

**Fall 2010 National Sea Advisory Board Meeting  
Astor Ballroom II  
The Astor Crown Plaza Hotel  
739 Canal Street at Bourbon  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130**

**Friday, October 15**

In attendance: Elizabeth Ban, Frank Beal, Patty Birkholz, John Byrnes, Leon Cammen, Jeremy Harris, Ross Heath, Jim Murray, Michael Orbach, Nancy Rabalais, Rollie Schmitten, Bill Stubblefield, Dick Vortmann, Dick West, John Woeste

**Saturday, October 16**

**8:30 AM – 5:00 PM - OPEN TO PUBLIC**

**8:30** Introductions

Woeste: Call the meeting to order 8:30 am

**Introductions:**

Judy Weis and Jeff Stephans (former Advisory Board Members), Ron Baird (Former director, NSGO), Capt Eric Trehubanko (Office of Naval Oceanography), and Elizabeth Ban (new DFO and NSGO)

**Review Agenda**

**Motion to approve the agenda – Harris**

**2<sup>nd</sup> - Schmitten**

**Woeste- Discussion?**

**Motion passed - unanimous**

**Review of minutes from March meeting**

**Motion to approve the minutes from the March meeting – Harris**

**2<sup>nd</sup> - Dick Vortmann**

**Discussion?**

**Motion passed –unanimous**

Schmitten –Note from agenda. Last March we asked Sally Yozell how Sea Grant can be more relevant. Sally said she was too new to know and would work with Leon to learn more.

Woeste– Sally Yozell never got back to us, sent her a copy of a resolution – a thank you letter was the only follow up we had.

Schmitten - If Cammen has a chance, perhaps a query meeting with AA?

West - As a representative of the Biennial report team I met with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). They are waiting for the Biennial report. NOAA has been trying to reorganize for two years.

**8:45 Chair's Update:**

Woeste - Thanks for responsiveness and on-going feedback.

Appreciate the work of:

Vortmann working on 2010-2011 budget

Heath leading the fund allocation committee

Orbach leading the Futures II committee

West serving as the Sea Grant Week planning liaison

Byrne leading the report to congress committee

Simmons serving on the Knauss selection committee and SGA awards

Board member commitment to staffing site review and serving as Focus Team liaisons

Frustrations with:

Board charter approval process

Difficulty of moving letters and meetings request through the NOAA system

Concerned about:

Appointment of new Board members

Staffing levels in the NSGO

Completion of a system supported/functionality of NIMS

Pleased with:

Tone and openness of communications with SGA

**9:00 National Sea Grant Advisory Board charter renewal, nomination process and Membership Committee (Jim Murray, Deputy Director, National Sea Grant Office) (See slides in appendix)**

Discussion:

Orbach- Let's talk to other FAC chairs and see if they have had similar experiences nominating for their Advisory Boards. I understand why Dr. Lubchenco wants to institute a new process. Is it clear to us that what they want is six names for three slots pre-vetted then go through process with three that she approves.

Murray – Yes, it's been made clear in the past few weeks that they want double the names to pick from. It's good that Dr. Lubchenco is trying to get involved in who is giving NOAA advice. We think we need to get NOAA buy-in on the nominees upfront.

Woeste – Our task is to establish the nominating committee and be thinking about people that we're willing to nominate. We are getting to crunch time in terms of number of people on the board. By next fall we might not have a quorum.

Murray - We'll need four more coming up next year.

Vortmann –Are the Board members in place through their term limit and then serve until they are replaced?

Murray – No, they can serve for four years; extend another four year term, and then a one year extension for a total of nine years on the Board

Orbach – Is there a board matrix? Do we have a Membership committee?

**(See Board matrix in appendix)**

Woeste – A Membership committee can be appointed if we want one.

Murray –I would like the membership committee to help us recruit and run by our thinking by this committee for their endorsement.

Woeste – Schmitten is willing to serve on membership committee, also Simmons and Orbach. For Beal and Birkholz – we are meeting with Larry Robinson to discuss and we need to justify with our matrix and why you fit into plan. Next year, Heath is going to be term limited, Byrne will resign next summer sometime. Four will be needed next year

### **9:30 Break – 15 minutes**

### **9:45 National Sea Grant Office report (Leon Cammen, Director, National Sea Grant Office) (See slides in appendix)**

Discussion:

Cammen - What counts is what the outside world sees of our impacts. We're in the business of creating and maintaining jobs. We are supporting a lot of students, publishing literature, leveraging over \$86 million dollars

Stubblefield- it looks like your overselling. We may have assisted 650 businesses or 3500 jobs but we didn't create all of them

Cammen– it wouldn't have happened without Sea Grant

Harris – Let's change it to say that we've been "instrumental"

Orbach – Are the targets for Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply realistic targets? We're way off. Don't want targets you can't meet.

Cammen – Yes, it's a realistic target. They are from the state programs. They take a detailed look at their programs – likely big activities happening in the next few years. Only six months reported.

Stubblefield – What's the difference between modifying practices and fishers using new techniques?

Cammen – We'll get back to you on that. We'll evaluate at the end of four years

*NOTE: Per Sami Grimes, NSGO - The focus team wanted to differentiate between fishers changing their techniques and other users modifying their practices. This change in semantics is to account for this.*

Orbach – A major recommendation of the Future's Committee report was new initiatives.

Cammen -This is intended to be the implementation of the Future's Committee report.

The real decision point is now. If we build the program, which models work the best? We want 32 teams going out and working with the community. We'll look at the different ways people did this and see what worked. In some places, we can't present it as climate activity, but as sea level rise is ok.

Orbach – there is an increased presence of this kind of activity in SG and moving toward Future's committee recommendation.

Harris – I disagreed with the NSGO's methods at first, but now think it worked. We've learned a great deal through the small grants. I'm taken back by not being able to use the phrase "climate change" in some communities. We need to be advocates of science and get people to understand climate change – stand up for science. As educators we've failed and Sea Grant has a responsibility. We need to explain it

better.

Heath – I found a NOAA website with 10 examples of observations of climate change. The report was not why it's changing, just that it is.

[\[http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cmb/bams-sotc/2009/bams-sotc-2009-brochure-lo-rez.pdf\]](http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cmb/bams-sotc/2009/bams-sotc-2009-brochure-lo-rez.pdf)

Stubblefield – Can you pull out nuggets/diffuse the spotlight so the senator in West Virginia - how do we let them know that it helps other states? There are things in Gulf of Mexico that have applicability in the other parts of the county.

Birkholz – There was a recent oil spill in Michigan and Sea Grant was involved. Every day for three and half weeks, we had all legislators and mayors city managers called in to white house and conference call with EPA. It helped dispel some nasty rumors that were picked up by the media. We got the real answers to the question. Sea Grant was mentioned several times – never got a full answer of what Sea Grant did, but want to get that info and bring it to my state.

Schmitt – This week's Focus group discussions were talking about communications and outreach. How do we bring the Sea Grant message to the heartland? Can we get a copy of this [\[National Stories\]](#) to every member of the Sea Grant network to show the results of last year's work?

Heath – This is a good time for Sea Grant to publicize what we're doing. Reality was that NOAA took a reputation hit and we need to correct it. The Deepwater Horizon spill really hurt them.

Cammen – We can put both hats on. Sometime it's handy not to be affiliated with NOAA. Within NOAA we've really grown – we've driven home the onsite presence. This is last year versus what we might do next year, based on flat funding (level appropriation) Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) taxed programs all across government. Sea Grant can keep funding and run our own SBIR competition. We used the Focus Teams.

Stubblefield – Have you tried with PMEL or the NMFS Science Centers to get Sea Grant involved in their extension?

Cammen – We've tried but they're not interested. They'll tell us to pay for it.

Stubblefield – That's very consistent with what we found in the research report.

Cammen – I will present this to SGA and Focus Team chairs and we'll get suggestions on what to do with this invasives and aquaculture money. We want to put more money into social science. Priority for NOAA, OAR and Judy [Gray] will say it and it should be delegated to us to handle. No one does anything about it. Set aside \$2 million for social science but instead of a national competition, we tell the state programs now that they should put it into RFPs for their competition. We'll agree on what kind of things/topics to put in and then we take our \$2 million and fund half of every project you have. We'll use our national pool – (\$500K) to spend elsewhere. This provides more incentive for social science in the state programs. That means that we're only funding this if it's important to the state plan.

Harris – Is the \$2 million for climate not in FY11? Sea Grant is unprepared to say that climate change is an important issue and is unfunded except for surplus. How is it not as important as aquaculture and invasives? You're hiding it under community hazards.

Cammen – We can't control NOAA budget wording. It's how we got it through budget.

Don't have a president's budget yet. We've put in what we're sure we're getting. If we get the money, we'll put it in.

Harris – You're showing \$1.4 million unallocated – do you not believe that climate change is important enough?

Cammen - We put it in the President's Budget Request. The SGA hasn't seen this yet. I'll impose some things, but believe that this topic is worth having a discussion rather than imposing.

Harris - How is this different from other budgets?

Cammen – We haven't heard how the demonstration projects have worked. We'll hear at the Sea Grant Week meeting. Then we can decide what we'll do with the rest of the money.

Harris – Is there fear of being identified with climate change?

Murray – Some fear in some programs in extension.

Harris- Inside the beltway?

Cammen – No.

Murray – We've heard that Southeast programs extension agents can't get into climate change public debate. They get at the issue by calling it sea-level rise. That is a local decision, not a NSGO belief. NOAA is the national agency in climate change research.

Harris – Climate change is a critical emerging issue with national focus and we need to establish credibility for Sea Grant in this field. If congress looks at the Sea Grant budget, they would think that Sea Grant was not really involved in climate change. If our advice is to make a decisive showing to create credibility and a brand that is identified with climate change, then Congress will be looking to us for leadership. I don't think the right approach is to slip little bits of money and hide it under different names.

Cammen – There is a 30 page budget document to congress outlining everything we did for climate change (\$6 million worth of projects.) This budget doesn't have a public identity yet. When we get money from president, we'll change this document.

Harris - But the budget request has 2 million for climate change?

Cammen – Yes, in a budget narrative

Orbach – I don't think it's the only mention either. Nature of the Sea Grant program – we really want to have all individual programs on board. I see movement here in the right direction and I'm interested to hear what SGA has to say. It's critical to have them on board, and know how to talk about it.

**10:30 SGA report (Gordon Grau, President, Sea Grant Association, Mary Donahue – Reporting on NOAA Sea Grant Workforce Survey)  
(See slides in appendix)**

Grau: University presidents will pound the pavement for NIH or NSF grants, but not NOAA grants. It's important for NOAA to engage universities like NIH, et al. Sea Grant will be 1/3 of OAR budget at when Climate leaves. Let this info [Results of NOAA Sea Grant Workforce Survey] engage you in a discussion.

Byrne-How many employees does NOAA have?

Donahue - 14,000, 10K scientists and 4K others.

Byrne - Most people who responded probably have a Sea Grant connection.

Donahue – If you have a positive inclination you might be more likely to respond to the survey. We used a statistician – he said that it was rigorous using 1600 respondents – very robust. But yes, there is probably some bias.

Orbach –Who is the audience for this?

Grau – Sea Grant Program, the Advisory Board, NOAA, Congress. We wanted to find out if Sea Grant is a significant contributor to the workforce. Only 22% of respondents said that they were supported by Sea Grant.

Stubblefield – This is nice data, but what does it do? It resonates with the Sea Grant community. Outside what will it do? We need to ask “Is Sea Grant essential?” Sea Grant contributed, but is it essential?

Grau – You could argue that with ROTC. But now we have an idea of what Sea Grant does for the workforce. The #1 contributor was graduate research assistants, Knauss fellows is #2.

Heath - If you took NIH post-doc fellowship, you needed to work for them for three years. If NOAA has staffing issues, then Sea Grant should do a similar program – super-Knauss fellowship.

Heath – There is a political side: key minority members in the house who have strong views about what’s going on in NOAA. Have you done any contingency planning for that? Short answer is that there won’t be a lot that will affect Sea Grant over the next couple of months because of congressional changes. Perhaps in the FY12 budget.

West - The NOAA reorganization will determine what is going to happen. NOAA didn’t share with the Hill which is why NAPA was mandated to write the Climate report. 1) We need to work toward the next Sea Grant reauthorization - make sure our language to congress shares with them what we need. 2) Sea Grant needs to embrace climate change. 3) Focus teams need to be more nimble than NSGO – they need to be nimble enough to address what NOAA needs to do.

Stubblefield –I don’t think it will be an issue of earmarks, but trying to protect cuts in discretionary spending. There will be a major push to reduce spending after elections and NOAA is in that category of discretionary spending. We need to protect against that.

Harris- Can we have a discussion on climate change?

Grau – We have forty faculty on climate at Hawaii. The islands give us a special understanding of it – it effects more than sea-level rise. If we don’t discuss climate, we don’t get water, energy, phosphates, famine – these are central issues that we’re passing onto the next generation. This is Sea Grant’s business.

Harris – What is your gauge of how the SGA will react to including climate change money in next year’s budget?

Grau – If it’s new money, great, if it’s the program’s money, then there will be resistance. Coastal Hazards is a good example.

**11:00 NSGAB budget and policy (D. Vortmann, NSGAB, J. Murray, NSGO)  
(Moved to the afternoon session)**

**Discussion on morning topics**

Woeste - Dick Vortmann does not wish to continue in the Vice Chair because he does not want to be a Chair. It is the Chair's prerogative to appoint a temporary nominating committee. The temporary committee will be: Dick West, Jeremy Harris and Ross Heath. They will come up with a nomination for tomorrow's vote for Vice-Chair understanding that the new Vice-Chair would move into the Chair's position in a year.

Orbach – Should we have a woman on the nominating committee?

Woeste – Yes, however I believe our only female Board member might be the nominee. Being on the nominating committee would complicate our ability to nominate her.

Woeste - Are there questions we need for Sunday's business meeting on the Performance Review Panel?

Vortmann – It seems that the way its set up is how the program did relative to its plan.

Can a program make their plan intentionally marginal?

Cammen – We just have to do a good job on reviewing plans.

Harris – I just have a comment – Sea Grant has such a tiny pot of money, but a very elaborate process on how it's distributed. It seems we should simplify, not make it more elaborate. Let's have an administrator to make the decision on where the money should go rather than go through elaborate process. Spend a dollar to manage a dime.

Rabalais – We need transparency in process, that's what PIE addresses because when resources get smaller, competition increases. We need this for protection.

Cammen – This system is much easier for everyone except the PRP so the issue is where you are not how you got there.

**12:00 Lunch**

**1:00 Sea Grant Academy (Mike Spranger, Associate Director, Florida Sea Grant)  
(See slides in appendix)**

Harris – Mike is doing a great job – I was at the FL SG review panel. We need more like him. As a former extension agent, this is such a valuable program. Wise dollars spent.

Stubblefield – Are parts that would be transferable to the Knauss fellows orientation?

History, Logic model, evaluation – the whole framework would be useful.

Vortmann – Great program, your alumni can help with networking

Spranger – We have started mentoring. We want to involve the past graduates to do the training.

Murray -Has it progressed to more than extension folks, like directors, etc.?

Byrnes– You could use development and implementation plans - the staff could develop and present a logic model and identify impacts of programs. This is a great outcome and based on your training.

Spranger – It was experiential. They had six months to write a plan of work. They came back and critiqued it as a group. They are producing really good outcomes. Thanks

to Leon and others for supporting this.

### **1:30 Committee updates**

#### **Allocations Committee (Ross Heath, NSGAB)**

**(See slides in appendix)**

#### **Discussion**

Orbach - What is an embedded inequity?

Heath - A program that started off with a small budget, then it is likely to remain small because it is based on past budgets. Several are below the \$1.5 million minimum. The real issue is the size of the budget. We'd like to find out for those who didn't respond to the survey, why they didn't respond to the second survey. The diversity of responses means that it won't be easy to come up with a solution. The programs are stressed. They feel that they won't be able to meet the match next year.

Vortmann – We have to do something. It's not irrelevant. We need to finish this exercise before reauthorization. This is a good program and they all deserve whatever it takes to stay alive. It can't be looked at as an entitlement program.

Byrne – The assumption is that the budget will change. Also with the reorganization of NOAA, we don't know what that means for Sea Grant. Another assumption – the next congress, will it be conservative or liberal? If it's liberal, that means it will eliminate some programs and turn them into regional programs.

Heath- We don't live in a closed Sea Grant only world – the State programs will go to the Hill and complain.

Beal –Are all opinions collected in first survey captured here?

Heath – We sent questions to all of Sea Grant including the Advisory Board. People from the Board responded, but not as Board members.

Birkholz- Speaking as a legislator from the Great Lakes, the largest freshwater body in the world - we're most at risk because we have the most coastline. I hear irrelevant issue a lot (Congress will change so why should we do anything now?) Michigan was cutting left and right – we did what we had to do to get matching funds. We don't know what we can do to get it now.

Vortmann –What was the total population you sampled from?

Heath – Sea Grant network list is 700 or 800

Simmons – If we go to a regional model, we will lose our state match. This is a state program and without state match, it won't be considered one.

Heath – Those moneys come with other obligations. Sea Grant core money lets us do our creative things.

Simmons – We need to ask state Sea Grant Directors “If you lost all your state funding could you continue your program?”

Heath – Make a state mad enough and they'll go to the Hill. We're trying to get the program to meet our national goals, but a state could come back and say you have to do things differently.

Harris – If a new system reduces University of Hawaii Sea Grant funding, Senator Inouye will step in and fix it.

Byrne – Will he do it for all programs?

Harris – He needs to be our champion.

Woeste – Supporting an initiative for Sea Grant is different than taking resources from your state.

Byrne – Should we identify those programs with strongest political support and eliminate the others?

West – We talk to all 300 Sea Grant folks tomorrow. What are we going to say about allocations?

Heath – Our message to the group is that no one answered. The Advisory Board didn't even answer.

Orbach - Imbedded inequities is really the problem. Maybe it's more like the Coastal Zone Management Program. What kind of program is it; is it right as it is or is it worth changing?

Harris – Sea Grant network needs to take more responsibility than to only have 14 out of 800 respond.

Orbach – We could divide and conquer and do personal interviews.

Heath – I'll hammer them on Monday. But if they really aren't interested in participating, then they will need to take what Leon decides to do.

Heath – We're still in early stages of the allocation committee. We're trying not to duplicate the research report.

Woeste – SGA had a committee that reported on the small program questions requested that the allocation look at that question. We may have gone broader. Leon charged us to respond to the directors questions and we are currently pursuing this now.

Cammen – This is the third rail of sea grant so we didn't get many responses. Dick's right that it will reach the level of having to find its language in the legislation. Sylvain [De Guise] gave us the opening to look at this. The program mission committee asked for this to be done. You grow your way out. What does distribution look like and how do you get there?

West – Sylvain and Anders [Andren] are on the committee and both support doing this. Emergency program has taken all of their research money just to stay alive. Is that ok? There needs to be some flexibility from the NSGO to say it's ok. This will continue to happen.

Heath – We have to keep research alive because otherwise the university will get mad at us. Is that a good enough reason? These are the issues that are sitting out there.

Stubblefield – We've avoided tough decisions by waiting for more money. We need to make the tough decisions now. We can't grow our way out of it. Look at the static or reduced budget and find a way to survive.

Heath- With this guidance we'll charge ahead.

Byrne – Where does the Allocations Committee go next? If we want to keep 32 programs we need to make adjustments. Why does OR get as much as CA based on amount of coastline? What about population?

Harris – Sea Grant is vulnerable right now and we don't want people going to the Hill and complaining about the program. We don't want to pick any fights that will divide our voice.

Woeste – We appreciate the work Heath and the Allocations Committee have done.

Vortmann- I now have a better understanding of why the response was so low. I just know my state program, not NSGO operations and allocations. We're the Advisory Board and we need to make a recommendation, then take it to the Directors and

then talk about it.

Heath- We need transparency. We need to hear what the folks are saying or not saying.

Murray – Can you design a better model and use it in a proactive way to work with the Hill and implement the model? Last allocation report, we had \$1.2 million figure to be a basic Sea Grant program. Then, Senator Leahy wanted to grow Lake Champlain. To bring all programs to at least \$1.2 million would take another \$6 million increase. That didn't happen. But if we have a more ideal model of what we'd like to be with a price tag, it gives us an approach to work with the Hill.

West- If we don't believe that we have to make a change (60/40 research) should the NSGO and Advisory Board just sit and watch the program fall apart? If you're really concerned with the future of the program, then you can't change what the model is.

Harris – The model doesn't work with reduced funding.

West – If we survive with what we have, we should be thrilled. Department of Defense is losing \$10 billion – we should be happy. We need to defend a different model.

What is NOAA going to do in the reorganization, and where does Sea Grant fit?

Heath- If the House changes hands, there may not be a Climate Service. OAR may be stuck where it is now.

West – If there's a Republican congress, the Climate Service could go to the EPA or elsewhere.

Vortmann – If the smaller programs went away, what would be the impact?

Harris – It's the prestige and clout. It's dangerous ground to say you're not going to deal with the inequities. If there's a battle about funds, the funder wins.

Orbach – Let's move more deliberately on this. We're not a block grant program. We certify all of our programs. Everyone doesn't always get the money. It's merit based.

Cammen – The key is coming up with a growth model with a target and trajectory. The only way to get a model everyone supports. No one benefits unless the program grows. What if the program contracts? If we do it right nobody loses, some just don't win as much as others. That's not as controversial. Harris is right that we can't just take money from one group and give it to another.

Orbach – I'd be happy to support it as long as we have a realistic explanation of what the growth is based on.

West – We need three models -growth, reduction and stability.

Vortmann – We need to be prepared for the potential for reduction. Force us to choose programs to let go.

Rabalais – The program might say “We can't afford to have an extension agent in every port, so we're putting all of our money into research) or vice versa.

West –We need to allow for regional flexibility.

Heath – We could look at a multi-state extension program, multi-state research program, etc. What is the right mix? For better or worse, Sea Grant programs are very conservative

### **Futures II Committee (Mike Orbach, NSGAB)**

Orbach - Futures II committee is Harris, Stubblefield and Orbach

Issues:

- 1) Opportunity for great NOAA visibility
- 2) Research
- 3) Regional efforts

Shoes that have dropped – Climate Service proposal, Obama task force [National Ocean Policy] report, and marine spatial planning. We have dropped NOAA reorganization and we suggest we wait until we hear about it and then we meet and see where we need to take the committee. We need to have something more focused than this charge.

Rabalais – Do we think we'll get anything on NOAA reorganization tomorrow?

Orbach – We can't move forward without it. We'll move forward when we know something about it.

Woeste – The committee should consider what the Sea Grant program is going to look like doesn't depend on where we reside. I recognize what you're saying - the reorganization has implications and opportunities.

**2:30 pm NSGAB budget and policy (D. Vortmann, NSGAB, J. Murray, NSGO)  
(See slides in appendix)**

**Discussion**

Vortmann – Can we carryover money from FY10 for FY11?

Cammen – No

Vortmann – NSGO is funding constrained. Our activities consume 6-9% of what NSGO has to spend. Cammen's number doesn't include overhead.

Cammen – Until last year, the Advisory Board budget was part of the 5% cap and now I've redone this. Now the Advisory Board is not part of the administration of Sea Grant. It comes from Sea Grant allocation instead.

Harris - Are there two meetings per calendar year or next year will there be only one?

Murray – The preference would be to plan for two per year.

Vortmann – With “no year” money, we can be flexible.

Murray – Previously the budget was formed that we know what trips needed to be included and then had contingency for other trips. The Chair can use the contingency (or let others use) accordingly.

Woeste – If we call a meeting where we vote, we're compensated. This way, we can meet when we need to. Let's vote on whether or not to approve the change in budget allocation for the Advisory Board.

**Motion to approve?**

**Schmitt motion, Simmons 2<sup>nd</sup>**

**Discussion?**

Harris – 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting must be in October or later.

Murray – Routine is that Chair needs to approve it and the DFO needs to be in the loop to approve spending of federal funds.

Harris – I recommend that the national office streamlines the travel process.

**All approved.**

Woeste - Ticket prices are ridiculous. I understand that nonrefundable can be approved by NSGO.

Murray – We'll approve nonrefundable ticket, but if you can't make it, you have a year to use the ticket.

Harris – Yet another thing we have to do, pay for stuff out of our pocket, then get reimbursed.

Orbach – Can we get a blanket approval to travel on nonrefundable tickets?

Heath – We need to talk to Garber.

West – it's NOAA's rule, not SG.

Schmitt – Flights prices are ridiculous. NOAA has the most complex reimbursement process in any state or federal government.

## **2:45 Break – 15 minutes**

### **3:00 Sea Grant and the Deepwater Horizon (DWH) oil spill (LaDonn Swan– Director, MS-AL Sea Grant)**

#### **Discussion**

Swann – At the end of the day, Sea Grant came out of the DWH looking great from the point of the NOAA collaboration team. The Gulf of Mexico (GOM) Sea Grant programs are the ones that started regional efforts, regional research, also got involved in original collaboration with NMFS Fisheries Science Centers in St. Petersburg, FL. Additionally, growth model – Senator Shelby proposed AL SG with \$4 million, but that didn't happen. The same year he funded at the \$500K level, one year of the engagement pilot recommended by the NOAA Science Advisory Board. We've also been working with NOAA Regional Collaboration team.

Then, 4/20 happened [Deepwater Horizon explosion], and that's when NOAA recognized Sea Grant capabilities.

We made some mistakes, tried public forums. We had 500 people show up for one and BP didn't come. We did that too soon. Then we brought together 20 federal agencies with all kinds of expertise. We had weekly calls with regional teams. We were involved in 50-60 extension teams/programs. That's what we've been involved with from an outreach standpoint. Steve [Sempier] is redoing the regional research plan – because of an event like this (low probability/high risk), yet no one mentioned oil spill research. He's updating plan to include this.

\$500 million for research is going to GOM Alliance. We need to know what else is needed.

On the human loss side, social science was left out. We need to support this. There will be long-term research strategic planning. We have the only regional research plan in the GOM.

That's where we are with research.

We've been hand in hand with NOAA with engagement, dockside chats, seafood

meetings. Since the well's been plugged, we've been doing less with NOAA and more with our usual stakeholders.

MS has a state recovery commission, AL has started one. Reports are coming out shortly. Implementation of these plans will come from the trust fund and BP penalty money (\$5 or \$20 million). There are great expectations on how to deal with this funding, including potential seafood marketing modeled after LA seafood marketing.

Stubblefield – Do the state's get involved on how to use these dollars? Can they get diverted for purposes other than research?

Swann – Sure, but it is a state led-federally supported program. GCOOS, Fisheries Management Councils are state led federally supported programs and they work.

### **3:15 pm Sea Grant and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill**

**Sam Walker–NOAA Senior Representative at the Incident Command Center  
(See slides in appendix)**

Walker – I've reflected on my perspective with Sea Grant and position with the spill – I'm from the tactical side of the response. I'm a product of Sea Grant. Sea Grant people get things done and they're very versatile. Who's prepared to work on something of this magnitude? Sea Grant folks. No training time. Even this year's Knauss class showed up on response teams and Sea Grant is very well regarded in the response community. They are trusted voices. Sea Grant extension officers can speak to the media and be trusted. These are reflections from the ground, not just a pat on the back.

Unfortunately, a lot of the work for NOAA and Sea Grant is just beginning now.

There was lots of academic expertise and collaboration – sediment and water column history/baselines. A lot of data was collected (map of subsurface observing locations.) The response team deployed ocean gliders in a strategic way. They were in hunt and seek mode and were equipped to take physical samples from Rutgers. It was a very coordinated effort. There were 40K physical samples taken and 50K observations taken.

The level of concentrated expertise and manpower was amazing. This could have taken over two years of conventional research. There were 26 different states represented within subsurface monitoring, and all 50 states at unified command.

There was a misconception that there is no science in unified command. It was filled with scientists.

Heath: There was some angst over the speed of the response. Do you have a timeline of the speed? The data didn't appear for over a month.

Walker- For practical reasons, we didn't get the data out. The labs were completely

overwhelmed. Also, there was a culture clash between getting data out to make decisions vs. research community need to publish and this caused a problem. Our team never withheld data.

Swann – I agree there was so much data. Dispersants data and PAH in seafood were public concerns. FDA took samples in state waters, NOAA in federal, volume of data and reconciliation were part of the problem. We need to agree on this response in advance. Transparency issue was missing – command, control and communication. Local knowledge needs to be brought into this process and development of response plans. Mistrust started early on.

Stubblefield – The subsurface maps showed concentration of sampling toward the flower gardens.

Walker- They were pretty far away, but isobathically it was driven toward the southwest. Light source crude, but what remained was at a fair depth 1000m range. We're back in those areas and not finding anything. No actionable oil around right now.

Orbach – What's the plan now?

Walker – we're transitioning a lot of our operations teams to natural resources damage assessment (NRDA) teams for sampling in phytoplankton. As soon as the response is officially over, unified response will leave. It will be NRDA and long-term research. Funding will be from private sector, BP. The response team data will inform subsequent scientific work.

Swann– The seafood industry can't start recovering until all the water is open. We are still in response until the waters are all open. They're hoping to do a regional marketing plan.

Woeste - What one or two lessons have we learned for Sea Grant?

Swann –Sea Grant has always been an advocate of regional collaboration and we did it two years before the spill. NOAA used us, and we used NOAA science. It was a great partnership. NOAA should have said Sea Grant navigated the landscape of the spill and the region. We can build from this experience.

Walker- The Sea Grant community is well positioned to respond to this type of crisis. Focus on operational products and processes and lessons learned are a great thing to think about right now, but there is no time to go to the drawing board.

Murray- Got a call from Justin Kenney to place a communicator in New Orleans to serve as a liaison between NOAA and academic community for future subsurface work. NOAA learned in this process that there were problems between NOAA and the academic community and now they know that Sea Grant is involved and communications are bridged.

Heath-There was a high level of emergency response, but I didn't hear any science response in any coordinated way. This was a totally predictable event, yet there was no planned response. If we have a big earthquake and tsunami, there is no scientific response plan on who will do what. Can Sea Grant come up with these types of response plans for the various disasters? Tsunami, volcano, earthquake.

Swann – I'd like to think that in NOAA's planning process that Sea Grant will be written into a response plan. We helped them with engagement during the oil spill.

Birkholz –We should look at the template from Nuclear power plants. They have disaster plans and the team meets frequently and runs a rehearsal.

Heath – That's emergency response, but not science response.

Walker - NOAA's new disaster response center and is a good place to take this suggestion. Ask "What is the immediate need and how do we protect the public health and welfare?" It's hard to write a fixed plan and for science it is more difficult.

### **3:45 Network reports**

#### **Legal (Stephanie Showalter, National Sea Grant Law Center)**

Byrne - Of your budget, how much is Sea Grant law versus other line offices?

Showalter - All of our funding goes to Sea Grant work. The breakdown is 75% advisory services/memos and 25% for line offices.

Byrne - Is your work reactive or proactive?

Showalter - We're proactive on research. We respond to requests to do work on the focus areas.

Orbach - What is total staff?

Showalter - 4 FTEs but we are the only law center with ocean and coastal law fellowship

Orbach - How much do you work with other law schools?

Showalter - We work through the Sea Grant Legal network. We created two internships in MN for dredging project and started a partnership with two law schools.

West - Do you work with NOAA GC?

Showalter - No, we're non-advocacy.

#### **Research (Stephen Sempier, Gulf of Mexico Regional Research Planning Coordinator)**

Sempier - We focus on regional research activities in the GOM.

Woeste- There has been a lot of feedback from discussions and decisions from the board and we see a good demonstration of these things happening in your network.

West - How frequently do you deal with the NOAA regional coordinator?

Sempier - Buck Sutter is in St. Petersburg, but we talk to him almost daily since the oil spill. We also have a monthly call.

Orbach - How much involvement do you have with the social science community?

Sempier - we need to fill that gap in the region. MS-AL and LA SG have resource extension agents. No successful social science projects were funded this past RFP.

Murray - Early on in oil spill, Sempier was way out front from the regional plan (1500 people were involved). He looked at a sub-sample and got responses from 300 - got public interest in various oil spill research and activities. It was the only thing NOAA had and it came from Sempier. He expanded it recently and reported it to NOAA Science Box. It was very instrumental in leading NOAA.

Cammen - Sempier is reporting on these things and has been right in the middle of most of them. It is very impressive.

West - The more GOM Sea Grant reports to the NOAA regional coordinator, the more NOAA hears about us.

#### **4:15 Knauss Selection Committee Updates (Harry Simmons, NSGAB and Chelsea Lowes, Knauss Fellowship Coordinator)**

Simmons - This is an inspiring piece of what Sea Grant does. It was great to be on the selection committee. I was gratified to see how many qualified candidates. We

chose 49 out of 99 candidates and it was a very impressive group of students. Placement week is November 14-19. The application deadline for 2012 is February 18, 2011. Chelsea will be taking over for Lugo and she'll be great for this effort. Some of the candidates were harmed by Sea Grant directors not spending time or writing anything useful about them. Sea Grant directors need to spend more time with them.

West – 2<sup>nd</sup> that comment

Byrne – Students applied for those fellowships who had no involvement with Sea Grant in the past.

Simmons – Which do we want? The best and brightest, or those who know more about Sea Grant?

Byrne – Is there any effort made to find the positions for those who didn't make the cut?

Simmons – Not now.

Byrne – Should we?

Lowe – These are legitimate questions

Byrne – Perhaps we should consider it.

Simmons – Many of the students probably applied for more than one, not just Knauss.

We have 43 who have accepted right now. Do we have 49 positions yet?

Lowe – We won't know until placement week.

Cammen – Generally we have 80 executive hosts chasing 30 fellows, and the legislative side is 10 because we pay for them. We may only have 11 legislative posts.

Simmons – We do get to keep the best ones.

Lowe – The executive office staff will hire Knauss Fellows graduates.

Simmons – This is a great program.

Cammen – Should we sponsor more legislative? More offices get served, but it's less prestigious.

Simmons – We need to better educate Knauss fellows in how Sea Grant works so they are our ambassadors.

Cammen – We give them Sea Grant 101, but we don't let them out in the field or on technical review panels. This is a delicate line – we don't want them to lobby for Sea Grant, but want them to understand their program.

Stubblefield – They should be our ambassador – it's been documented that they don't know Sea Grant.

Simmons – Should it be required that the states teach them about Sea Grant?

Stubblefield – I couldn't believe how many directors didn't even meet their candidates.

Schmitt – Do we have a mid-term or post-term review of the fellows?

Lowe – There is a six month review with the fellow and host. There is also an end of year report that fellows fill out.

Vortmann – Are there organized social activities?

Murray – We are involved in day session early in the year for talks (SG 101). They tend to have monthly socials. Also, we do brown bag seminars at the library (Lugo instigated). 50-60 people show up for them. There is an active email list of alumni.

Lowe – We also keep a database of all jobs they've held since their fellowship.

Simmons – I can't overemphasize that I have met future congressmen and senators in these fellows.

Woeste – We need more interaction with the fellows. Some of the Directors did that, but

should we have another conversation with them so they know it needs to be done.  
Vortmann – Can we discuss that during our site visits?  
Cammen – We will let the directors know how important it is. Some of the programs are working with the fellows before they start are sharing ideas with other programs.  
Birkholz – I'm a Rotarian and we do scholarships for seniors in college and they get extra points if they're junior Rotarian. They learn about Rotary that way. Require one day shadowing a sea grant agent.  
West – It could be that they are physically separated from Sea Grant while doing their research. I'm really disappointed that the directors aren't more involved.  
Murray – We're working with extension leaders to have the fellows get out with extension agent a few days. They might be better off with extension rather than directors.

**4:30 Site Review Panel (J. Byrne, NSGAB, M. Orbach, B. Stubblefield, NSGAB)**

Byrne – I was on MIT and WHOI visits, so I've only been halfway through. MIT tried to have a PAT crammed into two days. I hope that all of you who haven't done it yet get to do it.  
Orbach – I was on the VA review – they were concerned with all of the different kinds of review.  
Simmons - Yes, they think they get no credit for doing it.  
Orbach – They really want to put their best foot forward.  
Stubblefield – It's a lot easier for both the program and the review team than the PAT. What is the process for completing the report? My team hasn't gotten the reports back to their school either. We need more discipline. The NSGO is supposed to do the first draft.  
Orbach – We had Dorn [Carlson] and it was great.  
Byrne – They're in reactive mode once they've been reviewed.  
West – Overall I think it's a great process. It should be submitted for best practice in the federal process. It reduced turmoil and calms everything down. I suggest we get feedback from directors that have had site visits so far. Paul Anderson was just re-upped because of our report of how great he was for that program. This is a great opportunity for my folks to beat their chests for these folks in DC. We should collect lessons learned and send them to Sami[Grimes].  
Cammen – She's been doing that.  
Heath – I was on the team for AK and RI. It is a great process. They are all very different programs so we need to remember this as we move forward. No single parameter would work.  
Schmitten – I was also on AK, and Terry [Smith] did a great job. The instructions are very clear. I think it is good that the director and university get the review and that it's immediate. We wrote the report right there. However, the question sheet has a lot of duplication, and was not particularly helpful.  
Vortmann – So there is a commitment to get the report back.  
Cammen – We'll discuss it at NSGO. Yes, 45 days is the rule.  
Orbach – We need the programs to understand that they can't tell us everything. Pick the best elements and tell us those.  
Simmons – Yes, it's usually powerpoint presentations or panels. I liked the

conversations better than the presentations. There was more interaction.

Woeste – Do we need to be careful that we stay in the three focal areas of concern to the Site Review Team?

Simmons –It should be NSGO staff who keeps the review on track.

Woeste – We had a NOAA lab person on our team and that person came away being impressed with the program and learned a lot about Sea Grant. He left trying to stay in touch with the Sea Grant team in the state.

Murray- That NOAA person left talking about money they want to spend on that program.

Byrne – Judy Gray will be blown away. I can't make the USC site visit.

Vortmann – Can we make it easier and just do the ones from the state you live in?

Cammen – I think we should avoid your home state for perception purposes.

Murray – We need to get Birkholz and Beal involved.

Orbach – I can do USC.

Simmons – I can too.

Rabalais - I have a conflict, too.

John Byrne, Nancy Rabalais and Dick Vortmann get together to see if they can swap.

**4:45 Resolution for Dr. Manuel L. Hernández Ávila (J. Woeste, R. Chaparro – Director, PR Sea Grant)**

[Delay resolution for Dr. Hernandez until lunch on 10/17/10 as Ruperto Chapparo was not able to make it to the meeting.]

Woeste - Shall we approve it now and then present it tomorrow at lunch?

**Motion –To approve the Resolution for Dr. Hernandez**

**Motion – Byrne, Simmons - 2<sup>nd</sup>**

**Discussion?**

**All in favor – approved unanimous.**

**Date for the PRP is 17-21 of October, 2011.**

**5:00 Adjourn**

**Sunday, October 17**

**8:30 AM – 3:00 PM - OPEN TO PUBLIC**

In attendance: Elizabeth Ban, Frank Beal, Patty Birkholz, John Byrnes, Leon Cammen, Jeremy Harris, Ross Heath, Jim Murray, Michael Orbach, Nancy Rabalais, Rollie Schmitt, Bill Stubblefield, Dick Vortmann, Dick West, John Woeste

**8:30** Call to Order, review agenda and previous day's discussions (J. Woeste,)

Woeste – We needed to revise today's agenda, and we will have a joint lunch with SGA where John will give remarks to SGA over lunch, and we will present the Resolution for Dr. Hernandez.

**8:45 Biennial Report discussion and adoption, lessons learned, guidance for 2012 (J. Byrne)**

Byrne – We need to look at the report and make any minor changes necessary. The team was Mike Orbach, Dick West, Jim Murray, Jonathan Pennock and me. We also had invaluable assistance from Amy Painter and Bitsy Waters

It has taken a year to create, and some things have changed such as staff numbers, and budgets. We've included the state of Sea Grant, Sea Grant history and model, outreach & education efforts, focus areas, climate issues - the way it was laid out in strategic plan. We mentioned every Sea Grant program in the text of the report.

We included constraints and six recommendations. There are three appendices, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> appendix will be impact statements from the 32 programs.

Constraints: NOAA hasn't taken full advantage of Sea Grant abilities for engagement; we lack of effective NIMS, and there has been a failure of integration effort on coastal programs within NOAA. The report also looks at the decline in our buying power. The last section is the outlook and recommendations. It is a vision statement of what Sea Grant could be. 1) The program needs to be seen as having national goals not local; 2) We need an effective way of bringing measurable impacts of Sea Grant together (NIMS); 3) We need better integration of coastal programs within NOAA; 4) Sea Grant should take advantage of agents on the ground (engagement) 5) We need to be nimble (reexamine our priorities as needed) 6) We need more money for Sea Grant.

We'd like approval of the substance of the report and ok to release to congress.

Woeste- Let's approve substance, then discuss next steps.

Byrne – There is a letter of transmittal in report.

**Woeste – Motion to move forward to Congress?**

**Motion – Heath; West – 2<sup>nd</sup>**

**Discussion?**

Simmons – 1<sup>st</sup> page (contents) Jonathan Pennock is mentioned twice

Strike ex-officio Pennock and Murray and add in parenthesis (ex-officio)

Woeste – Ex-officio or consultants? Jonathan was a real member of the committee, not just observing, but made many contributions, as did Jim Murray. They did not influence what the report said, but were full committee members.

Orbach – Jonathan was a full committee member, co-author of sections; Murray was in Sea Grant and did not want to give that perspective, so he assisted with NSGO support. Is there anything in our by-laws that stops us from having ex officio support?

West – Let’s list both as ex-officio and move on.

Simmons – Just don’t list them twice. Also, in the transmittal letter “Congress” be capitalized in first paragraph in last sentence?

Byrne – I think we are overselling about job creation. Sea Grant didn’t create jobs and companies - can we change it to “Helped to create”?

Harris – “Was instrumental in creating”

Byrne – on page 10, we will put in the funding for Sea Grant, and on page 22 there is black square where there will be a picture of Board, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> appendix will be there.

Heath – Are the impacts printed, or web only?

Painter – Web only.

Harris – Thanks to John [Byrne] and committee.

Vortmann – This is a great balance of recommendations

**There is a motion to approve to send to Congress.**

**All in favor?**

**Passed unanimous**

West – I just got an email from OMB wanting our Biennial report. I gave a draft to Stu [Levenbach at OMB].

Orbach – Can we send a report to congress with our Chair?

West – NOAA doesn’t want to help us.

Cammen – We’re you told that?

West – Yes, but I don’t want to dwell on it.

Woeste – We will have a briefing tomorrow at 2:00pm with Craig McLean, Paul Sandifer, and Margaret Davison with draft copies or the report.

Byrne – The report will be public tomorrow morning when we make our report to the Sea Grant network.

Vortmann – We are publishing this as soon as the changes are done so we are public.

Woeste – Does the distribution list meet our needs? How many copies do we want to print? What uses will the Directors make of it?

Stubblefield – Everyone in congress should get a copy. Middle Americans need to understand what Sea Grant does for them.

Harris – Let’s take advantage of our contacts with Congress. We should do follow up visit with key staff.

Vortmann – All Board members should get sufficient copies to take to Congress and set up meetings with the members they know.

West – CARD should help distribute this; and then every one of us should take it to Congress.

Simmons – Should we further distribute this? Governors, etc.?

Cammen – It should come from the Sea Grant programs.

Heath – Discussions and web access is more useful than a printed copy.

West – Get something to OMB and the public – when will we have something to distribute?

Painter – We should have the changes by middle of next week, so by end of next week the report should be posted.

Byrne- There will be a week or two for Congress to get back. We wanted to get this done in September.

Harris – Who are key decision makers in congress to target?

Ban – We have a list from CARD that we will use for the Committees (Science and Technology; Natural Resources; Commerce, Science and Transportation).

Birkholz –In my state, there are people running again for federal positions or new people, but I see putting a bug in their ear with this.

Stubblefield –We need as much personal association as possible with congress.

Rockefeller may be developing an interest in Sea Grant. I'm happy to visit with Rockefeller. Harris has a Hawaii contingency. Schmitten does with NOAA Legislative Affairs.

**Harris - Move that the chair selects specific leaders to present to and make a formal presentations; 2<sup>nd</sup> Stubblefield**

**All in favor?**

**Unanimous**

Byrne – This would be a great document for Knauss fellows.

West – We should say that they have to read it before they apply.

Orbach – The budget graph is important to the report, so let's not send it to OMB until we have the graph. Showing how much money is leveraged is very important.

West – OMB can't wait. They keep asking me for it.

Stubblefield – Let's send it to OMB quickly, and everyone else can wait.

Murray – Let's recap: SGA is coming up, we should ask the quantities they need and reminder of uses. Woeste will discuss it at lunch. OAR Leg Affairs will work with us to get a plan for broad distribution and small group for targeted appointments.

West – When will the printing be done?

Painter –In three weeks.

Woeste – I'll need to have copies by November.

Byrne – Lessons learned – the next round will go quicker. This report is the basis for the next one. We'll update it, change the design. Much of the info won't need to be included in the next one. If recommendations are followed, then it will be an easier process.

Woeste – John, thank you very much.

**9:15 Judith Gray, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Ocean and Atmospheric Research (see slides in appendix)**

Gray - OAR is seeking an Assistant Administrator since Spinrad left. Now is a dynamic time for NOAA research and a great opportunity for the right person well. If you know someone, please let us know.

Climate service will be a very rich research component of NOAA. The public's ability to receive this kind of information is lacking. There is a huge role for Sea Grant and the climate service. We won't take the climate research from AOML and give that to Climate. NOAA said it would not break up any labs for climate service. Boulder (ESRL) is going to climate service, but AOML and PMEL are staying in OAR. But these are uncertain political times and we don't know what would happen if congress changed hands. Climate Service process would greatly slow down. All climate labs are still part of OAR until told otherwise.

Orbach – What is the difference between climate and weather?

Gray – Climate starts from long time frame and comes to shorter time frames and Weather is the opposite. Predictions at longer time scales are much more difficult to model. ESRL is trying to bridge gap between weather and climate.

The National Ocean Council of the NOP just had their first meeting. No interagency meetings yet, but we're just starting to pull teams together. NOAA wants to be lead in interagency arean for several of the priorities

NOAA Next Generation Strategic Plan: four primary objectives -  
Healthy oceans – NMFS  
Resilient Coastal Communities – NOS  
Climate Adaptation – Climate  
Weather ready nation – NWS  
NOAA Research is the mortar between bricks.

Woeste – What if the mortar is research and outreach?

Gray – Education, outreach and extension is a high priority in our strategic plan.

Harris – The success of the Climate Service depends on their ability to extend information to stakeholders. The strongest resource is the Sea Grant network. What plans are in the Climate Service to utilize Sea Grant?

Gray – Regionalization is imperative to NOAA and the Climate Service. NOAA has fisheries regions, weather regions, NOAA regions – none of which overlap. Climate regions and NOP has spatial planning regional structure. We need to use NOAA regional teams of some other existing structure for NOAA regions. All NOAA regional teams are tight with Sea Grant.

Harris – Climate is going to need extension service. Doesn't it make sense to have Sea Grant be that service?

Gray – Yes, it makes sense. Leon and I will bring it to the Climate service.

Murray – Sea Grant was asked by Glaken to lead background papers for guidance on regional climate service directors. Also I am the chair on NOAA training and extension service (NETS) committee – Sea Grant is over half of that. Our

- recommendations are to apply the NETS vehicle to the Climate Service at regional, state, local levels.
- Heath – The climate research is out there and but you need the term engagement; it is very important.
- Gray – Sea Grant is the interface between NOAA and the rest of the world.
- Harris – What is engagement function in climate?
- Gray – I don't know yet.
- Murray – The purpose and goals of engagement is throughout, it's just that the mechanism is not yet decided. Regional climate directors have just been hired. The piece I was involved with (engagement) was guidance for these directors. It was based on how we've operationalized regional efforts like invasive species.
- West – Great concept, but NOAA is keeping regional coordinators separate - not overlapping regions.
- Gray – We're not doing any of this alone – it's all about partnerships. We aren't all pulling in the same direction at once. Remember, we have a new administrator with a different approach – ecosystems approach to management. She is very interested in all sciences, not just fisheries (social, ecological) – Sea Grant needs to focus more on what you bring to the table as a whole.
- Orbach – Given new approach, what is the justification for OAR?
- Gray – If we were to take OAR and disassemble it, the research enterprise would die . If weather research moved into weather service, it wouldn't work. Climate language says research will be more applied there. Our research enterprise is interdisciplinary and helps inform more research (social informs ecological, and that informs fisheries). From a meteorology perspective, the chain is basic science to applied to transfer to operations to weather man – the spectrum needs all capabilities to communicate.
- Orbach – Isn't it true of a broad need for research integration?
- Gray – Yes, but we don't have all of the NOAA research in OAR For example - NCCOS is in NOS – why isn't this in OAR?
- Byrne – Without OAR research gets gobbled up by the larger organization. The value of OAR is to protect and integrate research. Social science complex is missing.
- Gray – OAR will become OER, AOML, PMEL, Air Resource Lab and NSSL. Also the Cooperative Institutes with those as well. Sea Grant will become 25% of OAR. Climate is 40% of OAR overall budget, 60% stays.
- Harris – Is there an anticipated budget increase for climate?
- Gray- No budget increase at all. The economic downturn will take two years to impact us, but we might go back to FY08 levels for FY11 and definitely FY12.  
There is no budget increase for labs or climate service under the reorganization.
- Harris – Can this reorganization happen under a continuing resolution (CR)?
- Gray – Yes, if there is the political will. Our reorganization plan has been delivered to the Hill and will be held until after the election.
- Vortmann – Will it take an Act of Congress or just lack of objection from Congress?
- West – It will take time – there will be a change in Congress, so there will be a change in the rules.
- Gray - We've been told that's not the case. Innovation, incubation, and integration is our new catch phrase.

Innovate – natural products, wall of wind is great  
Incubate – Eliminator trawl great example  
Integrate – medicine collection program. This is Sea Grant’s essence. Your work is fundamental to integrate what we do with population’s understanding.  
Stubblefield – There are gems like those from Sea Grant throughout the country. One of the gems that resonates is this medicine collection.  
West – this is in program, great partnerships. Governor of WV hasn’t heard about it. ID these items and bring it back.  
Cammen - After the Deepwater Horizon event – the response from Sea Grant was unbelievable. A few days after the spill, NOAA went DWH ballistic. First people there were Ocean Exploration and Research and the GOM Sea Grant programs. It was an amazing thing. There was a website full of resources for effective communications, rapid response research, GOM oil related research clearing house with NCDDC, GOM research plan revisions. Sea Grant organized 47 meetings with 4500 participants to provide science-based information to communities. Sea Grant provided legal support, translated materials for Vietnamese fishermen, hazmat training, HACCP training, information on fisheries closures, and even trained peer listeners for mental health concerns.  
Stubblefield – No one knows what we did for DWH. Our communications let us down. Things we did – not just for the GOM, but for the whole nation.  
Gray – Alaska Sea Grant brought down expertise from the Exxon Valdez spill to the GOM. Sea Grant were champions. Sea Grant does outstanding work with all of the bricks in the NOAA wall – we really are the mortar. Sea Grant is a significant part of what NOAA brings to nation.  
Woeste – This is a topic we’ve been long concerned about.  
West – Thanks. Please look at our Biennial Report to Congress and give us feedback.  
Gray – The challenge of Sea Grant is the diminishing resources. Engagement is eating research dollars. Research is suffering.  
Birkholz – Communication is essential. Sea Grant is there to get the right information out to the people.  
Gray –There were testimonials from fishermen that showed the strong connection that NOAA needs. SG provides the glue for NOAA.  
Woeste – The Board is interested in what happens to OAR and Sea Grant. Your presentation helps us catch up on what’s going on at NOAA. Looking ahead, the Board would be willing to put together a committee for feedback or proposal feedback and we would want to respond in a very timely manner. Whatever we can do to be helpful.

## **9:45 Break**

### **10:00 OAR Senior Research Council report (Ross Heath, NSGAB) (See slides in appendix)**

Heath – As I am term limited, we’ll need a new liaison to SRC  
Labs and Cooperative Institutes:

We need to coordinate better with the research labs in NOAA. There are seven labs and 14 Cooperative Institutes (CI). Three labs have Sea Grant links and the other four

should. There are 10 marine-related CIs that are in states with Sea Grant programs, but there isn't good coordination with that Sea Grant. CI in Washington State is across the street from Sea Grant. They both do similar research (local climate) but there is no communications between the two because the directors don't want to work together. Our integration needs improvement.

Deepwater Horizon:

During the meeting, there was a summary of contributions from NOAA line offices measured in person/days and there was not a single mention of Sea Grant. There is an embedded attitude that Sea Grant is not a part of NOAA.

Schmitt - In your slide you say "How did we screw it up so badly?" Are you referring to Sea Grant?

Heath - "We" is the federal government. Since we don't know where 75% of the oil went it is a big problem.

Orbach - Who is connecting this failure to Sea Grant? People are connecting Sea Grant with good community aspects of the DWH incident.

Harris - Was Sea Grant saying there was no oil plume or NOAA?

Heath - NOAA

Stubblefield - I'm disappointed that you think we screwed up. Problems made it in the media, but more good things have come out of it.

West - Be careful when you say we did well. OMB told NOAA not to release this information. How did OMB get involved in making these decisions? This hasn't tainted Sea Grant, but be careful.

Byrne - We had an emergency, but someone should have been thinking about the scientific opportunity.

Orbach - This was not a Sea Grant issue. We need to have a plan in place for disasters.

Harris - Follow up with recommendation that there are pending catastrophes and we need to prepare for the science response for these. What should Sea Grant be doing?

Heath - McLean enjoyed this presentation and is in support of contingency science response plans.

Woeste - We had a representative for Sea Grant at the SRC meeting, our involvement was a contribution and it gave us a measure of our challenges moving ahead. Since Ross Heath is leaving the Board soon, we'll need for another SRC liaison.

### **10: 30 Nikola Garber, NSGO – Travel Issue and NSGAB**

I understand that you have concerns with our travel and reimbursement process. We've been taking these issues to the head of contracts for AdTrav. There are many issues but we're working on it and we agree that it's unacceptable. Issues with ticketing more than a month in advance; availability of nonrefundable rickets - I can sign my name for nonrefundables. We had more problems because you are considered federal government employees, so you all had to get names and passwords for the system- we complained and another FACA board complained so now you're invitational travelers. They have switched it back. Now have your profiles in the system. We are going to complain to head of contracts again about the process, AdTrav's contract is coming up. We're trying to get hotel and registration in advance, but those need triple bids. We need blanket contract for travel. Go with lowest bidder. Other FACs have full time FACA person, but we don't have that

luxury, so sorry.

Harris – Other agencies have no problems with this. Why do we?

Garber – They have people dedicated for contracts. Let's get the next three or four meetings set and maybe we can get contracts done and cover it.

Harris – Can we be added into another agencies agreement?

Garber – It takes 6 months for an interagency agreement.

Cammen – Can we get a blanket nonrefundable ok for travel?

Garber – No, but if nonrefundables are acceptable, I need to sign within 24 hours. Just let us know and we'll handle it quickly.

Cammen – Can't we just approve it in advance?

Garber – Yes, but we need to confirm the itinerary.

Simmons – I'm the mayor of a coastal community. If there were to be a major storm, I would have to leave early. What would the charge be if I left early?

Garber - \$150 change fee plus new fare.

Orbach – We travel for a lot of other agencies, but OAR is harder. Appreciate your report and we see that there is effort.

Garber – Ann [Andrus] and I were very frustrated. Let's talk offline to see what works with other groups.

Byrne – Easier for us to just go through Ann?

Garber – Yes. She knows how to do the nonrefundable. Please use Ann if it's easier for you – you can just send your flights you want, we'll work with you to get it taken care of.

Orbach – Ann has been very responsive. We don't want to overburden her

Garber – We'd rather do it.

### **11:00 New Activities in NOAA: a Sea Grant perspective (L. Cammen)**

#### **-Ocean Policy Report**

#### **- Next Generation Strategic Plan and OAR Next**

#### **-NOAA Reorganization and the NOAA Climate Service**

**(See slides in appendix)**

### **Discussion**

Cammen- Judy Gray basically covered this material so let discuss it if you have questions. Murray sits in on NOAA climate extension planning and Sea Grant involvement. My point of view is that we've been involved in NOAA Climate Service development in FY10 budget. This involves extension capabilities and enhanced RISA programs. Sea Grant's capabilities will be considered during the planning in the future.

Harris – Isn't the Climate Service essentially complete and decisions made already?

Murray – The structure is complete, but operations have not even started. There is a Congressionally-approved NOAA Climate Service; the operational structure including regional climate centers are just getting started.

Harris – How is it that it's gotten this far and we don't know our role yet?

Murray – I've been involved in discussions.

Schmitt – Gray says new climate service is no cost and no new funds. They are hiring people as directors for cohabitation with Weather Service. Where is money coming

from to make these hires?

Cammen – Not sure where the money is coming from. There will be no office staff for directors; the new Climate Service is a line office without new secretaries, budget people, etc.

Harris- We're missing our chance. Sea Grant should be the main extension arm for the new Climate Service. The Advisory Board hasn't been asked to participate in any climate service discussions. We need to meet with Jane now, not after it's done. They need to utilize Sea Grant the way it should be.

Murray- Yes, we've been making that case for a long time. Making the case we have assets they need for climate. We've done a good job of making that case. Affirmation from the outside would be helpful. Also, our climate initiative was not what the Futures Committee report recommended, but the report led to our office funding \$1 million for climate initiatives. We got maybe an additional million more flex money for this year and it may go into climate.

Byrne – The USDA extension service would be delighted to take over climate extension service.

Murray – Yes, but the dilemma is that if NOAA creates the national Climate Service and we make the case that you have to use extension assets- we only function in 32 states. What happens with the other states? Maybe we should meet with National Institute of Food and Agriculture [formerly the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service) to discuss extension.

Harris – We need an appointment with Jane about what we feel our role is in Climate.

Murray – We have a meeting with Larry Robinson and we could discuss it then.

West – It's too late. [Jane] has already submitted her reorganization to OMB.

Stubblefield – Sea Grant is known for its extension on climate change. Sea Grant will have a place at the table.

Orbach – Someone from the Board should sit down in developing an operational discussion in close consultation with NSGO.

Cammen – We've been involved in the operational design of the thing – they just haven't gotten to that level yet.

Woeste – Leon, are you comfortable with plan that's been submitted? Other than to say "Sea Grant has assets to enhance your program" I don't know what else to say.

Murray – I think we say to NOAA "We have great assets, but if we don't get money, our folks are too busy to take on more." Our strategy has been to affirm Sea Grant's capabilities. Eileen Shea is the key person heading up regional climate service centers and that's where the action will be for Sea Grant. My concern is too often when money is available the tendency is to spend it internally in NOAA. Work with NETS and they'll compete for the money.

Woeste – Gray said that there is someone tasked with visioning the future OAR. Who is the head of visioning?

Cammen- The essence of what OAR will look like after the Climate Service is that it will look like it looks right now. There are no plans to bring other parts of NOAA into OAR. Sea Grant will have a larger role in social sciences.

Stubblefield – For last 10 years there's been series of coastal ocean programs that evolved over time. Is there any thought of integrating programs?

Cammen- There is a Coastal Goal throughout NOAA. There are the enterprise objectives

and four mission goals – coasts oceans, weather , climate and research, engagement objectives: holistic understanding : means getting social science integrated with chemical physical and biological modeling. We need to bring social science to the same level as the other sciences. Science is within OAR and within OAR, Sea Grant is the group to do something about the gap in social sciences.

Vortmann – Can OAR expand in the eyes of NOAA via Sea Grant work?

Cammen – Yes.

Vortmann- This is the first time I've heard NOAA recognize this need [social science] and I want to encourage it.

Orbach –There is some social science in NMFS, not in OAR, and within OAR, Sea Grant is the logical place to house it.

Harris- We said a year ago that Sea Grant needed to be better integrated with NOAA and you've done a great job. If you look at four NOAA goals, three are very close to our focus areas. Would it be advantageous to change the names of our focus areas to closely reflect the NOAA strategic goals so that it was clear that Sea Grant is right in there with the NOAA strategy? It would send a strong message.

Cammen – We can think about doing it. Our plan looks like their plan and ours came first. NOAA strategic plan will have a 5 year plan for goals. Our budget dollars sit somewhere else, but we're tied to NOS by a Memorandum of Understanding.

Byrne- Was Jane involved in the creation of NOP priorities and NOAA involvement?

Cammen – Yes.

West - We need to use Rhode Island Sea Grant experience to inform coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) framework – NOAA will be leading this effort. The lesson learned from Rhode Island is that you need a lot of science, not just planning. Data needs to have gaps filled. The important point is the time line – NOC just organized and 5 years later we are supposed to have CMSP for the country. This is ambitious and assumes funding we don't have. We're not starting from ground zero – states have been doing this for 29-30 years.

Woeste- We should think over what the Board should do in response to NOP, OAR and NOAA Next Generation Strategic Plan. We need to decide who we talk to and what message. After Gray and Cammen's comments, we have various thoughts about the Board to reaffirm the report, so Harris and West drafted something that the Board might want to do.

Harris – It is a letter from Woeste to Lubchenco (see appendix for copy of letter.)

**Simmons- Move to send it**

**West 2<sup>nd</sup>**

**Discussion – Comments?**

Murray – Great idea, the problem is that we've trouble had getting stuff through NOAA. My suggestion is to have it come from John Woeste, not Board.

**All in favor**

**Motion carries unanimous.**

Stubblefield – I'm not sure I'd send it to Jane's staff. It should be a personal letter.

Harris -No cc:s

Byrne- via email, will Jane read it?

Woeste – Since the spring meeting, all communication has been by email.

Harris – Personal hand delivery would be best.

Murray – Larry Robinson is number 2. We are meeting with him on Wednesday so we should let him know it's coming.

Orbach – Send it to their principal assistant.

Woeste – Murray – get a list of last 10 years who have been board members and include them on future correspondence such as the Biennial report, and Board newsletter.

## **12:00 Lunch**

### **1:15 Scientific Advisory Board meeting presentation – November 30-December 1 in DC (J. Woeste)**

Woeste – We have the opportunity to brief the NOAA Science Advisory Board on the Biennial Report to Congress. We need someone to do the briefing.

West – I can do it.

### **1:30 Focus Team liaison reports and discussion**

#### **Healthy Coastal Ecosystems (N. Rabalais, NSGAB, Miguel Lugo, NSGO)**

**(See slides in appendix)**

Stubblefield – Too many nutrients in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Lugo - Yes, There is a Presidential order to address the Chesapeake Bay watershed-we're trying to get more involved.

Stubblefield - Yes, however the greatest concern for the states is that these types of orders are bankrupting them. Whatever role we can play would be useful.

Orbach – In restoration, how do you define and deal with sea level rise/climate change?

Lugo –The GOM researchers might be taking that into account. Most are dealing with invasive species and creating habitat. Nancy, are you aware of our taking into account climate change?

Rabalais – Not yet.

Byrne – Is anyone looking at new wetlands that will be created?

Vortmann – What role might Sea Grant play in getting people to think about those questions? Which focus area will address this?

Lugo – It will be three out of the four, just not Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply.

#### **Hazard Resilience in Coastal Communities (J. Byrne, NSGAB, Lisa Adams, NSGO Knauss Fellow)**

**(See slides in appendix)**

Adams – We have five people resigning from the HRCC team and it's a significant portion of our team.

Byrne – Has the team developed a primer for hazard response of any nature?

Lisa - FEMA is required to have hazard mitigation plans (HMP) and Sea Grant partners with that effort. We're not emergency responders.

Simmons – HMPs are required, but it's not that level of detail.

Heath – State levels have this kind of plan.

Adams – Some of the programs are developing homeowner hazard handbooks –HI and MS.

## **Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)**

### **(See slides in appendix)**

Harris – At our site review at University of Florida we ran into advocacy issues – we have a responsibility to suppliers, fishers, and consumers. We insist that seafood is fine and market it without evidence of safety. Do we advocate too strongly in SSSS for marketing and supply rather than safety?

Schmitten – Not enough of an expert, but I think safety is foremost. We focus on looking at distribution chains to ensure safety.

Harris – Extension agents are working with fishermen every day, and not so much the consumers. The press about the “Sniff Test” made Sea Grant look foolish.

Woeste – It is a valid first line test. How else could we determine it?

Harris – What I saw was made us look foolish.

Schmitten- When the Exxon Valdez spill occurred we were going to open only one of three fisheries for sablefish. People took tissue samples to look for hydrocarbons. That sounds more professional than a sniff test.

Byrne – Food safety has a major role for CES. It is not just Sea Grant extension only. CES focuses on consumer issues.

## **Sustainable Coastal Development (R. Heath)**

### **(See slides in appendix)**

Heath- Two of the areas in our focus team have Ning sites (Climate - <http://sgccnetwork.ning.com/> and Sustainable Coastal Community Development <http://sgsccd.ning.com/>.) They are not part of the Sea Grant/NOAA site, but separate sites that are good and interactive. We need to learn how to close the loop – get focus team info to the programs. We do work and report to the Sea Grant directors but the information never filters to the network. We need to bring Sea Grant into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and start blogs.

Woeste – Are their agents and specialist with various focus teams that would be interested in communicating this or compiling a mailing list to get information out?

Heath – The Ning site for SCCD does that.

Murray – These are virtual networks and communities of practice, but they aren't tracking perfectly to the focus teams – climate, fisheries, extension, education.

Adams – We are working with Garber on NIMS and the updated website and building new address book and list of expertise. We ask the team members to form their own bio and what projects they're working on. If you're a part of the Sea Grant network, you can click on expertise on “climate change” and then press “email this group” and it would go to the right people.

Schmitten – Distribution chains are breaking down because it's all about the PI.

**2:00** Break – 15 minutes

## **2:15 Captain Eric Trehubenko, Executive Officer, Naval Oceanographic Office**

### **(See slides in appendix)**

Woeste – Do you have data and information that is available for us to educate coastal decision makers? What is the extent of flow of info to NOAA?

Trehubenko – A lot of data in ocean circulation models are leveraged by NOAA. We have a very close relationship. NOAA’s National Data Buoy Center is at Stennis.

West – When I was oceanographer, someone sued the navy for use of high res bathymetry. How much of DOD data is available to the public?

Trehubenko – 90%

Byrne – How much is used?

West – Very little.

Orbach – How do you relate to NWS and Climate?

Trehubenko – Major Titley is involved with DOD DOC task force. New long term modeling support effort to get zero to 30 year model of climate change/weather

Orbach – There is always reticence to deal with military, but Navy is on the cutting edge of climate change planning. Can you spread that gospel?

Trehubenko – Within our circle, it looks like we are getting the message out via YouTube or radio/tv with the Admiral addressing climate change.

Orbach – How do we take advantage of it over time?

Trehubenko – We have a Sea Grant fellow on the staff working with the principle action officer for Admiral Titley on climate change)

West – There was a summer study at war college “What will the ocean look like in 2025?” What is the rate of Sea level rise? The information is public knowledge but not out.

Harris – Is there any naval climate change adaptation planning that is unclassified to see the state of the navy’s information/data?

Trehubenko – Yes, There is a task force on climate change (in infancy) but I can put you in touch with key officer. The task force has a Facebook page- (<http://www.facebook.com/NavyTFCC>)

Byrne – You focused on surface conditions, anything about subsurface conditions?

Trehubenko – Focus is to analyze and forecast acoustic conditions. We’re the navy – we try to hide and find submarine contact. That’s the extent of subsurface research.

West – That was the largest investment during the cold war. It gave rise to Scripps and WHOI. Once the Berlin Wall came down, the Navy was no longer interested in deep ocean research. The threats now are in brown/shallow water. Not security, but survival.

## **2:45 Public comment period**

Ban– The Board received no written or public comments

## **3:00 Adjourn**