

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Meeting
March 4-6, 2013
Meeting Minutes

The Melrose Hotel
2430 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037

Sunday, March 4, 2013

8:00 AM—Introductions, review agenda, approval of minutes, etc. (Dr. Nancy Rabalais, Chair, NSGAB)

Roll Call:

Board Attendees present: Nancy Rabalais, Bill Stubblefield, Rollie Schmitt, Paulinus Chigbu, Amber Mace, Rosanne Fortner, Dick West, Dale Baker, Frank Beal, Dick Vortmann, Jeremy Harris, Harry Simmons, Patty Birkholz, Leon Cammen (*Ex-Officio*).

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO): Elizabeth Ban (Designated Federal Officer), Nikola Garber, Sami Grimes, Amy Painter, Dorn Carlson, Gene Kim, Mike Liffmann, Chris Hayes, Joshua Brown, Terry Smith, Hank Hodde, Gabe Dunham, Chelsea Berg, Jonathan Eigen.

Other attendees:

Kathryn Sullivan

Robert Detrick—Assistant Administrator for the Office of Oceanic & Atmospheric Research

Craig Mclean—Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Office of Oceanic & Atmospheric Research

LaDon Swann—Sea Grant Association, President

Jennifer Maggio—National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, 2020 Company LLC

Julie Galkiewicz—National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, 2020 Company LLC

Stuart Levenbach— Office of Management & Budget

Paul Bradley— Office of Management & Budget

September Draft Minutes (H. Simmons, 2nd R. Schmitt, all approved)

Chair Update (N. Rabalais, NSGAB)

Dr. Rabalais made a few comments to the committee in regards to Sequestration and how funding will be a lot tighter, for example, travel. Dr. Rabalais reported the Biennial Report to Congress is complete and was presented to the NOAA Scientific Advisory Board, where it was well received. The next Biennial Report will be geared more towards focus teams and groups that feed into the National Program. Through these various programs, we stay connected. We don't just meet twice a year; we do things all year long. We try to keep Sea Grant in the eye of the elected officials.

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) Report (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Dr. Cammen welcomed the New Board Members and thanked those who participated in the Performance Review Panel, the Biennial Report Committee, and the, 2014-17 Network Strategic Planning Committee. Admiral West gave a special thanks to Ms. Amy Painter for her hard work on the Biennial Report. Dr. Rabalais thanked Dr. Amy Scaroni (not present) for her help as well.

Year in Review:

Accomplishments, Planning Implementation and Evaluation (PIE) Cycle, National Grants Portfolio, Superstorm Sandy Response, NOAA Engagement and Congressional Engagement.

Sea Grant FY2012 PM's & Metrics:

It was noted there will be a joint committee with the SGA to try and collect accurate measurements between degrees awarded and students supported.

Outlook Year Ahead:

It was noted that NOAA is developing its 5 year Research Plan that reacts to the recommendations. Dr. Kathy Sullivan will be responsible for reacting to the report.

Budget Update:

Currently the NSGO is delaying RFP's. The window is bumping up against Grants Online and the NSGO needs to put out the RFPs or there is no way to award possible funding. The NSGO will hold the results of the competition until funding becomes available. The NSGO will either add funding in or fund half this year and half next year. Programs will be notified in a timely manner if the NSGO doesn't receive funding.

Outlook- FY 13 Appropriations:

Sea Grant has 3 budget lines and the NSGO would like to see them combined as one total. It has an impact on base funding and currently Congress hasn't been separating the budget.

Outlook-Competitions:

This year the NSGO plans to fund 4 regions instead of 8 for the Regional Collaboration Grants. Projects will be larger and more competitive.

Outlook-Aquaculture:

Extension projects are planned for this year.

Outlook-Community Climate Adaptation:

The plan for the NSGO is to fund ten projects through base funding. If there is a 5% sequester, other funding will have to be found. Program participants of the 30K and 100K will meet next week in Santa Monica to review the progress of these projects.

Sea Grant Association (SGA) Report & SGA Ad Hoc Growth Team (L. Swann, President, SGA)

Reviewed Past President Pennock; SGA Past Presidents; 2013 Board of Directors; SGA Standing Committee; 2009-13 Focus Teams; Sea Grant Growth Committee.

Sea Grant Week 2014 will be Clearwater Beach, FL September 8-12, 2014

Dr. Stubblefield believes marketing is the key to growth and the NSGO needs help. This cannot be done without effective partnerships and resources which is needed to have a continual presence in the Administration.

SGA Ad Hoc Growth Team: Dr. Swann reported the committee would like input on the growth and strategies and what needs to be included.

Discussion

The group discussed the need to look for external funding and not just federal funding. It was noted that the SGA is a 501(c) (3) and is currently looking into funding from the Kresge Foundation. The group encouraged growth and in looking at new ways of leveraging funds including local funding from mayors, county commissions, partnerships, etc. There needs to be a plan on how to receive funding from other areas. A good way to do this would be to find out how other programs are receiving external funds and ask them to share their stories and ideas. Currently the NSGO hasn't looked into private sector funding, but is interested in looking into. It was suggested to look further into C-3 and outside funding. OMB suggested Sea Grant look into what is organic in the new and emerging themes and what can be marketed. Fisheries extension is an area that is not crowded and isn't mentioned enough.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Panel (S. Levenbach and P. Bradley, OMB)

Dr. Rabalais introduced Dr. Levenbach and Dr. Bradley.

OMB: Dr. Levenbach reported the decisions that impact NOAA are indirectly impacted by other areas. Dr. Stubblefield asked if it would be advantageous to put NOAA in the Department of Interior. Dr. Levenbach replied this has been discussed.

Normal Budget Timeline: Dr. Bradley reported it is helpful to put into context how the budget is formulated from OMB to Congress. At any given point in time the agency is working on 3 budgets: current to execute, coming budget year and the initial stages of implementing the first out year budget.

Current Budget Timeline: Dr. Bradley reported several dates were given, but nothing is final. Dr. Levenbach noted the best time to come into OMB is around September to talk about the budget. We should also consider what tools OMB has. They are able to do pass backs. Sometimes there are management actions. These are some issues we might see

within NOAA with respect to Sea Grant. This is helpful to put together a budget. It is important to know it isn't just a number, it is management.

Budget Structure Drive to decision making: Dr. Levenbach noted budget lines are important especially during sequester and general context. Funding is tracked through the budget line. It is the unit in which we negotiate agencies. The more budget lines, the more OMB and the Hill will have control over the agencies budget. NOAA has the most budget lines and money can't move across the budget lines without congressional approval. It is important during sequester because it impacts how it is being allocated.

Balancing: Dr. Levenbach reported the burden is on OMB to demonstrate how the budget should be shifted around or cut to get within guidance. An issue with budgets is that the Agency's mission overlaps.

How Does OMB Prioritize: OMB noted it is hard to know what is going on with all programs, but it is important to know who is using their funds and who can make the most significant impact.

Discussion:

Dr. Bradley noted the impacts and reporting used by Sea Grant are exemplary. They are really important within OMB and an invaluable way to look at each aspect of a program and quantitatively see how effective the program is. Dr. Bradley gave examples of Sea Grant's performance measures. They are an important tool in the OMB decision making process. It is important that it be quantitatively measured. The more rigorous back up Sea Grant's impacts the more effective of a program is it. Dr. Levenbach also reported performance measures are very valuable in the budget context. There are a lot of decisions being made in a very short time. Dr. Bradley replied the performance measures on the report are fantastic and gives a great sense that it isn't just numbers, but the range of what is important for the different National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) communities in the nation.

Sea Grant Reauthorization Planning (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

There is an upcoming NSGCP Reauthorization program in FY-15. Given the political climate it has been discussed whether the NSGO should be reauthorized again. The first time in forty years we haven't rolled over the reauthorization. OMB suggested creating a one page bill that reauthorizes the program. It doesn't require a lot of effort and minimizes what can be done. There are a lot of risks with the current state of the Hill. If the NSGO is looking to make policy changes to the reauthorization as opposed to having a current authorization it may be worth taking the risk, if you have a good strong support. Performance measures are important to OMB and on the Hill. It means we have credibility that we know what we are doing. There has to be credibility before the NSGO can market themselves.

Sea Grant Response to Super Storm Sandy (J. Brown, NSGO)

Impacts to Sea Grant, Sea Grant Constituents, NSGCP Response, New Jersey Response, New York Response, Other Impacts, Future Actions.

Several Board members commented that infrastructure doesn't seem to be of importance and Congress needs to get involved. Katrina involved total destruction and is predicted to happen more and more in the future. It was recommended that Sea Grant take a major lead in responding to the immediate needs, but also think on the long term and convince people to take precautionary measures. A discussion followed on the pros and cons that came out of Super Storm Sandy, highlighted resilience and how Sea Grant is working with communities. It was noted there needs to be more talk on how it is going to get done and how to find other funding instead of the traditional ways of going to Congress.

It was noted there were several comments made about extreme weather events that were already experienced during Katrina yet we still keep making the same mistake. One of the bigger questions is how people react once they get their information. There is need for social science research, including where people get their information and how the weather service can use that information in getting the word out. There is a need for the weather researchers to get better warnings out to the public. Sea Grant can be a major resource in getting the word out and educating the public so that real measures can be taken to change the structure.

There needs to be research on what worked and what didn't. There was also dialogue on technical assistance and what outreach can be offered to people trying to recover from disasters. It was suggested that the NSGO create partnerships to increase funds for addressing these issues. The NSGO has the credibility, just not the funding to make it work.

There was a misconception regarding who is getting the word out about what Sea Grant does. OMB noted it was difficult not having good information on where the immediate impacts and challenges are when looking at the Presidential Supplemental. The fishing communities were a good example. One role Sea Grant could play post storm is as an information provider to OMB and Congress and what communities are doing. It was noted that Sea Grant does provide the correct information but by the time it got to OMB a lot of the information was changed. It was agreed that more people need to stand up and say what Sea Grant does for them, not just to Congress.

Budget Update (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Dr. Cammen stated that final budget decisions have not yet been made, only generalities. Sea Grant as well as other offices has put together a plan to meet a 5.1% reduction in budget. The NSGO will be held to the plan. No word yet on whether they have been approved. If somehow Sea Grant can roll the budget lines into one, it would make a big difference and the cuts would be more flexible. Proposals will be put in by Sea Grant for the Sandy Supplemental based on suggestions by directors. They will be forwarded to DOC, then to OMB and Congress.

Performance Review Panel & Strategic Plan Update (S. Grimes, NSGO)

Sea Grant Planning, Implementation and Evaluation Process; overview of PIE; Planning.

Dr. Stubblefield wanted to clarify the next planning will not begin until 2016. Ms. Grimes replied yes.

2014-2017 National Performance Measures:

It was noted that some programs haven't been reviewed in 7 years and at some point the evaluation process needs to be completed. A discussion followed on the strategic planning process and performance measures. Many of the programs were asked to revise their plans based on the results of the PRP.

Implementation; evaluation, 2012 Performance Review Panel, PRP Members:

It was explained what the scores mean for programs according to the NSGO policy. Programs were given the opportunity to point out factual errors that may have affected their scores. If there was no error, scores were final. Programs then receive metric funding based on their scores. If after 4 years the program didn't fix the identifiable problem, they are taken to the Advisory Board for decertification. The scores were normalized (lowest mean score and raised proportionally; higher scores were lowered to get identical means scores). The scores for each program were then weighted based on level of effort in each of the focus areas. Admiral West said we need to capture this information in the next Report to Congress.

2012 Planning and Evaluation Activities:

Several of the Board members suggested there needs to be an evaluation of the Sea Grant evaluation process to ensure that the process is to enhance the program. Ms. Grimes and Mr. Hayes of the NSGO were tasked with putting together the evaluation.

Virginia Sea Grant College Status (D. Carlson, NSGO)

Sea Grant Program succession:

There are twelve criteria to Virginia Sea Grant receiving College status. The review is much more comprehensive and is a very big deal for the campus. Virginia Sea Grant has previously lost their status and since then has turned around. It was noted there are no financial implications in having college status. It was noted it is more important to know how the state matching funds will support the federal dollars. Currently there is no formal request, only the intent to apply. Once the application is received, a formal request will be given to the NSGAB for review. It was noted there is a policy that there can only be one Sea Grant College in each State. The NSGAB could consider another institution, but it costs money for every program that is added. Currently there is a program in every coastal state. DC doesn't have a Sea Grant Program because they are not in a coastal zone.

Sea Grant Legislation Reauthorization (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

Required Action for Sea Grant, National Sea Grant College Program Act Reauthorization, Projected timeline for Sea Grant Re-authorization FY 2015-2020

Discussion:

There was a discussion on the Administrative cap and the need for it to be removed in the next reauthorization. It was suggested a smaller group go to the House and give the views of the NSGAB. Then that group should report on the findings and recommendations they have. There is a worry from the group on asking to remove the cap at this time. Dr.

Kathy Sullivan has said that it is not the time to keep your head down, but to show what an incredible program Sea Grant is and that the country can't live without it. The NSGAB replied the only way for Sea Grant to grow is to remove the cap. Dr. Stubblefield noted from his understanding the SGA is firmly committed to maintain the cap. Dr. Swann replied that the SGA are sympathetic to the NSGO on the need for resources but believe in the cap for the federal government. Admiral West noted it is an issue that needs to be resolved. There needs to be a look at the value the NSGO can add above the program. Admiral West noted there was a similar discussion prior to the last reauthorization that resulted in the creation of a joint SGA and NSGAB committee to review the National Office. The Board spent a lot of time and created a [report](#) based on their findings.

Biennial Report Follow-up Discussion (D. West, NSGAB)

It was agreed upon during the last reauthorization that the NSGAB press for re-designation. Term limits were added as 2 four year terms. Issues were reviewed that are necessary to address during the next report, for example the administrative cap. The last page is important for new folks because it lists all the reports and studies done by the NSGO. The Board will be asked to do another report in eighteen months and they are asking for volunteers to help. It was noted the report is helpful in preparing as a new member.

Motion to Recess: West, 2nd Simmons.
All in favor.

Meeting in recess until 9:30 am Tuesday, March 5.

Tuesday, March, 5, 2013

9:30 AM- 12:00 PM-Open To Public

Role of the Focus Teams (G. Kim, NSGO)

The focus team reports are a great tool and it was discussed that they should be promoted further. For someone without a long history or no history in Sea Grant, the focus teams and reports are a very useful way to absorb what is going on and the intent of the whole Sea Grant program. These teams are very connected to the National Strategic Plan and focus areas. The NSGO would welcome feedback for a focus team deliverable and how to promote them.

Hazard Resilience in Coastal Communities Presentation (H. Hodde, NSGO)

Healthy Coastal Ecosystems Presentation (G. Dunham, NSGO)

Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply Presentation (G. Dunham, NSGO)

Sustainable Coastal Development Presentation (H. Hodde, NSGO)

Public Comments:

Ms. Ban (DFO) announced the Board received one public comment in writing prior to the meeting and is included in the briefing book (available online). Additionally, two members of the public were present to speak to the Board.

Barbara Blakistone, National Fisheries Institute:

Good Morning! My name is Dr. Barbara Blakistone, and I am the Director of Scientific Affairs for the National Fisheries Institute (NFI) in McLean, Virginia. The National Fisheries Institute (NFI) is the nation's leading advocacy organization for the seafood industry. Its member companies represent every element of the industry from the fishing vessels at sea to the national seafood restaurant chains. From responsible aquaculture, to a marketplace supporting free trade, to ensuring consumers have the facts on the health benefits of fish and shellfish, NFI and its members support and promote sound public policy based on scientific research. NFI is pleased to offer its perspective on the state of seafood science and technology research.

NFI and its associated group the Seafood Industry Research Fund are quite concerned that traditional sources of funding to support seafood research are being diverted to fishery management, sustainability, and consumer social communication and outreach. There is a current trend toward large grants on basic research. For example, NFI is an advisor to the NoroCORE grant housed at North Carolina State University for norovirus research. Funding for NoroCORE is \$5 million each year for 5 years of research. Norovirus is a specific topical area within food safety and the virus affects many commodities, not just seafood, so the work is broadly applicable, but a large allotment of funds from USDA are then narrowed to microbiology. Government agencies appear to have forgotten the world of food science

which includes not just the microbiology to keep food safe, but that food must be harvested, processed and packaged and it takes chemists to understand the keeping of that food, how to retain the nutrients, and how long it will last in storage.

NFI finds it puzzling that the National Sea Grant College Program has all areas focused on the environment. For NFI a “safe and sustainable food supply” means seafood from water to TABLE. Because many of us work in offices and rush home in hopes of a tasty, quick to fix meal, that means food science has been at work. Your website notes that, “With international seafood imports on the rise, and fish diseases and contamination escalating, the safety of our seafood is a growing concern.” The Board should know that between 2005 and 2010 there were 2,348 illnesses attributed to all imported food and a mere 141 of those were from seafood. None was from aquacultured seafood. Our tables are safe, though continued vigilance is ever in order.

The Board itself has no one representing the processing side of the seafood industry and therefore no perspective on what it takes to get seafood out of the water, processed and prepared for the consumer to serve. NFI is not suggesting the environment where fish live be ignored. What we are recommending is a partnership to understand and enhance water to table, but we are concerned not even partnerships listed on your website mention anything to do with processing the harvest from the sea. And there is a harvest. Your website notes that, “The rising demand for seafood, coupled with the decline of many U.S. fisheries, has led to a seafood trade deficit of \$9 billion per year.” NFI commends the great job that NOAA has done in managing U.S. fisheries and has them on track to be the best managed in the world. NOAA has made sure the supply of U.S. fisheries is not declining.

Given the situation I have described, NFI asks for continued dialogue on funding research at our Sea Grant colleges not only for fisheries management but for seafood science and technology. Industry government partnerships are often the best means to advance science. The NFI’s Seafood Industry Research Fund sponsors \$150,000 a year in applied research. This is a humble amount not intended to replace what government agencies can do. If Americans are to follow the USDA Dietary Guidelines recommendations on seafood consumption, we’ll need to couple programs in fisheries management and seafood science and technology. Together we can feed Americans and keep them healthy by eating seafood, the best source of omega-3s.

Thank you for your time and attention, and I hope we can indeed continue to dialogue.

Christina DeWitt, Oregon State University:

I am Christina DeWitt, Director of the Oregon State University Seafood Research and Education Center (Sea-REC), and a seafood scientist. I am testifying in front of this Committee because of my concern about the disinvestment of this critical field over the past decade. I would first like to highlight some of the successes from seafood science and education because of Sea Grant support over the years. This includes the development, training and implementation of Seafood HACCP for the industry during the 1990s which continues to this day. This was a tremendous achievement and demonstrated the importance of collaboration among Sea Grant extension, the FDA and the seafood industry in creating a program for the national good. The Seafood HACCP program is now viewed as a model for other food systems to use as they implement the new food safety regulations under the FDA Food Safety and Modernization Act. There were many other Sea Grant funded research programs such as surimi work done at North Carolina and Oregon State Universities which laid the foundation of a billion dollar industry in the U.S. and throughout the world. Seafood science programs at Alaska, Oregon, Louisiana, Florida, North Carolina, Delaware, Rhode Island and many other states (including now closed programs in Washington, California, Massachusetts, and Texas) helped local industries address problems in safety, new product development, smoked fish, shrimp processing, marketing and a host of other issues. This solid interaction between science and industry created an excellent foundation for the evolution of the industry and an understanding of the use of science-based information for economic growth and financial stability of rural counties where fisheries play an important role. We should also not overlook the work of Sea Grant funded faculty and programs at universities that dedicated their research and education efforts in working with industry and the consumer in communication of the important health benefits and risks in seafood consumption.

I am concerned that this work and these linkages are not getting the necessary focus and support by Sea Grant and other national funding agencies when the need for seafood research and education is as great as ever. There is inadequate investment and understanding of fisheries and aquaculture as integrated food systems producing more than \$5 billion dollars in economic benefits. The importance of fish in the diet, as demonstrated in the news last week of the impact of the ‘Mediterranean Diet’ in the reduction of coronary heart disease is one example of the role that seafood education can play in improving the health of the nation. Yet despite these benefits, U.S. per capita consumption of seafood is lower today than 30 years ago. Issues around seafood safety, such as histamines in scombroid fish, still require research to ensure the safety of the catch. Post-harvest reduction of fish waste,

nutraceuticals, innovative processing technologies, and traceability through DNA analysis, are all cutting edge fields that should be supported through Sea Grant programs.

I am concerned that the disinvestment in seafood science is also occurring at the university level where administrators feel that programs that lack opportunities in research/education funding are a low-priority and vulnerable for budget cuts. This vicious circle results in faculty not being replaced, education programs not being continued and a disruption of an important pipeline of well-trained young people into the seafood industry. This is especially critical today when students are showing renewed interest in food systems related disciplines. We should remind ourselves that fisheries, their sustainability and environmental impacts, depend on an economically sound seafood industry that can supply the consumer with safe and wholesome seafood products. This is best achieved through strong and innovative research and seafood programs supported by Sea Grant which should continue to fund seafood science as they have done in the past.

Discussion:

Dr. DeWitt said there are a lot of projects that she and her colleagues are still working on, however they are seeing programs stop at a significant pace. The problem is they can't go after USDA because they are supposed to get money from NOAA and NOAA has stopped supporting seafood research. When you don't get the funding, you aren't supported by your local university. They are in a tenuous position because they are the only food system that can't access seafood funds. They have to leverage what Sea Grant is doing and bring USDA in. Seafood science needs a way to compete for funds and there is no competition. Dr. Cammen asked about the FDA. Dr. DeWitt replied they don't support other research only their own. It is only USDA and Sea Grant. Dr. Stubblefield asked if the FDA could pass money to Sea Grant to fund their research. Senator Birkholz suggested they look into the Farm Bill. Mr. Schmitten and Dr. Kim both discussed the concern with the government moving away from seafood and who has been affected. Dr. Cammen will set up a meeting to continue the conversation.

Vote for New Nominating Committee (N. Rabalais, NSGAB)

Rabalais (Chair), Schmitten (Vice Chair), Simmons, Stubblefield

Motion to approve-Vortmann, 2nd Baker, all in favor.

Motion approved.

The Nominating Committee will nominate the next set of officers, including chair, vice chair and member at large.

Motion for recess- Simmons, 2nd Baker, all in favor.

Motion approved.

Joint Session with Sea Grant Association-Open to Public

SGA President's Report (L. Swann, SGA)

Paul Anderson (Director, Maine Sea Grant) was elected as chair for the External Relations Committee.

ERC Report-Budget Presentation-Joel Widder

Programmatic Request for \$70M-Ask for support.

It was asked if education programs would be consolidated into the Department of Education. There needs to be more clarification on what is meant by consolidation. Everyone needs to be more careful about advertising Sea Grant as a major education activity until we know the nature of the consolidation plan. A discussion followed on the funding and cap. It was asked by Sea Grant Directors to talk to stakeholders and try to get them to interact with delegation using the template created, and to share a copy of the letter so they can keep track of who they are sent to. Karl Havens also requested to have a copy of the letter and who signed it to keep track of which states are involved as well as any response.

Update on the NSGAB (N. Rabalais, Chair, NSGAB)

The SGA agreed there needs to be more time for discussion because there isn't during their meeting. They discussed creating a committee on metrics and would like to work with the NSGAB. It was noted that OMB would look over impacts which is a good idea because they feed directly into the Biennial Report to Congress. It is useful when going on the Hill or speaking to the State Legislatures.

NOAA Research Update & Discussion (R. Detrick & C. McLean)

Dr. Detrick noted the connections everyone present makes with local communities in their various regions and effectiveness in translating the science that we do into forms, tools and information through our various stakeholders at the local community level. It is integral to maintain the support of NOAA research. Dr. Detrick commended Sea Grant officers that were involved in Super Storm Sandy. They offered great advice on how to be resilient. That is great work that makes it so well regarded within NOAA.

Budget Updates:

Dr. Detrick stated in Sea Grant we try to protect our people, not only federal. We have tried to maintain our core mission capabilities. We've tried to portion the cuts between internal and external in proportion to their size in our budget. The spending plan is now going through the approval process. We won't be doing anything immediate between now and March 6, 2013. The FY14 budget request hasn't been released yet and we expect it to be presented to Congress towards the end of the month. NOAA received \$380M from the Sandy supplemental which serves a variety of different purposes. The most that is relevant to OAR was \$50M for lab and cooperative institutes for sustained observations, weather predictions, ocean and coastal research. We solicited input from our labs, cooperative institutes and programs for ideas as to how we could address the language in the bill. There was a lot of great feedback. We took those ideas and developed a spending plan that addresses those issues. That spending plan has also gone forward to Congress and OMB and eventually will find its way to the Hill for approval around March 15, 2013.

Reauthorization:

Dr. Detrick noted it is not too early to think about reauthorization. We would like this to move forward. We really need to know what our FY14 budget is going to look like and the long term impact before we get into further discussions.

NOAA SAB R&D Portfolio Review Task Force:

Dr. Detrick explained this is a review of NOAA's research portfolios. The review is nearly completed and we're expecting it to go out for public comment. We have taken those comments seriously and expect to present to the Science Advisory Board in March. NOAA will have a year to respond to recommendations.

5-Year Research and Development Plan:

Dr. Detrick noted the intent was to develop a plan from 2013-2017. The plan is now available for public comment at www.nrc.noaa.gov/plans.html. It will not be finalized until we have the final portfolio review.

Goals:

Dr. Detrick discussed the four main goals in NOAA's next generation Strategic Plan.

Dr. Rabalais noted many coastal and marine researchers around the US would say she is pleased to hear you say equitability between internal and external. She feels external has been taking a lot of cuts and not just sequestration. The more we continue to engage the better off we will be. Dr. Detrick replied it is a commitment he has made within OAR. A member of the SGA asked how we can better integrate research across NOAA. Sometimes activities going on in other line offices don't recognize the resources that the Sea Grant Program can provide them. Dr. Detrick replied he thinks it is second nature to us to think of Sea Grant when thinking of engaging stakeholders, sometimes that doesn't always happen. It is something we need to work on. We try sometimes and I have heard Captain McLean discuss using the Sea Grant Program in meeting other line office planning objectives. It is important to try and talk and make connections, but we also need to show where we can help.

NOAA Leadership Update (K. Sullivan, Acting Administrator, NOAA)

Dr. Sullivan reported it is imperative to look at what NOAA does and show how it is important to the nation. There is a plethora of needs, constituents and voices in the coastal zone. The challenge is to find themes that we all need and want together. When we can find that, all of our voices come across to stakeholders and funders. That is something we need to continue to have dialogue on with the SGA. It needs to be something that we build and share together.

Messaging Opportunities:

Dr. Sullivan said that events of the past year have provided a fresh and novel opening and has reawakened a level of interest in NOAA and new audiences that can engage and help in new ways. Super Storm Sandy in particular has shifted the debate in our arenas. We are moving into a different era and need more robust solutions. We have the ability to create conversations from civic to national and get ideas on where to build and what science we need to forward our discussions. Dr. Sullivan applauded Sea Grant for the help received after Sandy. That is a real proof of value that will stand the test of time.

Budget Outlook-FY14 and Sequestration:

Dr. Sullivan assured everyone they are looking and working as hard as they can internally. They share the perception that the budget shown in FY 13 isn't a good balance. We heard a lot of opportunities that help the effected region and build better resiliency.

Swearing in of New Board Members:

Dr. Sullivan provided the Oath of Office to the new National Sea Grant Advisory Board members: Dale Baker, Paulinus Chigbu, Rosanne Fortner and Amber Mace. (All members had previously been sworn in prior to the start of the Board Meeting on 3/4/13.)

The joint meeting of the National Sea Grant Advisory Board and Sea Grant Association was adjourned.