. Stirling then thanked Dr. Gibson again and stated that she's looking forward to seeing her at the March meeting. Normally we would go around and have everyone introduce themselves but since we did that in June I don't think that would be necessary. There's something else we would like to do. Elizabeth Rohring is retiring and has been our long time Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for a number of years, and her contribution list supporting the Board goes on and on and on – so we have a special item that we would like to present to her and would like to ask you to open it and maybe say a few words if you like.

Ms. Rohring - Opens her gift and stated that when she joined Sea Grant that Dr. Murray was the DFO of the Board – it's been an honor working with everyone on the Board and I now have a chocolate gavel of my own. She also stated that she will be retiring on October 31<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Morlock - Stated that they have even more celebrations coming from the National Office for Ms. Rohring and are looking forward to sharing those with everyone.

Ms. Stirling – Moved on to the next item and turned the meeting over to herself, Dr. Murray and Dr. Helmuth to discuss the Board Executive Committee Nominations position.

**10:00am – 10:05am: Board Executive Committee Nominations (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair, Dr. Jim Murray, Board Vice Chair and Dr. Brian Helmuth, Board Member)**

Ms. Stirling - stated that Dr. Carole Engle will be moving off the Board Executive Committee and we now need to fill this position. We put out a call and asked if there was any interest in joining and received a response from Dr. Nancy Targett. We now need to have a formal nomination and vote to approve Dr. Targett as the new Executive Committee Member-at-Large. The Executive Committee membership includes a Current Chair, Past Chair, Vice Chair, and two Members-at-Large positions. The current position we need to fill is for one Member-at-Large position for a two year term starting on January 1, 2023. Those who volunteered to be on the Nominating Committee cannot be considered for one of the positions I just mentioned. The Nominating Committee representatives are myself, Dr. Jim Murray and Dr. Brian Helmuth. She then asked if there were any questions or additional calls for nominations and turned the meeting over to Dr. Helmuth to make a formal nomination for Dr. Nancy Targett.

Dr. Helmuth - stated that Dr. Nancy Targett has volunteered to become a member of the Board's Executive Committee. I as being a part of the Nominating Committee accepts Dr. Targett as the new member of the Executive Committee. He then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Stirling who asked for a motion to accept the nominee as the new member of the Executive Committee.

Motion to accept Dr. Nancy Targett as the new Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee: Dr. Carol Engle

2<sup>nd</sup> – Kris Norosz

Vote: All in favor

**10:05am – 11:30am: Interim Report to Congress (Dr. Jim Murray, Board Vice Chair, Ms. Judy Gray, Board Member and Dr. Carole Engle, Board Member)**

Dr. Murray - stated that he would be leading the presentation but Ms. Gray and Dr. Engle will assist in answering any questions. Section 5 Reduction of frequency required for the national Sea Grant Advisory "State of Sea Grant" Report to Congress. The Board should report to Congress at least once every four years on the state of the National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) and shall notify Congress of any significant changes to the state of the program not later than two years after the submission of such a report. Previously an extensive report was required every two years. We wanted the interim report short and focused on the significant parts of what the larger report had and used hyperlinks to provide more extensive information. We had several March and August virtual calls, developed and modified an outline of key topics, reported progress and received input from the Sea Grant network. We also received assistance on content from the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) experts and Sea Grant leadership and engaged them in what topics to cover, and received editing and graphic assistance from the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) communicators. We came up with a good outline from those discussions and ultimately gave writing assignments to each of us and we feel pretty confident in the information because so many in the National Office knew about the topics.

The report had four sections of management excellence and administrative changes and included Guam program institutional status change, partnership and liaison program, Sea Grant transitions its collection to NOAA and the first review of the National Sea Grant College Program.

The report also included new and evolving Initiatives: deepening engagement in resilience, marine debris, contaminants, aquaculture, reef fish, and American lobster initiative. Last topic is Sea Grant and the Blue Economy: offshore renewable energy, workforce development, Sea Grant's response to Covid and resilience and social justice.

Next steps we need to discuss, vote and approve the report today. Dr. Murray then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Stirling.

Ms. Stirling - stated that Dr. Murray, Ms. Gray and Dr. Engle put a lot of effort into this and know it will be very well received on the Hill.

Dr. Engle - thanked everyone for providing feedback to the report which was very helpful and the communications team for all their hard work.

Ms. Gray - stated that she would like to highlight how important the reporting systems were, newsletters, etc. all of these tools really paid off because the summary is so succinct.

Ms. Stirling - thanked everyone and stated that she would like to discuss plans for taking the report to the Hill and would also like to get input from everyone on the Board regarding things that may have been missed, editing that may need to be altered/corrected in any way. She then opened the floor for questions and comments.

Ms. Norosz – I had a few editing comments on pages 4 and 6 – the word should be New not News Offshore Renewable Energy. Our goal is to inform and empower participants. Ms. Norosz also stated that she wanted to make sure that everything mentioned here is the last few things that have happened in the last three years - recent activities.

Dr. Helmuth - informing participants is a one directional force.

Dr. Murray - stated yes – some of our work is revolving and they added these things – reef fish – similar to resilience but highlighted the increased work and numbers over the last three years. Making sure what was evolving these last three years.

Dr. Engle – you can add aquaculture – new initiatives of high priority.

Dr. Susan White – the Sea Grant Association (SGA) also had comments. I will hand them over to Dr. Murray. Let's be coordinated on the Hill visit because that's where all our programs are included.

Ms. Holmes – I want to remind the Board that they should not be talking about the budget or asking for resources on Hill visits.

Ms. Stirling - Not as a Board representative, it's an ethics issue.

Dr. Murray – In conclusion - we're doing all this good stuff but the demands are increasing expeditiously and we're looking forward to addressing all these needs.

Dr. Murray - In terms of moving to adopt the report, the edits should be pretty straight forward. Seems to me the Board can entrust us to deal with the edits – we all agree with the message and how we say that and where we say that needs to be done and good minds can do that. I would like to have a motion to adopt with edits. Would that work?

Ms. Stirling - I think that would work.

Dr. Murray – We would like to now have a Motion to move and accept the report with the caveat that the editing suggestions mentioned today be included and that we engage the Leadership Committee of Sea Grant to work over the next week

2<sup>nd</sup>: Dr. Peter Betzer

Vote: All in favor

### **11:30am – 1:30pm: Lunch Break**

Ms. Stirling – Welcomed everyone back to the Board meeting. I would like to now turn the meeting over to the Head of the Sea Grant Association (SGA) - Dr. Susan White is from the great state of North Carolina who is going to provide us with a very thorough update of activities. She then turned the meeting over to Dr. Susan White.

### **1:30pm – 2:00pm: Sea Grant Association Update (Dr. Susan White, President, Sea Grant Association (SGA))**

Dr. White – Thanks. As I've done in the past, this is as much a conversation as it is an update so we have ample time to work through a couple of my bullet points, but also, I'd welcome conversation with the Board and our other Sea Grant Association (SGA) reps here as necessary. So I thought I would start with a very broad scale and talk about budgeting and coordination because that's a lot of what the SGA focuses on as you know, so the FY 23 works that we have in play, but we are already turning our attention to FY 24 and our programmatic reflects is under development this week. And we'll finalize that likely in the December timeframe. And when that is finalized, we'll certainly share it with the Board. And obviously to coordinate our presence on the Hill and we talk about and discuss budgets, but as you know, the constraints of what the Advisory Board has, and the constraints of what the National Office has, and sometimes the constraints of the Association are much less. So, again, if there's an opportunity for us to support and coordinate that is one of the requests that the Association always brings to the Board during this time of year.

Joel Whitter is retiring from Federal Science Partners (FSP). And so we are very excited to welcome Alexa Hayes and sure we will hear about it this week if you haven't already. Joel is off gallivanting in Europe somewhere for the month and will basically be part-time and then at some point he'll go cold turkey but if you know Joel going cold turkey probably won't ever happen. So although that has and is a significant shift for FSP, they are well positioned. So we've been very excited to get to know her and I hope that you will reach out and visit with her while she's here. She will carry the message with Meg Thompson, who continues to be a Lead for SGA and the other pieces.

So you all are well versed, I think in what the budget marks are for the House and Senate for Sea Grant, hopefully at this point, the house was \$96.5 million and the Senate was \$105 million. But there is aquaculture in both of those as that is separately allocated. So in the House, it's 14 ½ for aquaculture and in the Senate it's 15. And again, that is yet to be determined. We anticipate a continuing resolution

through the fall and maybe even into early December. And then FSP has indicated that we would anticipate a budget or should I say an executed budget. So that's good news for the Association. We hope that's good news for the Advisory Board. When we get to Hill coordination, Darren and I will be doing some briefings this Fall. So are there any conversations or questions from the Board?

Dr. Murray – Let me sort of relate this back to our discussion this morning. As you're going to the Hill what's your pitch in terms of handling the core vs direct funding?

Dr. White – That's a great question. That was my next conversation topic because your External Relations Committee (ERC) has drafted some initial guidance on how to manage discussions on congressionally directed spending or core community directed funding, what the House calls it is something along those lines. Direct Community Projects.

Dr. Betzer – I think they are completely separate carve-outs in the appropriations process.

Dr. White – That's right. So there's two pieces. There's directed spending, and then there are things that say you should do this and you're going to do this. So when it comes to conversations with our current State Program Directors, we very much focus on base. We prioritize the base and the network approach, and we recognize we can't stop money's from coming in. The FSB has provided some guidance for SGA. I think it's been briefed to the delegates on best practices. And then of course, we always ask delegates to quickly connect with the Board for their FFP partners so that we're all aware of what's coming in as much as we possibly can but there is the priority for the Association and other budget questions.

Dr. Betzer - Has there been an increase in base?

Dr. White - Yes

Dr. Murray – Let me sort of philosophically show. I used to work in the general assembly in North Carolina Cultural Caucus meetings in part to learn what they were interested in buying, what are the issues – cultural issues that you cared about in a particular time. Often we would target initiatives towards whatever it was they were interested in. In other words, if they were interested in buying a Cadillac we didn't try to sell them a pick-up truck. The question in relation to sort of a philosophy to using directed funds are you actually going after directed funds or are you actually going after directed functions. There are a number of issues that say that Senators and Appropriations Staff are interested in Southern Coastal States. Are you at all trying to put together directed funding proposals?

Dr. White - Individual states have been requested to do so. That's part of the challenge and opportunity and something we're going to grapple with for another set of years as we've come back into play a little bit, a little bit stronger. We have a letter going in to Dr. Richard Spinrad from our Association, reminding him of the importance of the programming. We just saw Dr. Steve Thur come in as the new Acting Assistant Administrator for OAR - we just got an email from him. As Administrator for OAR, how can we continue to elevate the profile of what is a small program and how do we elevate again and again, when there are other line offices that are also well positioned for resilience planning. That is a challenge and an opportunity that I present to the Board. I would point out that we also have good relationships with our coastal roundtable. This is relevant to all of you because it shows our Association's ability to walk across other Line Office Associations. The Coastal States Organization, NEERA, and The Sanctuaries Foundation amongst others. We have often and will continue to do this year joint letters to support

NOAA appropriations, joint letters that specifically outline our own individual acts and point to how we work together. We think as a leadership group...that group meets regularly...acknowledged there's so much work to be done and there's not enough money for everybody. That's not a competitive space, it's a complementary space. I think it's worth noting to the Board that those crossline offices know they have to manage their own spaces. That's my budget in larger pieces. Any other questions on that sort of budgeting side? No.

I want to change gears a little bit and talk about some of the State Association's perspectives and what we're hearing. I want to point out a couple of the challenges we're having, but also some of the challenges that come with opportunities. Reflecting on challenges here with some of the funding opportunities that have been coming out more and more recently from the National Office and competitive functions. Administratively, the burden for the states has increased considerably in the last five years. We have data that shows all these great pieces, but I think the challenge that we're seeing in a COVID time continues to create burnout. I've talked with Jon as well. Folks are losing staff without the ability to hire. At the state level, we're worried about inflation. Our state budgets are declining. We can't fill positions. Your States are under a lot of stress and you'll see that the Fiscal Officers are going crazy trying to get all this information through because they have to come through Sea Grant, which means all of our software testing. Programs are understaffed. There's some challenges - one of the challenges is that our Research Coordinators have to do a lot of panel work and they don't have a lot of administrative support. You'll hear this tenor and I want to take a moment to reflect on that tenor. It's not all bad. But it is tiring and the National Office has also verbalized a lot of the same that's parallel. When we think about the sort of update of the SGA I would say that people are tired. It's not a new statement, but I want to reflect on it and represent the feedback that we hear at the Board level.

There are also continuing discussions about match wall – we brought this up about a year ago and had great brainstorming opportunities on how States might be able to find match...required match. We were so pleased that the new Marine Debris funding did not have a match requirement, but that comes along with the same conversation in funding as we increase our base which has a match requirement. That's sort of the state of bad news, maybe more like challenging news.

Ms. Norosz – You said that you're losing staff and you're unable to replace people. I wanted to know if that's a budget problem, or is it just that you can't find people? And, I'm wondering if the salaries that the state programs are able to provide are competitive?

Dr. White – Yes. It is all of the above and I don't think it's unique to Sea Grant. We can use North Carolina as an example. We lost two to three people because they could work fully remote and the University is not fully remote. They could get better corporate salaries and the university is not competitive. They had greater family stability and the university had moderate stability. Then when we try to recruit into those positions, we get probably one, two or three candidates in before we find someone that is willing and able to take the position. That's not always the case and some states have different reflections. These are generally not competitive salaries, nor have they really ever been. But the overlay now is even worse. I will say that this is part of the State budget challenges. I'll use North Carolina because we have a very fiscally conservative State budget, Wisconsin and I have had a good set of conversations over a long period of time that for the last four years we've had flat salaries, no salary increases and they've just released the ability. All of those salary increases come from our base. There's no new money from the State. We're mandated to do these increases and they all come from our



grants. I'm pleased because that helps us recruit and retain. But it all comes out of our grant works. And that's not an unusual space necessarily, for States across the program. So good and bad with those. Yes, Kris, all of the pieces are in play.

Let's get to the good news. Our teams are doing great work. We see this in the ability to respond to national competitions. We see this in the work that's produced. The networks themselves are looking at trying to figure out additional professional development opportunities. The SGA Ethics Committee will be shortly approved in the SGA bylaws that we're voting on this week. I feel and I think the Association would generally agree that the robustness of the Association's day job work continues to expand and I think that's a wonderful thing. We have so much to learn. And to grow into that space. In professional development, a lot of our work over the last five years we've been using some surveys on professional development needs to get to some of the recruiting and retaining opportunities, how we can move team members through career paths when we're completely flat organizations in some situations. So the professional development has an ad hoc group with the network's was represented by narrowed down and thinking about early career mid-career. Trying to bend in these spaces for opportunities for trajectory of growth and a Sea Grant Program. I think that's a wonderful opportunity for us to recruit and retain, but also to have opportunities for professionals to grow together across the network, which is great.

I wanted to make sure and I have not done full diligence on part of it because one of the recent strategic planning sets of feedback was our legal network. We needed to elevate the legal network in the National Strategic Plan. I want to make sure that the Advisory Board doesn't forget we have an entire Legal Network. We have a Law Center, Stephanie Showalter Otts is the Director there. We want to make sure you all remember that we have Legal and Policy expertise, and that's important to the actual execution of the program.

Our SGA meeting tomorrow, we have a couple of discussion points which are worthy of note. One is on the logo. We've talked about branding. The Network has to work with the National Office to think about how to make it accessible and that's a huge win. The SGA delegate to the Communicators' Network will bring that to the table for conversation on how we think about logo rollout. And that changes with the States and there's some branding challenges that may come up so we'll keep you posted on that. Hopefully you've seen the logo. It's not a significant change, but it is more accessible. That is an important ADA requirement and the SGA is supportive of it. How it rolls out I think is going to be more of a conversation.

Professional Partnerships - this is constant conversation. It's an important one, always has and it overlaps with both challenges and opportunities. How the National Office thinks about developing partnerships and how they're associated to the State Programs connect, Execute Partnerships from the National Staff is one way to think about - but it's also how the States think about developing State-based then require the National Office past three months.

Leadership Retreat - This is my last board meeting with you. Two years is hard to believe we've only met in person together once. Darren Lerner who's here from Hawaii will join us in December again with the Board at the Leadership Retreat in December. We look to transition between one SGA President to the next. We will hold an election this week for new positions on the SGA Board, President Elect, Ethics Chair of Bylaws, At-Large and PMC Chair. We will see some new faces at the December meeting.

Dr. Murray - If the Independent Review Panel had a recommendation to revise the Allocation of Funds Policy where does the SGA stand on that – would they say leave well enough alone don't go there or is there interest in having that policy revised.

Dr. White – The majority of the Association would reflect on not ever touching it again – It was so divisive – there are certainly programs that perhaps feel like there's a reason to look at it again because of their scale and scope, but I would think the majority would not want to see that come into play.

Ms. Stirling – Any other questions for Dr. White or observations?

Dr. Murray – We're supposed to be giving the National Office sort of high level advice on various issues. One thing I'd like to ask you and others if you were asked to say what kinds of things should the Advisory Board be looking at within the next year – what sort of high level policies do you think would be beneficial to the overall network?

Dr. White – Ok - sounds good – I appreciate that.

Ms. Stirling - Anything else for Dr. White?

Ms. Gray – Dr. White, I would like to thank you for your incredible service – it's been so nice getting to know you over these last few years. You've done a great job representing the Sea Grant Association and know we will be in good hands with Dr. Lerner but you will be missed.

Dr. White – I appreciate that and I'm not going very far so will look forward to keeping in touch with everyone. Thank you.

Ms. Stirling – Dr. White, I'd like to echo Judy's very good words. I very much enjoyed working with you – it's always delightful to work with people who are pushing the envelope and have a broad reach and you certainly did that.

Dr. White – It's been a pleasure and I didn't mention that Covid has been an interesting time at the Association, the Board and the National Office has made great progress under significant challenges. So while there's great progress to be made, I reflect how great the programming is across the Board. It's been a pleasure and thank all of you.

Ms. Stirling - We are going to move to the strategic discussion segment. Is there anything else pending that anyone wants to say from Dr. White's presentation or the Sea Grant Association. I hear nothing so let's start the discussion on the Spring Board meeting and logistics especially with Dr. White being here. Our Spring Board meeting dates are Sunday, February 26<sup>th</sup> and Monday, February 27<sup>th</sup> please put that on your calendars. Let's see what we can do about hopefully having meetings with even more of us together which would be delightful – we'll roll with the punches and figure it out. We're looking at potential Board visits to the Hill anywhere from the 28<sup>th</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March, which overlaps with the Sea Grant Association meeting so we want to be fairly careful because some of those agenda sessions we absolutely want to be sitting in on. We have to figure out when people are going to be available that we really need to touch base with for the two year report and the printed copy of both – the previous report. So given that logistical standpoint, we need those of you who desire (which is completely optional) to go to the Hill with Dr. Murray and I. I would hope that those of you who have a personal relationship with a member of Congress or with a staff member office, either Senator or Representatives

might be willing to go in with us and discuss whether or not it would be useful or not to have a meeting with that person.

Dr. Gibson – I'm not volunteering but I'm trying to figure out what goes on in those briefings and wanted to say that one of our graduates actually was on the Kamala Harris Executive Team and she had been working with her when she was a Senator but think she's moved on so I no longer have any connections there – but I actually would like to know what happens at those briefings?

Ms. Stirling – We are under a requirement from Congress based on the Law of reporting certain periods of time on our activities, the "State of Sea Grant" reports to Congress. We do a major report every four years and then recently we've been asked to provide an Interim Report because things have been moving fairly quickly and lots of change is occurring. That was the basis for our working on the Interim Report that we had a fairly robust discussion about today.

Dr. Gibson – So you go there to discuss that report with them?

Ms. Stirling – Yes, we are required to report to Congress, so we take those reports to the Hill and we talk to either a staff person or whoever is in the chair and we bring them up to speed on the highlights of the program, the content in those reports that is particularly relevant to them -- so we do our homework ahead of time and that's when it's helpful to have someone with us who is from that State. But even if you're not from that House/Senate members jurisdiction, if you're from the State that will help as well. We are not allowed to lobby for money for the agency, the Sea Grant office or for Sea Grant programs. Does that help?

Dr. Gibson – Yes it does...thanks.

Ms. Stirling - We will be hand delivering both reports, the 2020 Biennial report and the 2022 Interim report. After January 1<sup>st</sup> once we see how the Committee structure works out and membership and who's on first – we will find who's interested in going to the Hill with us.

I will say that in the past when I wanted to talk to the Delegation from South Carolina, I have coordinated with the head of our program in South Carolina. We have not met on the Hill at the same time with a member. I have always gone in first and tried to basically lay the groundwork, which is useful because what we give members is the 30,000 foot download, along with the specific nuggets that are of interest to them or specific to them or their region. There's always some linkage there in the subject matter individually. And then inevitably I would run into the head of the Sea Grant Program from South Carolina as he was going into the office. So it can work very well. I think it's better for our Board just to be on the conservative side. Any other thoughts on Hill visits or any questions?

Dr. White – I would like to say something from my perspective. The coordination from our Association's perspective is really critical. The fact that the National Office is getting invited, and hopefully the Advisory Board will invite themselves -- those are pieces that are usually and proactively shared with the State program members. Each entity may have different messaging, so it is better to coordinate beforehand.

Ms. Rohring – I just want to make a couple of clarifications for the record. The Biennial Report to Congress was never approved by anyone within NOAA including OAR. This is a Report of the Board not of NOAA. It is a courtesy to share it with them and if they have any suggestions then the Board will take

that into account. The other thing is that there are three different groups that we're talking about going to Hill visits. There's the SGA, the National Sea Grant Office and then there's the Board and those are three distinct reasons as to why we need to coordinate amongst all three because even between the Board and SGA leadership sometimes we step on each other's toes. We need to make sure that it is very clear who's going, with what goals, when and with whom.

Ms. Gray – Going with an SGA member you can totally play separate roles. The SGA members can ask for what they want and you can represent what's important to the Board. I thought it was a really good example in Florida when we met with Florida members. They were really happy to see them as a united front, so we do not have to go separately.

Ms. Stirling - Anything else on this subject? You will be hearing from us again in the new year and we will get this all sorted out then. We're ending a lot earlier than what we thought so this is a great opportunity for us to plug into the Sea Grant Association meeting. I'm sorry that most of you are not here but we hope to see you in person at the Spring meeting.

**Meeting Adjourned at 2:40pm**

**Monday, September 12, 2022**

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC – 9:00am – 5:00pm ET

Ms. Stirling (Board Chair) welcomed everyone back to the meeting. She gave a summary of yesterday's meeting and action items for the Board, and went over the agenda items to be covered at the meeting. She then turned the meeting over to Ms. Holmes (Designated Federal Officer (DFO)) for a DFO briefing and Roll Call.

Ms. Holmes read an official statement explaining her role to the group and took roll call of the members of the Board. Ms. Holmes thanked everyone for their diligent work in preparing for the meeting and the previous day's discussion, she then proceeded to go over the ground rules of the meeting and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She then turned the meeting over to Ms. Stirling (Board Chair) who went over the agenda for the meeting and officially called the meeting to order.

### **Roll Call**

*Members of the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (Board):*

Dr. Peter Betzer; Dr. Carole Engle; Dr. Deidre Gibson; Ms. Judith Gray; Dr. Brian Helmuth; Dr. Jim Murray (Vice Chair); Ms. Kristine Norosz; Ms. Deborah Stirling (Chair).

*Board Ex Officio Members:*

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

*National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) support staff in attendance:*

Ms. Susan Holmes, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Board, National Sea Grant Office; Ms. Donna Brown, Project Administrator, National Sea Grant Office; and Ms. Lacy Alison, Program Officer, National Sea Grant College Program.

Ms. Stirling – Thank you Susan. I would now like to introduce Dr. Jonathan Pennock, Director of the National Sea Grant College Program who will be giving us an official update.

**9:10am – 10:00am: National Sea Grant Office Update (Dr. Jonathan Pennock, Director, National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP))**

Dr. Pennock – Good morning everyone. I'll be providing an update and hope to get through this pretty quickly to bring everybody up to speed on a number of things that's going on within the National Office. Then I will go around the room to answer any questions you might have. I will be filling you in on where we are on the staffing side and what we are doing in the National Office. FY23 budget update that is quickly approaching, the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) activities and NOAA priorities, and actions related to recommendations from the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB).

Where we are with the NSGO Staff – The Deputy Director position which Kola occupies full-time is now being filled by Tatiana Sims-Parker (who is here in the room with us) who is our Acting Deputy Director while Kola is on detail, we have Summer Morlock who oversees our programs and Jon Eigen is our CFO. Jon Eigen oversees our operations and the Human Resources side of things. And, then we have a third position which is through partnerships and our external and national investments that has been a slot we've been trying to fill for quite a while and Kola has been acting in that position as well. We're looking to fill all 15 positions on the Board, and we welcomed Dr. Deidre Gibson and Dr. Nancy Targett to the Board earlier this year, we have one nomination still in progress and moving towards additional nominees and will be moving forward to NOAA Leadership shortly. We have several empty slots to be filled – we'll determine those nominees in what will be a 6-9 months process. NOAA Leadership Side - Dr. Steven Thur was named the permanent Assistant Administrator for NOAA Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR) effective early October and Cisco Werner will be stepping back from his Acting role and will transition back to NMFS. Emily Menashes is now the Deputy Assistant Administrator of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR) for Programs & Administration replacing Ko Barrett who is now NOAA's Senior Advisor for Climate and Dr. Sarah Kapnick was named NOAA's Chief Scientist in July, so the team is really shaping up.

What are the NOAA's Strategic Plans – one of the priorities is working on building a Climate Ready Nation and resilience, which are central to NOAA's mission and accelerate growth in an information-based Blue Economy. There are a few individual things that are involved in the Strategic Planning process and it always takes a couple of years for the new administration to solidify their Strategic Plan and moving forward we have linked the ongoing strategic planning efforts to Sea Grant into these priorities and the timing has worked out. Kelly Samek has done an excellent job in moving that forward and we want to thank everyone for their engagement. We've shared the second draft of the National Sea Grant Strategic Plan with the Sea Grant network on September 6<sup>th</sup> and expect to finalize it in the coming month. Program Officers are working together on that both within NOAA and Sea Grant so I think we are in pretty good shape. The strategic plan has the basic focus areas but there are a lot of nuances there as well.

Looking Ahead (FY 2023): What are we doing in the National Office this year – We're working on the guidance for the next Board nominees packages and one of the things I think we will discuss later is the 40% report and how we weave that in. I appreciate what everybody put into that – the Board's leadership and I certainly will be accepting the core of that recommendation – what I'm doing right now which is preventing the document to go final is that there may be a couple of things that we have to work out timing wise with the omnibus cycle and when things will take effect relative to our next review cycle. But the core of the plan and providing the flexibility of 30-50% and all of the work surrounding

that there is no question that is the way we will go. We are working on our opportunities for developing our funding and NOFO plan for FY 2023, Updating partnership-related policies and procedures and using reporting information to complete our own various annual reporting requirements. One of the big priorities that the National Sea Grant Office is currently focused on is preparing for the transition from Grants Online to ERA in 2023. This is the way we enact and track all of the grants that we do – every year we’re well over 300 actions and in certain years we’ve moved close to 500 actions. Those are going to be changing to the new ERA system possibly this year if it doesn’t get delayed further. The ERA system will be linked to everything...financial and every other system to make that work -- so it is a big undertaking. We are also continuing to respond to the Board’s Independent Review Panel recommendations and suggestions (maybe with Partnerships, Organizational Structure and Communications as the three main elements for this year). Also, engaging in developing Sea Grant’s role in IJJA and IRA and tracking and engaging in conversations around the country on many hot topics such as wind/renewables, marine debris, Tribal engagement, DEIJA and resilience.

Inflation Act and Build Back Better - Congress used what’s in these acts, but didn’t call Sea Grant out specifically. There are inundation, extension and other aspects in the draft language that fits Sea Grant. For example, resilience and climate although guidance has not been provided yet. Could be a quick turnaround when we do receive it. \$2.6B/\$3.6B to NOAA is in the resilience language so that’s where we will focus. Hopefully, we will hear something this week.

Dr. Betzer – What’s the reason for the fire drill?

Dr. Pennock - Aligning administration and Congressional priorities - we have to follow the Congressional priorities. We hope that Congress see’s Sea Grant as one who will be able to be part of the solutions, but it’s a process that occurs at a very high level and we often don’t hear until the very last minute.

*FY 2023 Budgets:* The Presidential budget came in very high for FY22. What’s proposed for FY 2023 would be a significant increase for Sea Grant but these numbers (in slides) are likely higher than what will become the actual amount. However, we are relatively confident that the budget will not decrease.

*FY 2023 Expected Opportunities:* Young Fishermen’s and Aquaculturists Career Development (opening Sept 2022) - Support for workshops and conferences (opening Sept 2022) - Knauss Fellowship (opening Fall 2022) - NMFS-SG Fellowship Program - Aquaculture (2nd supplemental deadline if didn’t submit in FY22 and other opportunities TBD) - Other potential partner-based opportunities - Looking at House and Senate marks, these may be included: Lobster, Highly Migratory Species, Contaminants of Emerging Concern and Resilience.

We’re currently implementing our short two year (2022-23) omnibus and that’s part of the 2018-2023 process. The program evaluations will include a 2018-2023 full cycle review. These program Site Review Teams (SRTs) will kick off planning and prep in 2024.

Information Services - The Board delivered a report and recommendations in 2021, the NSGO began working closely with University of Rhode Island (URI) and NOAA Library in 2021 to transition the Sea Grant Archive to NOAA. In January 2022 we launched Sea Grant Collection at NOAA and in May of 2022 the NSGO Publications Coordinator started, and February 2023 is when the URI grant ends.

Independent Review Panel (IRP) - in addressing the Board recommendations, we plan to try and focus on three things, organizational structure and excellence within our office, partnership framework and

communications assessment and update – this is something that we’re doing on a normal basis especially with the network and a big focus of the IRP. I’d say those are three of the five major recommendations and we will try to get through three of them this year. So I think the IRP was tremendously helpful for us and we’re working on responding and helping it to make us better.

Competitive research policy or the 40% Committee which I mentioned earlier – the Board report recommendation of the 30-50% policy is good and we have to look and see how we will integrate that into our new policy and the guidance we give out. Any questions? Dr. Pennock then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Stirling (Board Chair).

Ms. Stirling – Any questions for Jon Pennock or has everyone had their questions answered?

Dr. Betzer – One of the things that came up yesterday in one of the SGA meetings is that they were having problems – they had good ideas for partnerships with different State programs – but the problem is the institutions were saying no you can’t do it because of the rules of the Board. At a higher level you’re doing some wonderful things and they’re trying to emulate this at a lower level with different Sea Grant programs and apparently they’re having problems.

Dr. Pennock – There may be things when they’re trying to work on their own partnerships and then if it’s from a Federal entity we end up getting involved basically to move the money for them that’s one of the problems.

Dr. Garber - Based on the conversation yesterday it was more ERP competitions that some programs wanted partnerships – so the principal investigator may only be 15% for Puerto Rico and 50% at another University and some Universities can’t take them so they have to move to other Universities regarding ERP – 50% on other Universities so when they do move I think that’s where the problem comes in because now it’s a question of how do we do that.

Dr. Gibson – Quick question because I’m new. Can you briefly explain a little about the Young Fisherman’s Program – it seems kind of interesting so I’m just curious.

Dr. Pennock – This was an effort that went through Congress for several years that didn’t make it all the way through. It was led by representative John Young (AK) when he was still living, but it was really to address the graying of the fleet and how we get young people into commercial fisheries. Then in 2020 they passed it. The Young Fishermen’s Development Act of 2020 authorized Sea Grant up to \$2M a year. That first year was already through the appropriations cycle so there was no new money provided last year. Congress said we’ll increase the budget but it wasn’t directed to spend money on this. So it’s really to increase the workforce development side of the commercial fisheries – we are actually trying to mesh that with aquaculture because 80% of the skills you need to know such as welding and other things you need in aquaculture and commercial fisheries. We’d be happy to talk with you more about that and Joshua Brown is leading that within our office as well.

Ms. Stirling – Jon can you talk a little more about transforming from Grants Online into ERA online and when that’s going to land from an ERA standpoint.

Dr. Garber – Not only is ERA changing but the entire budget system for NOAA is changing. It was supposed to all happen this Fall but that will change our whole Grants online to ERA which is supposed to happen October 1<sup>st</sup> of 2023 and then there will be this transition period. So as things move from

Grants Online into the ERA system, everyone will be on it. Right now as of October 1<sup>st</sup> it's already been bounced for one year so we shall see.

Ms. Stirling – Thanked everyone for their participation and announced that we will be taking a break and returning at 10:30am.

**10:07 – 10:30am – Break**

**10:30am – 12:00pm – Board Resilience and Social Justice Subcommittee Update and Membership Changes (Dr. Brian Helmuth, Board Member and Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair)**

Dr. Helmuth – In order to set the context for where the Subcommittee came from, in the 2020 “State of Sea Grant” Biennial Report to Congress, our recommendation was to amplify efforts to institutionalize social and environmental justice and diversity equity, and inclusion (DEI) in Sea Grant’s organizational structure and programming. Explicitly what that means is it recognizes all the ongoing fantastic work within the Sea Grant network. Over the last six years Sea Grant has developed a National Community of Practice across its programs that facilitate peer learning and promote leadership on justice, equity, diversity and inclusion. What is different about this recommendation, and I think it's important to point out because it really drives what we're focusing on with the Subcommittee is that the recommendation was that this effort should be pursued until justice, equity, diversity and inclusion move beyond being a separate priority and practice, but instead are integrated at all of the practices. So this really sets it apart from Aquaculture where a program can choose to be part of this effort or not, and it emphasizes that resilience without social justice is not resilience. And I think that's what we'll go through today. We'll talk a lot about what the Subcommittee has learned and how it's evolved. As you'll hear some of this from Ms. Stirling, this has been very much a network wide effort where we have representation from the National Office, the Board, the Sea Grant Association and from the Sea Grant Network. We all have contributed equally to this. It is unusual in that it's a self-driven Subcommittee that the Charge originated from within the Board itself rather than from the National Office. But it is a collaborative effort that is continuing to evolve.

Ms. Stirling – The charge as we saw it based on the information coming to us from the White House, as well as coming from the programs are as follows: (1) Explore the critical but often neglected role of social justice (social and racial equity) in developing and implementing resilience strategies, (2) Characterize the broad landscape and intersections among resilience and DEI, specifically with regard to social, economic, environmental and racial justice that are inseparable components of resilience and resilience planning, (3) Identify the specific and possibly unique issues that economically and socially challenged communities face with regard to coastal hazards environmental degradation and the effects of global climate change, (4) Identify ways and means through which the National Sea Grant College program can address these specific issues, and thereby ensure that social justice is integral to its resilience efforts, and (5) Guarantee that all segments of coastal communities prosper and are resilient and that breaks down from our initial assessment the following ways: (a) Assess the current state of Sea Grant efforts to integrate social justice into resilience programs, (b) Develop strategies for ensuring that social justice is included in resilience efforts, (c) Create and adopt measures or metrics that explicitly include aspects of social justice as an essential component in building coast Community and Environmental resilience, and (d) Identify and collate best practices, literature and case studies to help inform the optimization of activities addressing this critical and rapidly evolving area. At this point, I'm going to kick it back to Dr. Helmuth who's going to review what we find is a relatively compelling



contribution that Dr. Sam Chan made who sits on our Board Subcommittee from one of our Sea Grant programs. Then Dr. Helmuth will cycle through several case studies.

Dr. Helmuth -We are continually learning and the subcommittee is evolving, and part of that may be that this probably should have been the title of the Subcommittee's Equitable Resilience because I think this quote that Dr. Sam Chan found really captures it: ***“Equitable Resilience is increasingly likely when resilience practice accounts for issues of social vulnerability and differential access to power, knowledge, and resources; it requires starting from people's own perception of their position within their human-environmental system, and it accounts for their realities and for their need for a change of circumstance to avoid imbalances of power into the future”.***

So to avoid the risk of oversimplifying it, resilience simply doesn't mean shoving the problem downstream to other people who are vulnerable and don't have the resources to deal with it. That's not the way that resilience is often enacted, especially in the United States right now. And so this gets it at the core of what we really are hoping to do with this Subcommittee. I'm going to walk you through a case study that partly comes out of research we've done in my own lab group out of Boston, but I think it really drives home this point. One of the things we don't talk about often enough is the risk of extreme heat. It's been called the silent killer. It's actually the number one threat from natural disasters, it kills more people than hurricanes and tornadoes. I read a paper that documents that five million excess deaths per year are due to extremes in temperature historically that's mostly been to extremes and cold exposure but because of climate change that has shifted to extremes and high heat exposure, with projections getting exponentially worse over coming years. So that's already an estimated 9.4% of global deaths. Or another way to look at it is 74 extra deaths per 100,000 people due to extreme heat exposure. So like virtually everything else with climate change. Vulnerability varies among populations and people where if we think of vulnerability is the product of exposure risk, sensitivity to that exposure, and then adaptive capacity? We see a lot of heterogeneity across landscapes and exposure to heat. So one of the big culprits is what's called Urban Heat Island effects. I think many people have heard about these. This is what occurs when physical structures like buildings and paved surfaces absorb shortwave solar radiation. If you can imagine putting your hand on a parking lot on a hot sunny day. It can get much warmer than the surrounding air. We did a study a couple of weeks ago during a heatwave in Boston where the surface of the pavement was at 160 degrees Fahrenheit that reflected heat builds up within cities. Landscapes play this really crucial role in determining how people experience heat waves, and there's a lot of variability within cities in that exposure. One of the main drivers of this has been driven by funding from the NOAA Environmental Literacy Program in looking at the role of historic redlining. For those who don't know, redlining occurred in the 1930s during the Great Depression, where the Homeowners Loan Corporation put together these maps of what they perceived as risk to determine who would get loans and who wouldn't. The metrics that they used included explicitly racist aspects to them. Almost 100 years later, there's division in those areas designated into these four categories across the Boston landscape (map below). It looks at the amount of paved surface and differences in temperature across those landscapes. This is a study that one of my Grad Students did, using Citizen Scientists who drove around these communities. What we found is that there's an average difference between the A areas and B areas of two degrees C, and during heatwaves, it can be 10 degrees different so whereas 90 degrees in some of the areas that have low amounts of pavement that have high green space, it could be over 100 degrees in some of those areas that historically were designated in the 1930s

is hazardous because of those historical influences. History continues to play a role today in variability in people's exposure to extreme heat.

One of the possibly obvious solutions to this is to increase the amount of green space - these types of approaches have been used to inform things like replanting of trees in parks, increasing the amount of surface that can absorb heat and there are other solutions where you use white colored roofs to reflect some of that light back in the space. The problem is that often when that's implemented, it results in green gentrification, where you have investments in green infrastructure that beautify locations that lower that exposure risk, but that's immediately followed by raises in rent and in housing prices. And so the gentrification ends up shoving out the people whom the changes are supposed to benefit to begin with. And so the solutions involve co-development strategies with community leaders like rent control.

The core message here is that in order for it to be effective, it can't be top down. It has to be collaborative, it has to be done in conjunction with local communities. This is where Sea Grant shines and where we have the opportunity given our extension to work collaboratively with communities.

Based on some of the things we saw from our last site reviews, it does not always happen. There are instances where programs are working with developers to increase green space -- the green infrastructure without working hand in hand with at-risk communities to ensure gentrification does not occur. So these are some of the areas where there is still a lot of progress that can be made. But we think Sea Grant is in a really unique position to act as a Leader on this in ways we think will inform all of us.

Some solutions: South Carolina Sea Grant started a heat monitoring program similar to what I showed you in Boston, where they looked at areas with high green space and low green space. One of the issues in South Carolina is tall buildings blocking wind coming off of the estuaries. They used that to implement the Charleston Heat-Health Research Project. The consortium faculty are also working with staff and volunteers from a number of organizations, including the Charleston Housing Authority to come up with solutions that benefit everyone equitably. This is a great example of what programs should implement.

What we're finding in the course of our discussion is that there's an awful lot of really good work being done across the Sea Grant network but there are some programs that are not there yet and need help in getting up to speed on how to do this. So, while we're talking about metrics, largely we're talking about learning together, about how we do this in a way that supports each other to get the entire network up to speed and builds on the successes like this one from South Carolina Sea Grant. If we build a giant seawall, we're simply shoving the problem downstream to other areas, or vulnerable stakeholders which we see all the time. Redlining plays a role in this, but we can think of this in many other contexts.

Ms. Stirling – We've been meeting for about 18 months now and have gotten an extraordinary amount of information from a wide variety of sources and lots of input from every element in the system, so I think we're on track.

The subcommittee has come up with the following preliminary recommendations:

- (1) Formalized the Sea Grant DEIJA community of practice and make sure their guidance is incorporated into the National Sea Grant Advisory Board, the National Sea Grant office and the Sea Grant network planning;

- (2) To provide Sea Grant Programs clear direction and resources to assess where they are and where they need to make shifts in their program to integrate social justice into resilience efforts;
- (3) Provide guidance on metrics and how they might be applied for this specific work;
- (4) Require program annual reporting towards incorporating DEIJ in resiliency efforts; and
- (5) Require an annual review by the National Sea Grant Advisory Board of reported progress.

We set up several small groups in our Subcommittee to consider various approaches.

*Program Performance Measures*

*Policy Performance Measures*

*Functional Performance Measures*

*Agency Performance Measures*

The White House put out several Executive Orders when President Biden came into office regarding setting up metrics for this type of effort. One of the things that actually incentivized us to set up the Subcommittee was to get ahead of the metrics coming from the top down. We already had a DEIJA community of practice among the Sea Grant programs and there were specific programs making very specific progress in some of these areas and others that were just getting around to addressing it. We knew there were likely to be useful, best practices from some of these programs and other considerations because there were groups out there that have been thinking about this much longer than we have. We wanted to figure out a way to bring that up from the bottom and incorporate it into any thinking about measures and metrics rather than having some quantitative thing come down from up top that may or may not be useful in terms of actually providing the results.

Our first goal was to (1) Reform how Fellowships are run to improve diversity, (2) Increase in the number of underserved students, fellows and others working on resilience, (3) Increase in the number of communities served and/or level of services provided to them.

*Goal 1: Shift in Hiring Practices:* Develop hiring practices that promote workforce diversity and community resilience efforts; consider residency of candidates and communities of focus and include local community leaders in hiring.

*Goal 2: DEI Training:* Enhance literacy in DEI as a prerequisite for community resilience.

*Goal 3: Document efforts and learning to become equitable and to reach communities previously not reached:* Co-develop resilience plans with local communities, especially those previously not reached.

*Agency Performance Measures:*

*Goal 1:* Increase resilience of communities by making internships and fellowships more inclusive and diverse and by ensuring that resilience targets are informed by the communities served.

*Goal 2:* Increase resilience of economically and socially challenged communities by co-creating resilience plans and targets with community participants.

*Goal 3:* Build and sustain community resilience efforts by creating a positive work environment for all employees.

*Goal 4:* Transform the agency so that fairness and equity are principles embedded in its community resilience practices and projects.

*Goal 5:* Provide adequate funding to support inclusion and climate resiliency projects and programs.

*Goal 6:* Drive the goal of enhancing community resilience by including guidance and specific Language in the Sea Grant Omnibus document to encourage projects that consider DEI.

Ms. Stirling – Opened the floor for questions and comments.

Ms. Norosz – I was really looking forward to this discussion. Two things - so much has jumped out at me and I really appreciate the work that's been done. I feel like one of the hardest things to do is the metrics to measure progress. One of the things that I saw on a number of slides -- I can't stress the importance of including the community members in all of this work. I have seen this happen so many times in Alaska, where tribal members are excluded or thought of at the last minute or aren't acknowledged for their traditional knowledge of generations of living in the same space. And I'm sure that's true of many places outside of Alaska and in the United States and our territories. Another point I feel really strongly about is hiring practices - I think it's been in some of the organizations I've been involved with, it's been really hard to figure out where and how to advertise those jobs. So the idea of coming up with best practices is crucial.

Ms. Stirling - This is not a conclusion of this effort by any stretch of the imagination. And we recognize that there's a lot of material to consider here and we may not get through all of it today. We have to hear from the SGA group tomorrow and I can assure you that will also be a process and not inclusionary. We have a discussion period and we have people moving among the various flip charts responding to the questions that are being raised and then we have to take that information into consideration and make it available to everybody for input. This is just the front end of this process, so we're not going to push anything through at this point, it's just too preliminary at this point.

Dr. Helmuth – Ms. Norosz, I agree 100% with everything you've said. And on your point of hiring practices, we've been discussing, for example, going beyond just where you advertise, but what language you use, what skills you look at and who's on the Committee, so all great points that we agree with completely.

Ms. Stirling - We've incorporated some of those in our discussion materials. This is the first look that the Board has had as far as where we're coming from on the preliminary discussions – so this process will continue.

Dr. Engle - I'm very glad to hear the discussion that this needs to be a long term effort because we're really dealing with a very complex issue. My background is in Social Science and while I focused on economics recently, the very early 10 years of my career was on social change in the context of Latin America. So just a little bit of context of where I'm coming from. I read a great deal about social change, and a lot of Latin American authors, so I do think there's one thing missing in the discussion. But I want to preface this with something about the United States that's bothered me over the last year. I've been

doing a series of studies on US Aquaculture – this is very specific to aquaculture. That's a fairly small group, but I'm afraid that it extends beyond this group. New studies have been about regulatory costs and we've been interviewing aquaculture producers all across the United States and every sector we try to interview all of them. What I learned last year and this is during COVID. I interviewed quite a few aquaculture producers who are totally disconnected from the network of support services in the United States. Some of these are very small farms, some are not that small. I was really astonished - all of the individuals who I talked with haven't even heard that they were eligible for Cares Act funding. And I was the one doing a study on regulatory costs in their farms and yet I was the one who had to put them in touch with their FSA to apply for Cares Act Two, they totally missed out on the funding from the Cares Act. All of these producers are in a place where there's a strong Sea Grant Aquaculture Extension effort. And there's also a strong land grant extension effort. Some of them had never heard from an extension agent- they're just disconnected from everybody. And some of these are substantial farmers that are very knowledgeable about lots of things, but they're just not connected. Whether they were Vietnamese, Filipino or Hispanic. When talking to other people about this, they just seemed perplexed. They said they're hard to talk to. There are groups of people that are not being served - but I think there are a lot more than we realize.

When you think about this discussion in the United States and Sea Grant and what needs to be done and then you think about how diverse this country really is. In every different way from resources to individuals to culture groups, and all kinds of things in this country. I suspect that there are a lot of these groups that nobody has made the effort to connect with. Integrating these groups is going to come down to an individual level which is what's missing in the slide deck. I think it comes back to individual extension agents and specialists and individual educators, that in order for them to be effective, they need to develop a trust and earn the trust and confidence of the individuals in these communities to the point where those individuals are willing to talk to them. In the highlands of Guatemala, I saw the same thing at University where I worked at an HBCU for 27 years, I saw the same mistrust of a marginalized group towards the people - it takes a very long time but it has to happen on an individual level. In order to get the input from these communities, to inform these programs, and to really pull it up then we need to really take advantage of this marvelous network that Sea Grant has of extension agents and educators and have encouraged them, to know who these communities are and where they are.

Does Sea Grant want to have a recommendation, that every Sea Grant Program really looks out at all the demographics to understand who, what and where? And then what is the plan among Sea Grant extension and educators who are so good at working one-on-one to make sure they invest the time and effort to go out and develop that personal relationship so they can bring the problems back from the ground up of these marginalized groups, and understand how it can help them.

My philosophy is to meet their needs, and then engage them in broader discussions of resilience planning and other things. I think that's what's missing. I saw on the one side to create diversity officers and do outreach and extension. I understand where that comes from -- I can see some value in that. But that's sort of separating diversity out into a separate box. Whereas what I think we need is for extension and educators to look at who are all of the different groups that we serve in our area and groups we've never heard from over here -- somebody has to invest a year or two of time to build that trust and confidence. I think the strength of the extension and education network really needs to be mobilized to make sure we're not missing anyone. Once I put those farmers in touch with their FSA office, all they had to do was call them and FSA was very happy to process their applications because

they were eligible. I think we need to think more about how Extension and Educators are engaged in this, and every Sea Grant program really knows all the different groups in their region and where they are, and have really reached out to them. And that, to me, is sort of a fundamental starting point that many programs could include in their strategic plans. And then think about how best and who best would be to go out and vote that year or two or three, to restore some confidence of the leaders in those communities and other people and really understand their core problems.

Ms. Stirling – Dr. Engle thanks so much for that information. Since you have been studying some of these communities, are you going to be publishing a paper or can you make that information available to our Sea Grant system so that the extension agents can reach out? Or can we pass this on in some manner that would be useful – protective of those communities of interest?

Dr. Engle – We're publishing all of these studies and these individuals only participated in the study but we don't identify any individual farms. We signed a very straight, confidential business information and agreement because they do provide farm financial information. The study was about measuring regulatory costs on aquaculture farms and those papers are coming out.

Ms. Stirling – I understand and we do not want to create any problems with those communities. If you could just provide us with the States would be a valid starting point.

Dr. Helmuth - Dr. Engle, thanks so much for that. I completely agree with everything you said. I think a lot of your points are implicit in what we were trying to get across. And it sounds like we need to make them more explicit. One of the goals that flew by was generating that baseline information on communities that we missed and establishing that trust 100% agreed. One thing you said at the beginning that I don't think we have in this Committee that we should make sure we include is that focus on financing because beyond aquaculture means that is an issue in so many ways. And there are organizations like Nature Conservancy, for example, that are looking at how do you not only facilitate access to federal grants, but also how do you facilitate access to loans? How do you get that financing and it isn't a quick fix – it's much more of a long term effort. I think that's one thing we have not explicitly discussed - all your other points are well taken and I completely agree.

Dr. Murray - Dr. Engle, I also agree with everything you said. It relates to a couple of things in the slides of the report. One is the incentive of doing this work. I don't think there's any wish to ignore those communities but it's easier to work with other communities who support you. We have to turn that around and incentivize extension agents to get out and want to do the extra effort. And second, what I really like in this report is the hiring aspects. My opinion there's no sort of malfeasance that we don't go to those communities but it's in part because there are cultural differences that we often don't think about when we're hiring. If you want to hire someone to do extension work in a Native American community you'd hire a Native American from that community who has that trust built in that you were talking about.

Dr. Gibson – I totally agree with what Dr. Engle was saying and know it's true – in addition to hiring people that can communicate, extension and those in the Sea Grant offices really need to think about cultural competency because you don't want to have more impact over this thinking we can't communicate with them so we just don't worry about it. Even if you're not even thinking about reaching out to other communities I think it's a shame that this is what's happening. So not just hiring a person to communicate with these marginalized communities, but that the thinking of hiring from these different

offices should be going through some cultural competency training so that these issues are important to them, not just one person. Brian mentioned redlining in the 1930's and that's something we are seeing the effects of today and something we will see and feel for generations to come.

Ms. Stirling – We are still on the front end of this discussion and the development of our recommendations. We will be looking to all of you to continue to look at the slide presentation that was presented and the information included in it – please submit your thoughts, questions and observations which would be very helpful. We have until September 23<sup>rd</sup> at close of business which is a Friday which gives everyone sufficient time to get their information to us and that will also give us time to amalgamate the information we get from the Sea Grant Association meeting tomorrow which will enable us to have a discussion and provide this information to our Environmental Justice Subcommittee which will be meeting the following Monday afternoon.

**12:00pm – 1:30pm – Lunch Break**

**1:30pm – 3:00pm – Strategic Discussion for National Sea Grant College Program (Ms. Deb Stirling, Board Chair, Dr. Jonathan Pennock, Director, National Sea Grant College Program and Dr. Peter Betzer, Board Member)**

Ms. Stirling – Welcomes everyone back to the meeting. If you have any questions, thoughts or observations from anything we've discussed yesterday or earlier today, this is the time to get them on the table. After that, we will follow up with any questions or observations or commentary you may have from Dr. Pennock's presentation this morning. Thereafter, we will go to the Guam Institutional Status Update which Dr. Betzer will be presenting – we will then have a strategic discussion regarding how one can position themselves and Sea Grant to work with US territories in the Western Pacific. And, we'll have a 30/minute break and have more time to talk with Dr. Pennock and whatever is remaining from the earlier observations and discussions on the 40% Committee business. Let's start with anything remaining from previous day's discussions or any comments or questions from earlier today? *No questions.* Ms. Stirling then moved on to the Guam discussion and turned the meeting over to Dr. Betzer to provide an overview of his travel to Guam to attend the Sea Grant Institutional Status celebration for the University of Guam.

Dr. Pennock – Asked all those who were in attendance that were visiting from the University of Guam to introduce themselves.

Dr. Austin Shelton – Hello everyone, I'm Austin Shelton, Director of University of Guam Sea Grant. Thanks to the Committee of the Advisory Board that gave us a comprehensive two week review back in October, we really appreciate all of your support and the National Offices support and approval of our Sea Grant Institutional status. Today, we have seven of our team members from the University of Guam here in Ohio. Our leadership team is here in the room with us – Fran Castro, Associate Director and Kyle Mandapat our Assistant Director for Communications. Thanks for having us today.

Dr. Betzer – Gave an overview and slide presentation of his trip to the University of Guam in celebration of their new institutional status. Institutional Review Initiated (October 2021). Celebrating Elevation to Institutional Status (August 2022). GUAM Senate and how they do budget; the people I've run into really knew and appreciated Guam Sea Grant.

Dr. Pennock – It was all hands on deck within the group and think it's important to note the effort and obviously Peter highlighted what everybody appreciated so much in the last year and the tremendous growth that the program has had since they started a number of years ago, but certainly where they've come to with institutional status and I think they're well on their way to go beyond that. Congratulations again Austin. I hope to navigate into a discussion not so much about the Guam review, but about what opportunities we may have in the Pacific or the Caribbean. When Guam Sea Grant started off, Hawaii Sea Grant was a mentor program to Guam. That's a model that has been important to Sea Grant over the years. Dr. Lerner thanks for your presence, you played such an important role in helping to get things started – obviously Guam is up and standing on their own.

One part of the trip that Peter didn't participate in and that Austin and Darren helped to set up was a visit to the Northern Marianas Islands and specifically the college. I would like to invite the President of the Northern Marianas College Galvin Deleon to say a couple of words. We had a tremendous visit just for a day – Galvin welcome to the meeting and please introduce yourself and then I'll follow up with a couple more words.

***Galvin Deleon Guerrero, EdD - Office of the President, Northern Marianas College*** - For a little bit of context Northern Marianas is a Commonwealth United States similar to Puerto Rico and as I shared this morning with the Sea Grant Association we're a chain of Islands – 14 Islands that run parallel to the Marianas Trench, our total land square mileage is 84 square miles, but the actual oceans massive the Marianas is 68,000 miles. But when you look at the US economic zone we actually covered 750,000 miles. While our Island may be small the potential is huge and our commitment runs as deep as the Marianas Trench. We are very excited to begin this conversation following the great wake up by Dr. Shelton and the University of Guam, and we're just as excited to begin this discussion about expanding Sea Grant opportunities.

Dr. Pennock – Thanks Galvin. What I would like to do today is open up a discussion around what could and should we potentially do to have a bigger impact in particular the U.S. territory where we already have authorization and how we might do that to address issues that are critical today. And Northern Marianas colleges and leadership is asking that question, but there are others who could legitimately ask that question for why Sea Grant had extension presence in the Marshall Islands and Samoa over the years we've had some good discussions. It's pretty clear to me that in order to be really successful ultimately we need to have to be able to generate a homegrown presence on the different Islands. How might we be able to move forward in a way that expands our ability to do good work the way Sea Grant does in different communities at least in the aquaculture space, so how might we look at that space. I'm just looking for a discussion with all of you and the time is appropriate. I would like to open the floor to a wide ranging discussion.

Ms. Gray – After what we went through several years ago with trying to redistribute or create equity and distribution of funds (new money), I think there's a real opportunity here. We have money that comes in through other avenues at least to get it started – and then it grows from Sea Grant. I think there's ways we can be really creative here and glue together enough money to get started.

Ms. Stirling – I'm watching the Defense Subcommittee and appropriations very closely because we've got so much money going to the Ukraine that I think there's going to be a lot of pressure on the Defense budget when they get around finally doing 2023. But that's short-term. This needs to be a long term initiative.



Dr. Engle – There’s a lot to think about and there’s been some interesting thoughts that have been put on the table. Not sure of the best way to proceed or the kind of lay-out as to what options we might pursue. A lot of things that has to be considered – not sure what direction the Board may want to go in order to do that. Another Ad-Hoc Committee in order to have follow-up conversations to explore different options of what might be possible not just in this case but a little bit broader as well as other groups that have similar thoughts as well.

Ms. Norosz – I concur with Carole’s comments – I think it warrants further discussions.

Dr. Gibson – I’m coming for a more personal perspective – Virginia Sea Grant had a meeting a couple of years ago (just an information session) on how to become a Sea Grant Institution. One major issue was the amount it cost for the University to become a Sea Grant Institution because Hampton University is not a Sea Grant Institution. We could never initiate funding proposals – we have to partner up to get that funding. We’re an HBCU, our campus is right on the water and we never get these opportunities, if there’s a Subcommittee I would love to be a part of that.

Ms. Stirling – We will now take a break until 3:30 in order to further this discussion.

**3:00pm – 3:30pm – Break**

**3:30pm – 4:50pm – Strategic Discussion for National Sea Grant College Program (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair and Dr. Jonathan Pennock, Director, National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP))**

Ms. Stirling – Welcome back. Dr. Pennock will now address his thoughts on the 40% report and once we’ve worked through that we’ll deal with any issues/thoughts or questions you might have regarding his observations that we can revisit if needed.

Dr. Pennock – I fully support the 30-50% recommendation. What I’m trying to figure out and wouldn’t mind input from the Committee members and others in the implementation. When does it take place? Do we take the 40% part of what we do and not implement the 30-50% over the next four years or are we willing to be more flexible now. The reality is we have a more flexible policy so the decision to make is do we take the 40% part of what we do or are we willing to be more flexible?

Ms. Stirling – Just a few reflections on one of the Committee’s discussions – we punted on the implementation – the Committee went back and forth and the discussion and inevitably we decided that we were not going to focus on the implementation but on the implementation process. Different set of complexities involved in implementing it. The other aspect is we heard repeatedly from different Director’s concerns that it would be imposed very quickly in some immediate time frame and would pose a lot of problems because of what they’ve been doing. In terms of implementation we left it up to the National Office to work with them and develop plans to do that over a period of time.

Ms. Norosz – Carole I think you did a good job – Jonathan I can understand the difficulties in changing horses in midstream and I don’t have any good ideas for that. Think it would be really awkward to judge them for part of the review period under one scenario and a different scenario for the latter part of it. If we’re going to give them flexibility we probably wouldn’t want to implement that until after the review.

Dr. Pennock – This really comes down to the diversity of the programs. The bottom line is just showing that you are working in a way consistent with the three lanes involved – research, extension and education.

Dr. Engle – There was a lot of uncertainty about how this was being measured and needed clarity in the guidance from the National Office about what is going to happen and what isn't moving forward. With that flexibility built in it may or may not hurt to get a little more feedback from the Director's as well.

Dr. Murray – I'm fine with the flexibility – there's a chance to remind the network this is a new policy coming up. I would recommend clear guidance to the site review teams because that's where the problem came up. Program Officers and Advisory Board Chairs add a paragraph of what is happening because that's where the problems came in – here's where the policy now stands – different teams prior to their priorities of research felt differently and that's what we want to avoid.

Dr. Pennock – That was very helpful.

Ms. Stirling - Anything else you want to bring up?

Dr. Pennock - I think that is something we should think about – I personally get challenged when there is a non-MSI – it would have to be a true equal partnership – questions we need to sort out.

Ms. Holmes - Our policy and process and where the Board gives that advice – what our internal guidance is then asking the Board what they need to do leading up to that point.

Dr. Murray - The programs might be eligible – hesitant to get into more than one Sea Grant program in a State – not administratively.

Ms. Stirling - I was wondering about the prospect of putting together a consortium and appears as a minority served institutions and creating a consortium out of that – complicated political implication out of that – over the years things have worked pretty smoothly – they've pulled a lot of people in on the Advisory Board and engaged a lot of people.

Dr. Pennock - We already have a consortium. I don't want to cut people off.

Ms. Stirling - There are individual relationships....a lot of cross-utilization. I don't have all the details on how the consortium works.....operate as adults and actually work things out. Looking for other operative mechanisms that might enable more participation without taking away as a whole – the whole pot of money.

Dr. Murray - Some consortium organized at the Sea Grant level – North Carolina State there are five institutions that does marine work – Vice President of the University Sea Grant level – HBCU State.

Ms. Lacy Alison – I'm the Virginia Sea Grant, Maryland, North Carolina and Georgia Program Officer at the NSGO but I don't actually have a definitive answer. This topic has come up with programs wanting their institutions that they are in consortium with or other institutions to be able to apply for funds. Some of our funding announcements specify that the applicants must be Sea Grant programs. But there are other funding opportunities that come through that have a lot more flexibility. I think the reason that the answer isn't cut and dry is because there are all those nuances. Some of it sounds like a National Office restriction depending on the funding source and then there are also rules within each Sea Grant Program or their consortium about who can apply for funds and who can be a partner. I think being a partner is definitely much more flexible than being a direct applicant.

Dr. Pennock – The other question I have that’s potentially board worthy is reviewing the Bridge Program which is their educational program that has been hosted for years by Virginia Sea Grant – would like to discuss further when time permits.

Ms. Gray – PIER and Grants Online migrating to ERA – Make sure PIER is fully operational because we’re critically dependent on that also for Site Reviews. Am I correct that we are now doing site review every six years?

Dr. Pennock - No – we have one six year review because we added the two additional years onto one 4 year cycle and we’re returning to a 4 year cycle for the next cycle.

Ms. Gray – That means that every four years the Board is now going to be required to do a complete quadrennial review of the State of the Sea Grant Report, the same year we are doing site reviews. I was in charge of previous Biennial Reports and the level of effort it requires takes away from those people being available for site reviews and we have Sea Grant Association members on that. Not sustainable to have both things every four years. Wanted to get the Board’s thinking on that. Not sure if we can flip it earlier whenever we’re getting ready for site reviews – write the report in the Fall of 2023 and release it in Spring of 2024. Alert the Board of the potential workforce limitation.

Ms. Stirling - Great observation.

Dr. Pennock – I also had not processed that and we will get that off cycle. We do four because that’s the Omnibus cycle – but we can figure that out. Thanks for bringing this to my attention. Ms. Holmes is on it.

Dr. Pennock then welcomed Korea Sea Grant to the meeting and asked if they would introduce themselves.

*Korea Sea Grant Staff:* Jungsoo Han, MOF of Korea ([water04@Korea.kr](mailto:water04@Korea.kr)), B G Lee, Jesu Sea Grant, South Korea ([leebg@Jesumu.ac.kr](mailto:leebg@Jesumu.ac.kr)) and HeeJu Kim, KIMST of Korea ([kh54285@kimst.re.kr](mailto:kh54285@kimst.re.kr)).

**4:30pm – 5:00pm – Wrap Up (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair)**

Ms. Stirling – Important Dates: Two year “State of Sea Grant” interim report to Congress editing should be completed next week. Due date for the Resilience and Environmental Justice comments and observations is September 23<sup>rd</sup> so we can start the digestion process the following Monday at our Environmental Justice, Resilience and Social Justice meeting. We will also have a compilation of our feedback from the Sea Grant Association presentation. Sunday, February 26<sup>th</sup> and Monday, February 27<sup>th</sup> is our Spring Board Meeting in Washington, D.C. and the Sea Grant Association Meeting (SGA) is on Tuesday and Wednesday (February 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>). Hill visits may be virtual and some in-person depending on security issues and where we all are with Covid health closures/openings.

**Meeting adjourned 4:45pm**