

**National Sea Grant Advisory Board Virtual Meeting  
June 8, 2022  
Final Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, June 8, 2022**

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC – 1:00pm – 4:00pm ET

Ms. Stirling (Board Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting. She gave a special welcome to the two new Board members, Dr. Gibson and Dr. Targett and stated that everyone is delighted to have them join the Board. She then turned the meeting over to Ms. Holmes (Designated Federal Officer (DFO)) for a DFO briefing and Roll Call.

Ms. Holmes read an official federal statement explaining her role to the group and took roll call of the members of the Board. Ms. Holmes thanked everyone for their diligent work in preparing for the meeting, discussed the ground rules of the meeting and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She then turned the meeting over to Ms. Stirling who went over the agenda for the meeting and then called the meeting to order.

**Roll Call**

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

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

*Board Ex Officio Members:*

Dr. Jonathan Pennock, Director of the National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP); Dr. Susan White, President, Sea Grant Association (SGA).

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

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

**1:00pm – 1:05pm: Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair)**

*Agenda*

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

Motion to approve the June 8, 2022 agenda: Dr. Murray

2<sup>nd</sup>: Ms. Gray

Vote: All in Favor

Ms. Stirling – We will now consider a motion to approve the March 2022 meeting minutes but we have a few corrections that need to be considered. I would like to ask Ms. Gray to present to the Board the amendments that she would like to make to the draft minutes.

Ms. Gray - Most of the corrections I submitted were made without changing content too much, but instead was to ensure that my statements made sense and were in complete sentences. I sent those amendments to everyone on the Board to consider.

Ms. Stirling – noted a few typos in the minutes and will submit those as well as Ms. Gray’s corrections to Ms. Holmes and Ms. Rohring after the meeting. Subject to what we discussed, are there any other questions? No questions.

Ms. Stirling - stated that since there are no other questions that she would like to have a motion to accept the March 2022 meeting minutes.

#### *March 2022 Meeting Minutes*

Ms. Stirling asked for a motion to accept the March 2022 meeting minutes with corrections.

Motion to approve the minutes from the March 7 & 10, 2022 Board meeting: Dr. Murray

2<sup>nd</sup>: Ms. Gray

Vote: All in favor

Ms. Stirling thanked everyone for their votes and then turned the meeting over to Ms. Holmes for the public comment period.

#### **1:05pm: Public Comment Period (Ms. Susan Holmes, DFO)**

I did not receive any written or public comments prior to the meeting. If there are any members of the public who have joined us or in attendance who would like to submit public comments, you are welcome to type your comment into the question box in the bottom of the control panel on the right hand side of your screen. If you would like to share your comments verbally, please note that public comments are limited to three minutes per person. *There were no public comments.* Ms. Holmes then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Stirling who then turned the meeting over to Dr. Murray for an update on the Interim Report to Congress.

#### **1:10pm – 1:35pm: Interim Report to Congress (Dr. Jim Murray, Board Vice Chair)**

Most of you are aware that probably 10-12 years ago it was required that the Board provide a *State of Sea Grant* biennial report to Congress every four years. There have been five reports presented to Congress to date. With the reauthorization of the legislation in 2020, the bottom line is that the Board is to notify Congress of any significant changes to the state of the National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) no later than two years after the submission of the biennial report. Historically the biennial reports contain a tremendous amount of data. The report also includes recommendations for the NSGCP moving forward and addresses whether recommendations in the previous reports have been

addressed. Dr. Roseanne Fortner and Ms. Gray, as well as the national office and the Sea Grant Network staff have contributed a lot of time to these reports. According to the Sea Grant reauthorization legislation, section five to reduction and frequency of a *State of Sea Grant* biennial report, Congress now requests a biennial report every four years and shall notify congress of any significant changes to the state of the program no later than two years after the report. This will be the first of those report updates; to be submitted to Congress in fall 2022.

There is a small group of Board members who are part of a writing team working on this report, including Dr. Engle, Ms. Gray and myself, on behalf of the Board Executive Committee. We have engaged staff in the national office, as well as Drs. White and Lerner from the Sea Grant Association as a mechanism to gain input from the Sea Grant network.

The proposed outline and the timeline are being presented to the Board today for our discussion. We plan to write the report over the summer; continue to engage the national office staff, the Board Executive Committee, as well as Drs. White and Lerner to develop a final report in mid-August in order to present a final report to the Board during the September's meeting in Cleveland, Ohio. We will have the charge and legislation as to what the report is to do to solve our legislative mandate and to comment as to whether the program is making significant progress.

There will be three components of this proposed content in the cover letter:

Management Excellence: Status of GUAM becoming an institutional program, library changes, partnerships & liaison program (examples include Department of Energy (DoE) offices of Wind and Water and U.S. Coastal Research Program (USCRP) research to application partnerships and Independent Review Panel (IRP).

New Initiatives in the last 2 years (2020-2022): which include areas such as marine debris, resilience, aquaculture, reef fish & highly migratory species and lobster.

Impacts and benefits of Sea Grant work (and response to past priority areas), such as Blue Economy (framing for all the efforts), resilience & social justice, workforce development and Sea Grant's response to Covid-19 (multi-faceted across all focus areas).

Dr. Murray opened the floor for discussion and asked if there were any questions. Was something important missed or are there items listed that are not ready for primetime?

Dr. Targett – stated that the biennial report is very informative and impactful, and then inquired how this new two-year report update to Congress is envisioned to move forward?

Dr. Murray – stated that initially they were thinking about text (an opening letter and topical paragraphs), but are open to feedback.

Dr. Helmuth – inquired if how it is written and structured affect in any way impact the Board's ability to go to the Hill or getting invited to the Hill? Will the report be a document that can be left behind?

Dr. Murray - noted that by creating this new report gives the Board another opportunity to go and talk to the Hill. How the Board decides to share the report with the Hill gives the Board this opportunity. Hill

visits would definitely be a matter of discussion at the Board's September meeting. We have the draft report now so the question is what we do with it. One role for the Advisory Board is to make our presence on the Hill. What I was hoping from this particular meeting today was to get a sense of direction on how to move forward on the report.

Ms. Holmes – shared that the Board Executive Committee has expressed interest in having a formatted report similar to the past *State of Sea Grant* biennial report and if the rest of the Board today also agrees, that she would coordinate with the Board writing team and the national office communications staff on the layout of the report.

Dr. Susan White – suggested brainstorming options for additional topics to include in the report as well as shared thoughts on currently listed topics. For the DEIJA functional area, there is a lot of activity around this that varies throughout the network, for instance what the Board subcommittee on Resilience and Social Justice is working on varies from national office engagement at the federal level and this varies a bit with what Sea Grant programs are doing. If marine debris is considered a new initiative, is there really anything to say about it yet? The programs have not received those new funds yet. Resilience is not looked at as a new to Sea Grant, so suggest maybe reframe that to sort of a deepening engagement and this also applies to aquaculture, so readers can understand these are not new, but work continues in these topics.

Dr. Helmuth - Two other bullets under initiative to consider are contaminants and we have seen new funding and actions for it and the second is ocean renewable energy, which is not new money but there are many great activities here that meet White House interests. Lastly, in the impacts and benefits section, it might be helpful that the document defines what that really means and not get confused with groups that do similar work. Others are broad so we do not want to step too far out, if it is not well formed.

Dr. Murray - Agreed that the contaminants and energy topics are good to have. Any other thoughts on maybe moving around some things in the outline?

Dr. Betzer - Reiterated a couple of things that Drs. Targett and Helmuth brought to the Board's attention, in which you might want to pick out one to highlight, and that is wind and water and I'm wondering what other renewable energy initiatives is Sea Grant involved in?

Dr. Murray – pointed out that he is not an expert on most of these issues and that the National Office staff points of contacts for these topics and Ms. Holmes is going to help the Board with writing the various sections. He also inquired about NOAA approval of the report prior to going to Congress.

Ms. Holmes – clarified that the Board no longer needs to seek NOAA clearance for these reports to Congress. What the National Office has been doing, as a courtesy, is to send the report to NOAA for awareness before the report goes to Congress. As for the 2020 *State of Sea Grant* biennial report, hard copies haven't been printed nor shared with Congress yet due to Covid-19 hindering in-person engagement, but that the electronic version of the 2020 report was shared via email – so when you do go to the Hill both the 2020 and 2022 reports will be printed and available for you to take with you.

Dr. Pennock – Thanked everyone for their input and noted that Dr. White pulled out a number of topics that are relevant and important to the White House; marine debris (which is still in review at White House so we're close hold on where those monies will go); And clarified that highly migratory species monies went to Fisheries, so Sea Grant doesn't control that, but also supports any space to increase the knowledge and continuing this initiative and getting this work in front of congress is a good thing.

Dr. Murray – commented that we just need to figure out where to put that in...like highly migratory species and what about reef fish?

Dr. Pennock – suggested that amberjack and red snapper are good topics to highlight as well.

Ms. Stirling – Inquired if there were any other comments or final thoughts to share.

Dr. Murray - Thanked the Board for their feedback and mentioned that he, Dr. Engle and Ms. Gray will modify the list of topics based on the Board's discussion.

**Break - 1:39pm** – Meeting Resumed at 1:49pm

**1:49pm - 3:45pm: 40% Committee Report Discussion (Dr. Carole Engle, Board Member)**

Ms. Stirling - Introduced the next agenda, the 40% annual report and reminded the Board that they are revisiting the report from the 40% Competitive Research and Education Policy for Base Funding subcommittee because during the Board's March meeting several members of the Board raised concerns around the 30-50% recommendation. So in order to address this concern, a motion was made to send the report back to the committee with suggested language changes. Dr. Engle has volunteered to lead this discussion today, who is very familiar with the ends and outs of this report.

Dr. Engle – In addition to what Deb has already stated, the Board will be revisiting this motion today because there were several questions raised during the March meeting, so in order to help address those questions a webinar was provided last week, which I hope you were able to attend. Both Drs. Garber and Bell did an excellent job in presenting this information. The motion still stands from the last meeting to send the report back to the committee with a request of adding additional language to the report. To date nothing has gone back to the committee and the Board will revisit the motion after our discussion today.

As a recap, the Board subcommittee is referred to as the 40% Competitive Research & Education Policy for Base Funding subcommittee. The subcommittee was charged by the Sea Grant Director to review Sea Grant's 40% competitive research and education policy for base funding. 2020 generated robust discussion, which led to the webinar presented last week by Drs. Garber and Bell. If you were not able to join the webinar, there is a PDF available for anyone who wants to study it in detail.

This is a very complex issue that expands beyond research – one of the charges to the committee was to try to provide clarity. The one point the Board subcommittee heard repeatedly from a number of

individuals was the need for flexibility and this has been reinforced in the discussions of the subcommittee. In deliberating the topics of research and education in Sea Grant is reported in funding in many different ways – this subcommittee’s charge was to focus on base funding ONLY and not the competitive portion that not all research is managed competitively and the Board subcommittee tried to emphasize that in the report. We heard in our meetings and deliberations the importance of maintaining an impactful balance between research and education. These are four of the key points we focused on during our discussions. A motion in our last meeting was to send the report back to the subcommittee with a request of adding additional language to the report, but there is no chair of the subcommittee because Dr. Chigbu is no longer on the Board. In light of the information and data presented in webinar last week we would like to discuss today as to whether or not the current motion still stands or should be rescinded and a new motion be made or to accept the 40% subcommittee's recommendations in the report and upon acceptance, send the report to the national office. I would now like to open the floor for discussion or do get any further comments from the Board.

Dr. Grau – I have a number of thoughts about this. I did watch the presentation and it was helpful but I was still left kind of confused about what we are talking about so I did some thinking and heard some of the thoughts and tried to clarify for myself – I really think that what we are talking about combines two different and separate things – what is reported by the program to the National Office to NOAA or to Congress or the Administration. And what is funded by the program to the National Office to NOAA, Congress or the Administration. What we might better focus upon is what is actually being bought by core funds. This is two separate things - one includes real match vs. other money. Match funds salaries but not actually add to the buying power of funding – does this include national strategic initiatives or budget? These are typically directed towards a narrow focus. Aquaculture is an example. They may be important, but do not engage the broad range of the marine and coastal investigators, or the great majority of the coastal community.

What we might better focus upon is what is actually bought by core funds. In other words, what does the National Director want to pay for out of his core allocation? This has consequences for how a director of a university program wishes to invest the appropriation from NOAA. In this regime, there seems to be three lines of investment. I’m not thinking about what is reported by the programs to the National Office, or what is reported to the National to NOAA or to Congress or the Administration. This is return on investment, the benefits deriving from hard work and spending.

The three types of investment are research including the training of both graduate and undergraduate students, engagement including extension, education and communications; and administration. How a university and/or state, along with various partners may wish to invest its NOAA allocation in any one of these three may, of course, vary. Universities may well be motivated in some cases to offload administrative costs to NOAA. To what extent is the National Office interested in supporting these administrative costs and how much should these be allowed to impact investment in research and engagement?

The division of investment of core funds by the National Office should, I think, be the point of discussion. It is the prerogative and responsibility of the National Director to decide, after consultation with their stakeholders, how NOAA investment should be directed. Nevertheless, it is essential that what is

coming out of the NOAA bank account not be confused with what is reported either by local programs or by the National Office upstream as these are confusingly numerous and vary among the many local programs.

Should the National director wish to have a policy that directs that standardized portions of allocated budgets be spent on Research, Engagement and/or Administration? Let's say for example, that the National Office divides its core funds as: 40% research, 50% engagement and 10% administration. This would be how it invests. The return on this investment is what individual programs add to the enterprise in terms of spendable funds and the fruits of the combined NOAA and local investment in terms of trained students, knowledge, an increasingly knowledgeable citizenry, and the benefits that coastal America derives from this whole enterprise. Along with this, we know that certain matching funds, for example faculty salary match, are not investable and are included only to meet legal requirements.

Therefore, I would argue that our discussion should center on how the National Office allocates its resources and let the return on investment be part of a separate discussion. What is returned is (1) matching fund investment (some that has no spending value) and (2) research and training, engagement (including extension), education and communications and lastly administration.

Dr. Engle - Clarified by pointing out that there was a slide in the PDF of the presentation section of rectangular boxes that show the differences in funding. Base funds plus merit funds and that's what we're talking about. It doesn't include all funding but the special initiatives and different sources of funding (or leverage management funds) we're only talking about the OMNIBUS funding which is base funds plus merit funds. In addition, not looking at all of the percent of research funding for any given program. It is very important to distinguish the two. Total research spending and not the core part of that is not actually in relation to that.

Dr. Grau – Looking at what the national office would fund proves that program funding for research including the training of both graduate and undergraduate students, engagement including extension, education and communications and some programs also used funding programs to support administration – Dr. Pennock do I have that right?

Dr. Pennock - Yes

Dr. Grau - Three ways to invest in research. Engagement and administration; and of course universities would love to lay off their budget as much as possible to save your budget; funding large amounts of administration. What can be invested in research and engagement? Return on investment; real match for states and universities and private partners kind of a payback on national office investments; students trained knowledge that is derived from research on Coast and Ocean is probably the most important in principle. The real issue is how Dr. Pennock (ultimate responsibility); how do you make that adjustment? Research and administration decisions you ultimately have to make with stakeholders, the Board and other partners and then the question is do you have a fixed policy that applies to all programs that you are funding or do you have a policy that allows you to use your judgement with each program separately (34 programs)? Do you have to make 34 different and unique decisions? What it boils down

to is what we have to divide. Do we have a fixed policy and what that should be? Or do we have a flexible policy that allows Dr. Pennock to use his judgment? That's what it has come down to for me.

Dr. Engle - Fixed or flexible policy when it comes to OMNIBUS funding or each program?

Dr. Grau - Out of his budget what does he provide to each program? Does he want to see 40% of it going to research or graduate and undergraduate training?

Dr. Pennock - I say we stay back from what the charge for the Board was and not get too far away from it. Dr. Engle, you did a great job summarizing it. My first response is oh Jon did you blow the charge since it's becoming a real challenge? Competitive research is very challenging. The issue was really there were some programs 20 plus years ago investing 90% of their monies to this and I think the weighing in should say this currently became research and then competitive research. We probably have five different policies at a minimum that says different things about that – site review teams, director, etc. the committee has done a great job in digging in as to how we should do that. The question is, has the grant changed enough in the last 20 years that we should be looking into this with a lens as to what programs are now doing? Twenty years ago a lot of programs were not bringing in federal dollars and now we're in a different climate. What we are trying to do is hold a model of what to do, and is there language that provides that. What we are facing currently is research and competitive research, which is what makes Sea Grant and what we do. This is the feedback that I would like to get from the Board and SGA. In today's world can we come up with something that provides guidance but can remove the confusion that's been occurring and try to explain that in site reviews, etc. -- not well defined areas because there's different policies? A way we can get to a conclusion – 30-50% because the committee feels that it provides and prioritizes research and understands that programs operate differently. I'm happy to clarify this more but didn't want this to be what drives the conversation.

Dr. Engle – The focus has been on research but we've also had long discussions on the competitive side of it. There's a lot of resources and funding coming in from different areas. We saw 30-50% drawing a line in the sand – importance of research and emphasizing the other areas like competitive research. The committee spoke at great length the need to maintain the competitiveness of omnibus funding and not go too far from that. We spent a tremendous amount of time talking about the importance of the competitive part that Sea Grant is known for.

Dr. Pennock – I totally agree – Dr. Grau and others spoke to the value of competitive research – competitive in a way that's intended. The Committee worked very hard on that.

Dr. Grau – It's important to know what you're comfortable with Dr. Pennock – 50%? Because you're the one that has to make that decision. Are you comfortable with 30%?

Dr. Pennock – We're still trying to decide that. Some programs will be that low is well justified because they are getting other funds on the research side in order to have the capacity of what Sea Grant does well and be comfortable with that range.

Dr. Grau – A lot of these extra funds that come in whether from private philanthropic organizations or state budgets are not competitive research that uses that as camouflage – state representatives that



gets that funding – that kind of thing is unvalued and we don't really have a robust competitive research program as we once had.

Dr. Engle - The report from the committee emphasizes the importance of programs in developing a charge of maintaining strong rigorous PIER reviewed funding and drawing a line in the sand of the importance of research and competitive research and handling funding in a research manner. Strong importance of both of those.

Ms. Gray – Dr. Engle, you really spoke to me as most of you know I was in Dr. Grau's camp going toward 40% and what message we are sending between webinar and presentation I feel the committee has listened to all the sides and created a balance as flexible as possible. As it has always been it's up to the Sea Grant office to say are we comfortable with what the programs are doing which is important and are we comfortable with the report. You did an outstanding job and the time spent on this shows how important this is to all of us. Dr. Engle, I would run for office if I were you, you did a great job on this.

Ms. Norosz – On behalf of the committee, I would like to commend you Dr. Engle for explaining this. From our discussions, there are a couple of things I would add and these are my biggest concerns. Besides focusing on what the actual charge was which is to maintain the excellent research being done in Sea Grant, it's important to maintain our reputation being that this is a product being used across the U.S. There may be other issues within Sea Grant that causes confusion and that may seem at times unfair but it was not our charge to solve all of these. We gave a large amount of attention to competitiveness and flexibility. I appreciate people getting focused on what their reluctance was and concerns were and whether that has been addressed with the webinar and how to address that further. Dr. Murray – There was minor reluctance expressed during the last meeting. But, first I'd like to thank Drs. Garber and Bell. I went through those three reports and the language differed and it was not clear where one policy ended and one began so they're really all over the place. If nothing else we will now have a clear policy on all of this. There were a lot of programs struggling to get it to 30% and I like what the committee did. From a site review standpoint it was not clear what you did with these policies and now we have language for the first time that explains this and not just this is the penalty you face. My concern is with the evolution of all those research policies. For the last 20 years or so my initial concern at the last meeting was that for the first time mentioning a 30% number. The simple thing to do would be to add a couple things to report "encourage programs to maintain their current level of funding" is a huge ordeal and at the end of day if 30-50% is allowed it would be an exercise now. The sense from me and others is that the next allocation policy you develop there is language in there that you expect and encourage (you as the program director) to maintain your current level, and that 30% is ok for some programs. But site visits have a very good rationale to rate some programs lower. Bottom line is I'm ok with the committee's report, you did a good job, but worded it in such a way that encourages programs to maintain a certain level of research when they can.

Dr. Grau – Perhaps and this is only advice to put a statement in that says something like "*the current requirement is funding of research at a range between 30-50% is allowable but we strongly urge programs to thrive towards a standard of 40%*". In other words it allows 30% but it is encouraged 40%.

Dr. Pennock - I think there is a relatively easy way to do that with the data that was compiled by Drs. Garber and Bell. There is range and variance, but there has not been over the last decade's degradation to research and funding in a significant way. I do think that whatever the committee wants to do, we can either post some of that additional language in the report and the report comes to me. The report has the key components in there and how we use that as the basis and include some additional language. Sea Grant can maintain a 40% level is appropriate and may be the reason that that varies a bit, but not dropping below 30%. If that goes over 50% what that means is that you're not spending much time on extension, education or other areas that are also important to Sea Grant. The Planning, Implementation and Evaluation (PIE) policy provides guidance for programs and has to touch multiple point levels of clarity from past policies vs things that are still alive and come up with clarity that confines that.

Dr. Engle – We did talk about some of the next stages to implement a policy like this which I think is complicated. We tried to emphasize the importance of research and competitive problem solving – then we cut it off at where the implementations will start. Dr. Pennock is saying if he as a Director decides to accept the recommendation then it is up to us to work out all the details from that.

Dr. Betzer – Thank you Dr. Engle. Your committee was amazing in grappling with this complex issue. I've been reviewing programs forever and over the past 20 years Sea Grant has had outstanding programs that do impactful things with our society but this has changed. One major challenge society has is how we try our best to shift with our society. I'm impressed with what's been going on and the extensive partnerships with Puerto Rico, GUAM and Hawaii and how we support one another monetarily is commendable.

Dr. Helmuth - I agree with Dr. Betzer about the erosion of science. My hesitation in listening to this discussion is that the funding landscape has changed, but my concern was that when we say competitive research that many discussions are surrounding stakeholder engagement and extension, so where my head has been is that Sea Grant needs to stand firm on what it has already been good at without trying to do everything. Something that is less applied given these discussions. I think there are safeguards in place and anything we can do to enhance research is important.

Dr. Pennock – I think this has been a great discussion and glad it got pushed back in order to have the webinar with Drs. Garber and Bell. My goal was to remove the confusion in the current policy and the recommendation from the committee does that. We wanted to take a deep dive into what Sea Grant is today and to come up with a recommendation. The data showed that we have good data and that it has not been an erosion.

Dr. White – Thanks for allowing the engagement of the Sea Grant Association in these conversations because you've heard the diversity of input not only from your committee but inside your committee as well. So I'm happy you realized that it was important that we have those conversations.

Dr. Engle – Thanks to you as well because you also had a director from your side that provided great information and input for the committee, so thanks to you as well.

Dr. Grau – I'm feeling more comfortable with the report and if Dr. Pennock is feeling comfortable, it makes me feel more comfortable.

Dr. Targett – I'm new to this discussion and from my observations to Dr. Engle's point and Dr. Pennock's, the key is the balance with research, extension and education and keeping that balance in whatever form and giving the programs flexibility so that programs do not feel that they have to raise to 30% but giving more flexibility.

Dr. Engle then thanked everyone for their input and turned the meeting over to Ms. Stirling to discuss how the Board would like to move forward.

Ms. Stirling noted that this was an excellent presentation and a very robust discussion and also thanked everyone who weighed in on it. We now have to determine if the motion still stands with the report we agreed to in March, which was to send the report back to the committee with additional language which addresses this aspect of it in order to move forward and addresses the actual Board report under the current circumstances or should it be rescinded and a new motion be made with the additional language that will be sent to the committee to work on over the summer and report back to the Board during the September Board meeting.

Dr. Helmuth – Are we able to vote on this or rescind it?

Ms. Stirling – We have to have a motion in the vote in order to rescind it.

*Ms. Stirling asked for a motion to rescind the previous motion.*

Motion to rescind the previous motion: Dr. Norosz

2<sup>nd</sup>: Dr. Grau

Vote: All in favor

Ms. Holmes – Our new Board member Dr. Gibson has been on the Board for two full days and therefore is going to abstain from this motion vote and other votes.

Ms. Stirling called the vote and all were in favor. Motion passes.

Ms. Stirling then called for a motion that the Board accepts the 40% Committee's recommendations in the report and upon acceptance send the report to the national office.

Motion to accept the 40% Committees recommendations and Report: Dr. Murray

2<sup>nd</sup>: Ms. Gray

Vote: All in favor

Ms. Stirling asked if there were any further questions and then called the vote.

Ms. Stirling then stated that she will be putting together a transmittal letter to send to Dr. Pennock along with the report. She then thanked everyone on the Board and Drs. Garber and Bell who provided the webinar. This was a very complex issue and Dr. Engle did a great job in laying it out with such clarity. She again thanked everyone for putting their shoulders to the wheel on this. She then turned the meeting back over to herself.

**2:46 – 2:55: Wrap-up and Adjourn (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair)**

I have a couple of information pieces to share with you. I want to remind everyone to please hold the dates for the September Board meeting in Cleveland, Ohio during Sea Grant Week (September 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>). The travel dates for attendance at the Board and SGA meetings, as well as the Sea Grant week professional development sessions should be September 10<sup>th</sup> - 16<sup>th</sup> (Saturday-Friday) or if you would like to depart earlier you certainly may but are invited to engage with the Sea Grant Network for the full week during Sea Grant Week. I will say that past Sea Grant week's have been great experiences and very well organized and focused and encourage your engagement

Our Spring Board and SGA meetings will be held in February-March 2023 in Washington, D.C. at the Watergate Hotel. The Board meeting will be held on February 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> and the SGA meeting is February 27<sup>th</sup> – March 2<sup>nd</sup>. Please plan on travel days prior and after the meetings. Board members are welcome to stay after the Board meeting in order to attend the SGA meetings. We are a bit early for our time and have no more business to take up, so under the circumstances if there aren't any more questions we can close the meeting out a bit early.

Ms. Holmes – For our new Board members Sea Grant Week happens every two years during the fall for a couple of days following the Board and SGA meetings. The spring Board meeting accompanies the SGA meeting and is held in Washington D.C. yearly. .

Dr. Pennock – I just want to thank everyone again for digging into this complicated issue and contributing so much to the Board.

**Meeting adjourned - 2:55pm**