National Sea Grant Review Panel’s Special Meeting
Wednesday, November 14, 2007
2:00-4:00 p.m. EDST

Teleconference Call
Call-in Information: 1 866 746 2456
Pass Code: 3234152, #

Call to Order
(Nat Robinson, Chairman of the Board)
- Roll Call
  - Paul Anderson  Judith Weis
  - Robin Alden  Frank Kudrna
  - Peter Bell  Nathaniel Robinson
  - John Byrne  Jeffrey Stephan
  - Robert Duce  William Stubblefield
  - Richard West  John Woeste

  Motion to approve agenda (Robinson).
  Second: Byrne
  Approved.

Consideration: Report of Panel’s NRC Report Review Committee:
(4 items out of 8 will be discussed).

  Kudrna: Move to adopt Committee’s report. Cover page, 4 page document,
  transmittal letter.
  Second: Stephan

Discussion on 4-Page Document:
- Document is relatively unchanged with the following exceptions (Kudrna):
  1. 3rd page describes the NSGO program visit with a slight modification—
     originally we thought the visit tied to the review by the director was a
     positive feature. This was included but we allowed the option to separate
     the research portion through the use of a separate paper evaluation (as
     input/supplement).
  2. Last attachment: Option regional evaluation. We found merit in eventual
     regional evaluations that would enable us to look collectively at regional
     efforts. This concept was proposed at the RIT retreat. Program officers
     should be assigned on a regional basis to satisfy NRC recommendation on
     increased PO involvement—we included this as an option.
Concern over the use of the word ceremonial (regarding Director’s visit—4 page document and the cover letter) (Duce). Agreement reached that a substitute phrase should be found by Kudrna.

Discussion on Transmittal Letter:
- Few typos—will be corrected by Kudrna.
- Concern over statement that the SG committee does not support a paper review (4B near bottom of page) as not everyone responded (Duce).
  - Letter will note that not everyone responded to the survey (Kudrna).

  **Kudrna: Motion to accept as modified with editorial corrections.**
  **Second: Stephan**
  **Unanimously approved as amended.**

Consideration: Draft Revised Panel Charter (Dick West)
- Charter is more or less unchanged from the San Diego meeting (West)

  **Move to approve (West)**
  **Second: Duce**

- One amendment by Woeste—Move to strike paragraph on the second to last page (number 1) under Administrative Provisions that states that the Panel should report to the Secretary of Commerce (item #1) (West).
- Proposal to include Panel’s ability to advise the Sec. in objectives and duties section (Stephan).

  **Move to strike #1 under administrative provisions on 3 page of document (Alden)**
  **Second: Byrne**
  **Accepted unanimously**

- Discussion over modifying language in stricken section regarding the Panel’s ability to advise the Secretary of Commerce in the charter:
  - Proposal to add Panel’s ability to advise the Secretary after “to the director” as if it’s copying the Secretary (West).
  - Proposal to preserve the option to advise the secretary when necessity Demands (“shall advise either the Secretary or the Under Secretary, etc.”) (Stephan, Byrne).
  - Proposal to leave language as it—the FACA has a right to speak with the
Move to make #1 on line 1 “shall advise the Secretary…” and continuing with the language as is (Stephan)
Second: Byrne
Byrne withdraws second.

- Proposal to add “and meet with the Secretary where appropriate” (Kudrna).
- The Panel has never had trouble meeting with the Secretary (Cammen).
- Vote requested (Stephan)

Previous Motion (Stephan and Byrne)
Roll Call Vote: Passed 6-3
Yea: Alden, Bell, Kudrna, Robinson, Stephan, Stubblefield
Nay: Byrne, Duce, West

- Discussion on what new language means for the Panel:
  - Concern that everything Panel does must now go through the Secretary of Commerce (West).
  - Proposal to keep documents going to Secretary and add language—“and meet with the Secretary where appropriate” (Kudrna).

Motion to reconsider previous motion (Stubblefield)
Second: Alden
Accepted (Previous motion back on the table)

Motion to accept as friendly amendment: Instead of beginning with Secretary (leave as it is in the draft) adding the language to copy Secretary on documents and “meet with Secretary of Commerce as appropriate” (Stubblefield).
Second: Byrne
Accepted

- Concern over Page 2: #1; Legislation specifies that representative must be chair—this should be specified as well in the charter. In addition, an at large member is also included (see #5). Do we want to do anything with these? (Robinson)

Motion: Delete “solely” from top of page two (Stephan)
Second: Alden
Accepted
Charter needs to ensure that the SGA is represented so if the President can’t attend, a representative can attend (see #1, last sentence)

Vote: Proposed charter as amended
Accepted unanimously
Jim Murray and Dick West will make any edits to the charter and send it off.

Report: NOAA’s Science Advisory Board’s Extension Outreach Education (EOE) Working Committee (Frank Kudrna)

- Concerning report to the SAB: There are strong recommendations for NOAA as to engaging constituents and changing how business is conducted. Report was well received. Mary Glackin met with Kudrna afterwards in regards to SG demonstration project by Gulf programs that would coordinate all extension outreach education in the gulf by embedding SG people in offices. Mary said she’d talk with Leon and Louisa Koch in regards to funding for this. Dr. Spinrad was positive about report as well (Kudrna).
- Suggestion that the Science Advisory Board and Panel go on record saying that the recommendations were positive. Comments will be available to the public for 30 days in December—Panel should find a way to go on record during this period. Possible Exec. Committee responsibility? (Kudrna)
- At the end of the demonstration, SG should be a model for other regions. This could improve relationship with other NOAA line offices (Kudrna)
- Panel should also look at the impact recommendations could have on SG (Byrne).
- One of the recommendations is that NOAA should provide 10% of resources on outreach. Right now it’s 2.2%. This would provide new resources. Even with the demonstration project, new funding wouldn’t come out of SG but from these new resources. The question is, during the notice period from early Dec to early Jan, do we want to provide a response on behalf of the FACA? Do we want to give this to Exec. Committee? (Kudrna)
- Perhaps the Exec Committee could prepare a draft letter and ask for Panel’s comments? (Robinson)
- The implications for SG are high-stake. The danger is that SG becomes a PR office for NOAA. A lot could be lost in the implementation. The Panel should review this carefully (Alden).
- This is a great step forward—a major opportunity. It’s up to us to make sure it’s implemented properly. We need to make sure we retain SG’s character in the process (Cammen).
Motion: Look at the version we have and submit comments to Kudrna and Robinson by 12/10/07 and ask Chairman to send letter on behalf of the Panel (Kudrna).
Second: Byrne
Accepted.

- Panel needs to make sure in the letter that funding should be available (Weis).
- We need to make sure outreach and education doesn’t become PR (Anderson).
- Complements Kudrna for his presentation to the SAB (Bell).

Wrap-up/Adjournment
- Next Regular Panel Meeting: March 5-6, 2008, DC