

Action Items

- **The SGA and Panel are to submit comments to the OAR Review Team by December 1. Send comments to Dr. Moore, a copy to Dr. Rosen.**
- **Dr. Schuler is to send a copy of the CD in the California PAT briefing book to Panel members as requested.**
- **Mr. Stephan is to write a letter to John Rayfield, House Committee on Resources, expressing the SGRP's thanks for his significant contributions to the Sea Grant Program.**
- **Dr. Bell is to write a letter to Dr. Baird recommending that Maine Sea Grant become a Sea Grant College Program.**
- **Dr. Bell is to send a list of action items from the NMFS/SGA meeting in Seattle to other Panel members.**
- **Dr. Baird is to give SGRP` Chair a formal charge regarding forming two task groups to study strategic issues and NSIs.**
- **Dr. Woeste is to explore whether Panel members who are stakeholders should testify at PATs. He should develop a statement regarding this issue so that a decision can be reached before the next round of PATs.**
- **Dr. Schubel is to make a brief summary of the NRC, Byrne, Duce, Toll, and Inspector General reports to give to VADM Lautenbacher by January 15.**
- **Dr. Schuler is to send Panel members the SAB charge to conduct a review of NOAA Research.**

**Sea Grant Review Panel Minutes
Washington, DC
November 12-13, 2003**

Panel Members Present: James Arrington, Peter Bell (Chair), Robert Duce, Elbert Friday, Ross Heath, Manuel Hernandez-Avila, Geraldine Knatz, John Knauss, Frank Kudrna, Nathaniel Robinson, Jerry Schubel (Chair Elect), Jeffrey Stephan, Judith Weis, John Woeste

Panel Member Absent: Robin Alden

Ex-Officio Panel Members: (NSGO) Ronald Baird; Francis Schuler (designated Federal official); (SGA) Robert Stickney

NSGO Staff: Megan Agy, Emory Anderson, Susan Borda, Leon Cammen, Madeline Carter, Elizabeth Day, Jonathan Eigen, Kola Garber, Sami Grimes, Ed Hurley, Jamie Krauk, Jim Murray

Other Attendees:

OAR: Richard Rosen

SGA: Jennifer Greenamoyer

Opening Remarks (Dr. Bell)

- Since the last meeting, much has happened within Sea Grant, NOAA, the political world, and the Sea Grant Review Panel's (SGRP) Executive Committee and subcommittees
- Possible changes within the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR)

Proposed OAR Changes (Dr. Baird)

- In the OAR 2004 appropriation, Congress requested the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to submit a plan:
 - outlining the costs and alternatives of consolidating OAR laboratories
 - reassigning some of OAR's climate and ocean assets
- The Administration has convened a Research Review Team, chaired by Berrien Moore to:
 - review OAR research structure
 - develop a reorganization plan due December 15, 2003
 - **Sea Grant Association (SGA) and Panel are invited to submit comments to the Review Team by December 1. Send comments to Dr. Moore, a copy to Dr. Rosen.**
 - The Review Team has heard testimony from:
 - Dr. Baird
 - OAR
 - line offices (LOs)

SGA and SGRP comments to Review Team (Dr. Bell)

- At the recent SGA meeting, a group was formed to draft a letter to the OAR Review Team
- That letter may recommend that the NSGO Director report higher within NOAA
- Dr. Bell appointed Dr. Kudrna to lead a Panel committee to write a letter to OAR Review Team emphasizing:
 - Sea Grant Congressional support
 - Sea Grant's ability to play a cross-cutting role within NOAA
- Other committee members include Ms. Greenamoyer (SGA), Ms. Krauk (NSGO), and Dr. Stickney (SGA) who left the meeting to write the letter
- SGA and Panel letters will have an impact only if both organizations are in agreement
- Two separate letters could be sent or a joint one with a co-signed transmittal letter

Panel Business (Dr. Schuler)

- Dr. Schuler distributed the 2004 PAT (Program Assessment Team) assignment schedule
- Dates of April 5, for travel, and April 6 and 7 to hold next SGRP meeting were approved

NSGO Update (Dr. Baird)

National Research Council (NRC) Study

- Reauthorization legislation requires a study by the Ocean Studies Board (OSB) to look at the new PAT and NSGO evaluation procedures
- The last OSB study of Sea Grant was in 1994
- Dr. Baird has asked OSB to look at the program a decade later in conjunction with studying the evaluation system
- A number of recommendations from the 1994 study have been implemented
- Members of the OSB have been invited to observe a PAT and be present during the grading

Discussion

- A joint Marine Board and OSB study might be good
- Such a study would be very expensive

Second Set of PATS

- Programs are performing highly, grades are up
- Programs are showing signs of improvement, especially the lower rated
- No new trend in grading has been identified
- The equivalent in the new system of the old rating of "good" is becoming obsolete
- Briefing book quality has improved
- Variance seen in strategic planning and management
- Metrics being compiled to demonstrate how Sea Grant is contributing to the national interest
- Not enough time provided for PATs to grade and meet
- New bonus system will be used along with merit pay to reward programs
- Unlikely NSGO will have many funds to put into the bonus system at this time

Roundtable – SGRP Experience on 2003 PATs (Dr. Bell)

PAT Debriefings related to the PAT process, visit, and PAT structure were discussed by the indicated Panel members as follows:

MIT May 6 – Dr. Heath and Mr. Stephan

Mississippi - Alabama May 19 – Drs. Kudrna and Arrington

Rhode Island June 2 – Drs. Friday and Bell

Hawaii August 4 – Drs. Duce, Weis, and Schubel

North Carolina September 7 – Drs. Bell and Hernandez

Minnesota Sept. 15 – Drs. Schubel and Knauss

University of Southern California (USC) September 22 – Mr. Robinson and Dr. Woeste

California October 6 – Ms. Alden and Dr. Bell

Recommendations (Dr. Bell)

- PAT rating system might need changes, particularly the category of “needs improvement in administration of the program” – proposed changing language to “major improvements”
 - administration at the University of California is having problems, not CA Sea Grant
 - key is in how the PAT report is written to reflect why the grade is bad
 - university administration and provost are aware of where the PAT’s dissatisfaction lies
 - the institution has an opportunity to reply
- Always plan enough time for the executive committee to meet and write
- If pressed for time, exclude field trips and social events
- Programs need more specific requirements concerning strategic plans
- Listing of metrics defined by Panel’s metric committee would be useful
- Mr. Robinson made a motion that:
 - “The final draft of the PAT report should be shared with the Sea Grant director for the sole purpose of correcting misstatement or misinterpretation of material facts.”
- Motion was seconded and passed by the Panel

Best Management Practices (BMPs)

- California Sea Grant’s briefing book and CD could serve as a model for other programs
- **Dr. Schuler was asked to send a copy of the CD to Panel members as requested**

Report by the Panel Committee on Letter to be Sent to OAR Review Team (Dr. Kudrna)

- The letter should contain:
 - An introduction citing how Sea Grant supports the Administration's goals in reorganization
 - Information that the Sea Grant program clearly has Congressional support
 - Recommendations about where Sea Grant should reside in NOAA:
 - should report at a high NOAA level
 - should be separate from NOAA regulatory functions
 - NOAA's "wet" activities should be consolidated
 - cite the Duce and Byrne reports, made as attachments
 - highlight extension activities
 - This letter could be a joint letter with the SGA with a joint transmittal letter or could take the form of two separate letters from both the Panel and the SGA

Break for Lunch

Dr. Richard Rosen Assistant Administrator (AA), OAR

- Has been in his position as AA of OAR for one month
- Has worked with NOAA scientists for the last three decades
- Comes to NOAA from the "dry" side
- OAR laboratories on the "wet" side are not interacting with universities
- Sea Grant is a great resource for NOAA
- NOAA is trying to reach out on regional levels, which Sea Grant has done for 30 years
- One push in NOAA's new matrix system is in education and outreach – an opportunity for Sea Grant to better merge with NOAA
- Language in the House and Senate appropriation committees reports spoke directly to OAR:
 - House wanted a laboratory consolidation plan
 - Senate wanted a cost/benefit plan of breaking up OAR into other LOs
 - charged NOAA Science Advisory Board (SAB) to form *Ad Hoc* Working Group to review NOAA Research
- NOAA Research Review Team members are:
 - Berrien Moore III (chair)
 - Warren Washington
 - Richard Rosen
 - Richard Spinrad
 - Richard West
- Charge to the Review Team is to explain whether OAR:
 - provides effective support and vision to NOAA
 - is adequately linked to NOAA's service organizations
 - management structure and processes compare to other research agencies
 - consolidation of research laboratories would yield a more effective scientific program
 - laboratory consolidation would provide a more efficient structure

- The Research Review Team is to deliver its report to the SAB by December 15
 - SAB will consider the draft report and deliver it to NOAA in January
 - report will go to the Department of Commerce (DOC) in March
- To date the Research Review Team:
 - meets weekly via teleconference
 - met with VADM Lautenbacher to get his views
 - met with laboratory and program directors
 - is scheduling meetings with other interested parties, perhaps SGRP in December
- Observations by the OAR Review Team:
 - NOAA's research mission has a lack of clarity and plan
 - NOAA should agree on a definition of research
 - Many voices are speaking about NOAA Research, should there be a research czar
- Mechanism for NOAA research results going to operational offices is missing
- OAR Review Team is concerned about interviewing all the players and meeting deadlines

Discussion

- A formal response letter from the Panel would be helpful
- Review Team would also like to speak to the Panel chair directly
- Contact with Hill staffers about genesis of this criticism has not been made but needs to be
- NOAA needs a process to develop research priorities
- Administration is trying to address that problem through the matrix system
- OAR Review Team will be aware of Pew and Ocean Commission Report recommendations

Opening of the Meeting (Dr. Bell)

- Dr. Knatz made a motion to approve the minutes from the April Panel meeting, the motion was seconded and carried unanimously by the Panel
- Action items from the last meeting discussed:
 - Drs. Baird and Bell made a presentation at the SAB meeting to facilitate exposure of Sea Grant within NOAA
 - Dr. Bell appointed a team of Panel site visitors to review the University of Maine's application to be designated a Sea Grant College
 - The team consisted of Dr. Duce (chair), Drs. Woeste and Bell and Mr. Stephan
 - Maine Sea Grant Program is in transition with a new director who doesn't have a faculty position; university officials said they would address that issue
 - nine requirements to become a Sea Grant College are listed in the Federal Register
 - Maine Sea Grant has met them all
 - the site team recommended to the Panel and Dr. Baird that Maine Sea Grant should be designated a Sea Grant College
 - **Mr. Stephan has not written a letter to John Rayfield, House Committee on Resources, to express the SGRP's thanks for his significant contributions to the Sea Grant program but will do so**

- Dr. Knauss made a motion:
 - “That Dr. Baird, based on the site review team’s findings that all nine criteria to become a Sea Grant College were met, that Maine Sea Grant be designated a Sea Grant College Program.”
 - the motion was seconded and passed unanimously by the Panel
 - **a letter from the Panel chair recommending that Maine Sea Grant become a Sea Grant College should go to Dr. Baird**
 - Dr. Baird will endorse the recommendation, which goes to VADM Lautenbacher and then to Secretary of Commerce Donald L. Evans
 - next step is the ceremonial side

Executive Committee Report (Dr. Bell and Executive Committee Members)

Leadership retreat with SGA and NSGO (Dr. Kudrna)

- It was a positive meeting
- Dr. Baird discussed the Sea Grant appropriation
- Sea Grant’s priority setting process was explained
- Drs. Baird and Schuler gave a briefing regarding program ranking and grading
- Matrix system was discussed along with Sea Grant’s place in the matrix

Panel Executive Committee Meeting (Dr. Knatz)

- Met last night to discuss the training session this morning and the PATs
- Discussed topics to bring up during the meeting this afternoon with VADM Lautenbacher
- SGRP Vice Chair was appointed to write down these topics so that a structured meeting with VADM could be held

Panel Nominations Committee (Dr. Knatz)

- The Panel’s Executive Committee is composed of the Chair, Vice Chair, Member-at-Large, the past Chair and the past, past Chair
- A geographic balance on the Executive Committee is desirable
- The Member-at-Large keeps a journal of the Executive Committee’s activities
- The nominations committee (Drs. Knatz, Knauss, and Duce) has proposed the following slate of Executive Committee candidates:
 - Chair - Dr. Schubel
 - Vice Chair - Mr. Robinson
 - Member-at-Large - Dr. Friday
- A motion was made to accept this slate for nominations as a whole
- The motion was seconded and passed

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)/SGA Meeting (Dr. Anderson)

- Attending this meeting in Seattle were:
 - Sea Grant directors
 - Extension regional coordinators
 - NSGO staff

- NMFS personnel included Dr. William Hogarth, NMFS AA
- Discussed how the fisheries theme team could better coordinate with NMFS
- Dr. Stickney gave a presentation on aquaculture and fisheries extension
- A number of action items were agreed upon:
 - NMFS will take lead to schedule regional meetings and invite Sea Grant directors
 - regional planning structure will be set up for fisheries extension
 - provide a list of fisheries extension proposals to Dr. Hogarth for possible NMFS funding
 - to hold a biennial meeting and invite Sea Grant and state resource directors
 - a need for NMFS representation on Sea Grant program advisory committees
- **Dr. Bell will send a list of the action items to Panel members**
- Other subjects discussed:
 - need to improve communications
 - joint annual report highlighting how NMFS and Sea Grant partner
 - Continuing Dr. Anderson's position at Sea Grant by NMFS

State of Sea Grant (Dr. Baird)

Introductory Remarks

- New NOAA matrix system and OAR review has put added burdens on NSGO staff
- Three new NSGO staff members have been hired, all are former Knauss Fellows
 - Megan Agy (Research and Extension)
 - Jamie Krauk (Communications Program)
 - Sami Grimes (Writer/Editor)
- Sea Grant got a good Senate and House mark
- Returns from the PATs indicate that programs are performing very well
- State budgets are down presenting problems for Sea Grant programs
- The Ocean Commission report is due to come out
- Sea Grant international is making progress

NOAA Update

- The new matrix management system is a huge time demand
- The Administration is going to adopt it, so Sea Grant is engaging it
- It will be several years before the system starts

OAR Update

- The new AA arrived to a multitude of problems
- He does not want to lose Sea Grant to another LO
- Changes will occur in OAR; consolidation of laboratories
- OAR's Associate Director positions (Dr. Baird is AD for Oceans) may or may not continue

Sea Grant Strategy for the Next Five Years – Panel Charge

- Sea Grant Strategic Plan is progressing
- Need to involve ourselves more in strategic thinking about the following:
 - there is less money as a percentage of the appropriation being spent on research
 - Sea Grant in danger of becoming too heavy on the outreach side relative to research

- reauthorization funding levels
- Sea Grant's role in the national agenda
- formal response to the Ocean Commission
- what to do about organizing regionally
- our strengths, core competencies
- partnerships are critical
- 50 percent of NOAA research money is going to universities
- how to grasp opportunities and sell to NOAA and DOC
- this is an international age
- how to shape Sea Grant for the next decade
- Dr. Baird put forward two concepts in strategic thinking taken from the two white papers in the briefing book (tabs 5 and 6)
 - "A Paradigm for Sea Grant/Matrix Partnerships in NOAA"
 - concern that Sea Grant will be buried in matrices and reduce focus
 - could make Sea Grant research available to other LOs through National Strategic match money; matrix managers could choose the problem to be researched
 - perhaps can sell the above idea to Congress to get more funding
 - "Regional Research in NOAA Paradigm Options"
 - advocates a regional approach to solve nation's coastal and Great Lakes problems
 - regional organization is inevitable
- Dr. Baird will ask Panel Chair to form a task group that is involved with strategic issues
- NSIs (National Strategic Investments) also need to be studied either by the Panel or an outside group
- Research not informing operations is a chronic NOAA problem

Discussion

- Perhaps a joint Panel and SGA committee could be formed to conduct strategic issue and NSI studies
- **The Panel would like a formal charge from Dr. Baird to Dr. Bell about forming two task groups to study strategic issues and NSIs**
- Discussions about how to organize these studies could occur at the next Panel meeting
- Timing of studies is not urgent

Sea Grant Association President's Report (Dr. Stickney)

- Relationships have improved among the SGA, NSGO, and SGRP
- At a meeting with VADM Lautenbacher, showed that Panel and SGA are working together
- State budgets are going down
- Increased national funds would be welcomed to support research and help match
- The document, "Principles and Process for Determining Sea Grant Programmatic Priorities (PPPP)," is a big step forward
- The NMFS/SGA meeting was positive
- Many Sea Grant directors would like to work more with NMFS labs
- SGA has had many interactions with NOAA leadership this past year:
 - Sea Grant Week in Maine in 2005

- New Hampshire Sea Grant College designation ceremony
- other venues
- As for the reorganization, SGA is not unhappy with Sea Grant's location in OAR
- Most Sea Grant directors felt the second round of PATs went very well
- Dr. Stickney looks forward to working with the Panel and NSGO in the coming year

Update on the Panel's Communication Review Committee (Dr. Stephan)

- Members of this committee are:
 - Ms. Alden
 - Mr. Stephan
 - Ms. Amy Broussard, Texas Sea Grant Communications Director
- Committee's final report will be finished in the spring of 2004
- Two panels, both chaired by Kerry Bolognese from the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), were convened to look at:
 - Sea Grant library and Sea *Grant Abstracts*
 - national media relations center
- Cost of the national communications projects is one of the reasons to undertake these studies
- These three projects are not matched (1% funds)

NOAA Matrix Management (Dr. Cammen)

- Many positive aspects for Sea Grant in the new management by matrix system
- Management of LOs and programs will now be overlaid by issues
- One person from the NSGO is assigned to each matrix
- This new system has four goals
- Each category under those goals has a manager who has fiscal responsibility
- Managers report to:
 - LOs
 - Mary Glackin, Assistant Administrator for Program Planning and Integration
 - series of cross-cutting NOAA councils
- To avoid breaking up LO budgets, almost all of Sea Grant's activities, except for invasive species, come under the Ecosystem Research category
- Three NSGO man-months have been devoted to matrix activities
- Program Planning and Budget System (PPBS) is part of the matrix system
- The PPBS is a "top down" process unlike the Sea Grant model that is "bottom up"
- The new matrix system gives Sea Grant a framework to interact with NOAA and *visa versa*

FY 2003/2004 Budget (Mr. Eigen)

- 2003 budget shows \$60,017, 000 (instead of \$62,400,000)
- Lost a large carryover coming into 2003 -- \$2M for NSIs
- NOAA Grants Management Division (GMD) didn't complete processing the NSI grants in FY2002

- Due to 2003 carryover loss, tried not to have one for 2004, still had:
 - \$500K in OAR reprogramming
 - \$426K from closed out grants returned in late September at the end of the fiscal year.
- All of 2003 grants got out of GMD but not early
- Administration is trying to address timeliness problem by giving LOs earlier deadlines
- Funding GMD for computerized grants online may not solve the problem

Adjourn

Dr. Bell made a motion that the meeting adjourn, motion was seconded and passed

November 13, 2003

Panel Members Present: James Arrington, Peter Bell (Chair), Robert Duce, Elbert Friday, Ross Heath, Manuel Hernandez-Avila, Geraldine Knatz, John Knauss, Frank Kudrna, Nathaniel Robinson, Jerry Schubel (Chair Elect), Jeffrey Stephan, Judith Weis, John Woeste

Panel Member Absent: Robin Alden

Ex-Officio Panel Members: (NSGO) Ronald Baird; Francis Schuler (designated Federal official); (SGA) Robert Stickney

NSGO Staff: Megan Agy, Susan Borda, Leon Cammen, Madeline Carter, Elizabeth Day, Kola Garber, Sami Grimes, Ed Hurley, Jamie Krauk, Jim Murray

Other Attendees:

NOAA: Timothy R.E. Keeney, Mary M. Glackin

SGA: Jennifer Greenamoyer

OAR: James Phinney

Testimony at Program Reviews by Panel Members (Dr. Woeste)

- Dr. Woeste suggested the Panel vote on guidance that, where appropriate, Panel members on local advisory committees be allowed to testify before the PAT as long as the process is transparent to all
- Points raised:
 - should Panel members be on advisory committees of any kind
 - their testimony might be interpreted as a “conflict of interest”
 - probably should not give testimony at PATs
- **Dr. Woeste was asked to explore the issue further and come back with a statement so that Panel can reach a decision before the next round of PATs**

Panel Discussion – Developing a Panel Strategy (Mr. Robinson)

- Since Panel members' appointments are for a limited time, a SGRP strategic plan is needed to provide continuity
- Mr. Robinson presented four strategic goals:
 - develop and pursue approaches for achieving Sea Grant's \$103M authorization
 - assist the NSGO to improve capability and effectiveness
 - act strategically and in concert with our partners
 - define the agenda and priorities for the Panel's work

Discussion

- Panel's role on Hill is educating and informing
- The goal of \$103M authorization provides a target to discuss with both Congress and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
- Benefits of value added and value received are needed to make a case for \$103M
- Panel should determine what Sea Grant would do with increased funding:
 - could be used for one particular activity such as aquaculture
 - could be used to hire more extension agents

Timothy R.E. Keeney, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere

- He is a fan of Sea Grant and knows how strongly Congress feels about the program
- NOAA envious of how Sea Grant combines research and outreach
- NOAA Strategic Plan is completed
- Matrix management is important because it:
 - eliminates the need to reorganize the whole agency
 - makes better use of money
 - enables all parts of NOAA to work together in one direction

NOAA and Aquaculture

- Congress understands that aquaculture is important to NOAA
- Legislation with a startup cost of \$30M has been proposed to develop aquaculture in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)
- Opportunity for investment and creation of tens of thousands of jobs

NOAA and Invasive Species

- Funding for invasive species:
 - \$1B to Department of Agriculture
 - \$400M to Department of Interior
 - \$20.3M to NOAA
- Because of enormity of the problem, room for growth exists in the budget
- Baseline monitoring and mapping of invasive species are opportunities
- Non-NOAA research is looked on positively

NOAA and Corals

- Recent Coral Reef Task Force meeting was attended by 250 people
- Developed a national plan from which local plans were derived – “Building Local Capacity”
- The Task Force endorsed local plans and will assist in implementing them
- Federal agencies will have the opportunity to deliver products at the local level

Mary Glackin, Assistant Administrator, NOAA Program Planning and Integration

- Ms. Glackin thanked Dr. Baird for educating her about Sea Grant
- She manages and administrates the matrix management system
- The four matrix goals are fiscally based
- The prime drivers in identifying matrix programs were:
 - legislative mandate
 - services provided
- Ecosystem Research Program is large, receives one-half billion dollars of NOAA resources
- Programs will look to Sea Grant as a method to fill identified research and outreach gaps
- There is a need to develop a NOAA research agenda, none currently exists
- The role of the SGRP in the matrix system is to encourage Sea Grant programs to:
 - assist NOAA in establishing an Ecosystem Research agenda
 - identify returns on investment
 - submit proposals to fill research gaps in all NOAA goals

Discussion

- Sea Grant's outreach activities fit into the matrix by underlying all programs
- Budget cuts will probably not be made at the NOAA level
- Cuts are harder to predict at the DOC and OMB levels
- These tight economic times are particularly grim for 2005
- Planning is more important than execution in matrix management

The Panel Executive Committee, Drs. Baird and Stickney, and Ms. Greenamoyer left to meet with VADM Lautenbacher, Dr. Friday will act as chair

NSGO Communications Plan (Ms. Krauk)

- Communications team fully staffed
- Team recently held a retreat to develop a communications strategy
- Projects in the future:
 - new Sea Grant Website to debut mid-December
 - Green Book update
 - starter kit to engage people coming into the network
 - Sea Grant 101
 - Knauss Fellows promotion
- Team plans to build NOAA partners through:
 - a “brown bag” series
 - impact and success stories to increase NOAA recognition of Sea Grant
 - theme team interactions with other LOs

- Overarching goals of the team are:
 - Sea Grant Biennial Report
 - Sea Grant story, branding campaign
 - NSGO newsletter
 - Communication reviews of
 - Sea Grant library
 - Sea Grant *Abstracts*
 - Media relations position
- Jana Goldman of OAR public affairs has taken over the media relations job:
 - holds the media contact list
 - distributes tip sheets to the media

Final Evaluation Ranking and Procedures (Dr. Schuler)

- Evaluation and funding for the second cycle were:
 - similar to the first cycle
 - adjusted per the Toll Committee recommendations
- \$3M was available in the first cycle merit pool:
 - 15 programs in the first category received \$100,000
 - 11 programs in the second category received \$70,000
 - 3 programs in the third category received 40 percent of remainder
- What has changed due to legislation:
 - requires no fewer than five rating categories
 - set boundaries limiting number of programs in the “best” category
 - as required by the legislation, two categories were added
- Merit allocations will be the predominate method of providing core funds to the programs other than through NSIs
- The merit pool is 10 percent of the core program
- A bonus system was added to cycle two:
 - top 7 programs in category 1 will receive the highest bonus
 - next 7-8 programs in category 1 will receive a smaller bonus
 - programs in the three other categories will receive no bonus but will still receive merit funding
 - after the rating year, programs could be move up or down depend on the ratings of that year’s programs
 - whether big or large, programs receive the same bonus
- Rankings:
 - idea of “ranking programs” 1-30 seen as harmful to the spirit of Sea Grant
 - programs in the top groups are limited by Congress
- The question we have to deal with is what feedback to give to the directors
- After cycle one, directors were given the report without the grade
- The value of the merit pool to each program decreases as programs improve
- An alternative method to increase core funding is through national competitions like fisheries extension
- Planning to increase small program funding through the base

Break for lunch

Debrief on Executive Committee Meeting with VADM Lautenbacher

- Meeting theme was that the matrix system is a management tool that will help Sea Grant because of its cross-cutting nature
- Informed him of:
 - PATs
 - new Sea Grant college designations
 - communications review
 - OAR review
 - Panel activities
- Dr. Stickney told him about recent engagements of the SGA with NOAA
- Dr. Kudrna informed him of state interactions
- Mr. Robinson covered the advantages of the new matrix system
- Dr. Schubel discussed the budgets, particularly concerns about the 2005 budget
- Dr. Knatz reported on the Ocean Commission

Discussion

- Sea Grant needs specifics for budget increase requests
- Earmarks (NOAA/DOC defines as 'funds not requested in the President's budget'; not the usual meaning of 'funds directed to a specific individual') could be eliminated with a gentlemen's agreement
 - agree to work on issues
 - Administration prefers no earmarks in budget
- Need to get Sea Grant directors more involved with state government officials
- Panel should comment on Ocean Commission Report and how Sea Grant can implement the report's recommendations
- The take away message was: I need your help. Panel should go to Hill, inform Congress and OMB about Sea Grant, and directors should educate specific governors about their state's Sea Grant program
- Sea Grant's position in Ecosystem Research is only a placeholder and could be changed if it limits the program
- **Dr. Schubel will make a brief summary of the NRC, Byrne, Duce, Toll, and Inspector General reports to give to VADM Lautenbacher by January 15**
- NOAA and Administration perceptions of Sea Grant have improved

NSGO Updates

Presentation at SGA Meeting (Dr. Cammen)

- Presentation emphasis was that the amount spent on Sea Grant research is decreasing
- New Panel Guidance Document guidelines state that 46 to 60 percent of Federal core funds should be spent on research
 - core funding is base plus merit
 - NSI funding not included
- History of core funding spent on research:
 - 1995: 50 percent
 - 1998: 44 percent
 - 2003: 43 percent
- Average of core funding plus NSIs is 50 percent
- The percentage of core funds spent on Sea Grant functions such as research, outreach, administration and program development differs widely among programs

Discussion

- Decreases in funds allocated to research need to eventually be addressed at PATs
- Core funding has not kept up with inflation

Fisheries Extension (Dr. Murray)

- Sea Grant fisheries extension efforts have decreased by 20 percent
- Sea Grant was mandated by Congress, in 2003, to enhance its fisheries extension program
- \$3M of Sea Grant federal funds to be redirected over a five-year period
- Funds dedicated to hiring of additional personnel at state program level
- Mandate was unfunded
 - NSGO reallocated \$2.4M of funds
 - state programs reprogrammed \$600K of existing funds
- Markup language in House and Senate for enhancement efforts appears to be about \$2M
- \$4.47M worth of Fisheries Enhancement proposals received
- Dr. Hogarth might fund \$1M worth of proposals that interest NMFS

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Smart Growth Initiative (Dr. Murray)

- EPA has no state or local infrastructure to deal with smart growth
- EPA would like to develop relationships with Sea Grant extension specialists associated with coastal community development to enhance decision-maker:
 - education
 - training opportunities
- 45 Sea Grant extension specialists attended intense training session with EPA
- \$5K provided to each program participating in the training
 - funds to be used to implement extension work activity addressing smart growth
 - amount will be added to each program's 2004 omnibus
- Drs. Baird, Murray and Schuler to brief Dr. Keeney about this initiative
- First time such a partnership has been formed with EPA
- A detailee from EPA to come to NSGO to coordinate program

Update on Duce Committee Recommendations (Dr. Schuler)

- “Building Sea Grant: the Role of the NSGO” contained 21 recommendations
- NSGO has made great progress in addressing those recommendations
- Recommendations not fully met include:
 - Integration of Coastal Ocean Program – not been successful
 - Extension and education as *the* outreach arm of NOAA – improving but not *the*
 - OAR reimbursement for Dr. Baird’s AD position, other staff costs
 - Congress weighing in on this across NOAA
 - situation not improving
 - 5 percent overhead for pass-through funds – issue on table with new OAR AA
 - NOAA grants personnel dedicated to Sea Grant -- has not happened
 - Sea Grant Deputy Director at Senior Service Executive level – new OAR AA may abolish Dr. Baird's AD position

Update on Byrne Committee Recommendations (Dr. Murray)

- “A Mandate to Engage Coastal Users” made 20 recommendations
- Progress has been made on almost all recommendations
- Recommendations to NOAA, NSGO and SGRP not fully met include:
 - NOAA should create new office of outreach, education and public engagement – hardest to implement but being discussed
 - NOAA and Sea Grant network should review engagement with users – NOAA is beginning to do that
 - NOAA should reallocate resources to enable Sea Grant to discharge duties to users– a long way to go on the recommendation
 - NSGO to establish procedures for reporting program accomplishment – making progress
 - SGRP to engage Oceans 2000 Act Commission and Pew Oceans Commission – done for the most part
- Byrne Report recommendations made to Sea Grant programs need to be addressed at PATs

Wrap-up (Dr. Bell)

- SGRP appreciates the progress made on both the Duce and Byrne report recommendations
- Panel members thanked for their cooperation, enthusiasm and good job on PATs
- **Panel members asked to be sent the SAB charge to conduct a review of NOAA Research**

Adjourn

Dr. Bell made a motion that the meeting adjourn, motion was seconded and passed