

National Sea Grant Advisory Board Virtual Meeting
Virtual Meeting
March 7 & 10, 2022
Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 7, 2022

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC – 1:00pm – 5:00pm ET

Ms. Deborah Stirling (Board Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting and then turned the meeting over to Ms. Susan Holmes (Designated Federal Officer (DFO)) for a DFO briefing and Roll Call.

Ms. Holmes (Designated Federal Officer (DFO)) read an official federal statement explaining her role to the group and took roll call of the members of the Board. Ms. Holmes (DFO) 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):

Mr. Dale Baker, Dr. Peter Betzer, Dr. Paulinus Chigbu, Dr. Rosanne Fortner, Dr. Gordon Grau, Ms. Judith Gray, Dr. Brian Helmuth, Dr. Jim Murray (Vice Chair), Ms. Kris Norosz, Ms. Deborah Stirling (Chair), Dr. Jonathan Pennock – (*ex officio*) Director of the National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP).

Other National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) staff in attendance:

Ms. Susan Holmes – Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Board, National Sea Grant Office, Ms. Donna Brown – Project Administrator, Amanda Lawrence - NSGO, Joshua Brown - NSGO

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

Agenda

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

Motion to approve the March 7, 2022 agenda: Dr. Peter Betzer

2nd Kris Norosz

Vote: All in Favor

January 2022 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Stirling asked for a motion to approve the January 2022 meeting minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes from the January 6, 2022 Board meeting: Judith Gray

2nd Jim Murray

Vote: All in favor

Ms. Stirling thanked everyone for their votes and then turned the meeting over to Dr. Pennock to present remarks and plaques to the four outgoing board members.

1:05pm – 1:20pm – Appreciation for Former Board Members – (Dr. Jonathan Pennock, NSGO Director)

Dr. Pennock recognized the four outgoing board members(Dale Baker, Paulinus Chigbu, Rosanne Fortner, and Amber Mace) and what they have done over the years supporting the NSGAB. Dr. Pennock

and Deborah Stirling shared prepared remarks and (virtually) presented them with certificates of appreciation.

Dr. Pennock and Ms. Stirling thanked all the board members for their leadership to the board and said that they hope Sea Grant can continue to draw on your expertise and contributions to the world.

Ms. Stirling thanked everyone and then turned the meeting over to Dr. Chigbu for an update on the Resilience and Social Justice Committee.

1:20pm – 1:50pm – Resilience and Social Justice Subcommittee Update – (Dr. Paulinus Chigbu, NSGAB)

Dr. Chigbu began with sharing the context and background of the subcommittee's current membership, Charge and Preliminary Recommendations. The Subcommittee on Coastal Resilience and Social Justice has deliberated on strategies for ensuring that social justice is included in resilience efforts, reviewed best practices, literature and case studies, and has begun the process of creating performance measures/metrics that explicitly include aspects of social justice as a key part of resilience. To encourage change, taking into consideration that there is a wide range of understanding among Sea Grant community about what Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice (DEIJ) means, the subcommittee shares the following preliminary recommendations to discuss with the Board, while the subcommittee continues to work on the charge:

- Formalize the Sea Grant DEIJA committee and make sure their guidance is incorporated into the NSGAB/NSGO/Sea Grant network planning for DEIJA in all of their work.

- Give Sea Grant programs clear direction and resources to assess where they are and where they need to make shifts in their program to align resilience efforts with social justice.

- Provide guidance on metrics and how they might be applied for this specific work.

- Require annual or biennial reporting on progress made towards integrating DEIJ in resiliency efforts.

Dr. Chigbu then opened the floor for discussion and comments.

Dr. Murray - Inquired about recommendation #3: "Provide guidance on metrics and how they might be applied for this specific work" is the committee planning to add that to the site review guidance and for them to consider?

Dr. Chigbu – mentioned that this guidance will be discussed later today.

Dr. Murray - Suggested it ought to be evaluation criteria; Unless this committee continues their work we may explore that; to put into their site review guidance.

Dr. Helmuth – Once there is a perception that we have more paperwork than guidance. How we deal with the different legs in front of us and how do all the programs get up to speed and make progress. This came out of the biennial report where we want to enter DEIJ in everything we do like resilience and to make sure it's a part of that.

Ms. Gray - Something we discussed was to make DEIJ and specific requests with proposals and how we are addressing DEIJ because you might get funded if it is addressed. But this might be more in the weeds.

Dr. Chigbu – They’re being incorporated into the performance metrics.

Ms. Gray – What we’re voting on today is what the next steps for the subcommittee are.

Ms. Stirling - This is strictly informational and the committee will be continuing their work, this is a highly complex set of issues and very different in each state program. We wanted to use best management practices and the actual experiences of our programs to inform us. We’re going to continue the work and not be voting on this today.

Dr. Engle – When we look at Sea Grant nationally there are a lot of locals. To what extent has the committee discussed moving this into the evaluation process and how do we incorporate those programs who are doing a lot of DEI and the programs that hasn’t done as much? We don’t want to penalize those programs. I’m sure the committee is grappling with this and many other things but would like to discuss this and the complex issues of this topic.

Dr. Chigbu - Based on that we have a second recommendation to see where Sea Grant programs are and where they need to make shifts in their programs to align resilience efforts with social justice and make those necessary adjustments.

Dr. Helmuth - We’ve talked extensively that there’s not going to be a one size fits all. We talked about what it would look like to include local community members in this process.

Dr. Grau - Discussion about collaborating with other government agencies and various professional groups in an attempt to advance this?

Dr. Chigbu – Best practices from several agencies but not collaborating with these agencies or similar groups.

Dr. Grau – Jim and I initiated conversations with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and collaborated in a memorandum of understanding and noticed that EPA is very strongly engaged in this area and there may be an advantage to partner with them and not reinvent the wheel in most cases.

Ms. Norosz – There seems to be a lot of areas of much interest and reading through the charge the subcommittee is supposed to include external experts and who might that be and what that expertise is? The Charge is to help us out on these types of issues and explicit bias is hard to tease apart. And appreciate the work that’s been done and what’s the timeline on this and the recommendation, and hope we can be clear about this.

Dr. Chigbu – It would be good to invite external experts like Dionne Hoskins-Brown and even others from NOAA Fisheries.

Dr. Helmuth – It would be good to specifically work with other programs to see how they interject DEI into their programs.

Dr. Pennock – The Board stood this up and it’s important - one place I would be interested in the committee going between DEI and resilience and DEI overall and that’s important because we’re trying to incorporate DEI in everything we do. DEI and resilience is a massive topic and I was just told that Brooke Carney (NSGO) is working with EPA on this. We need to continue to grow our efforts in resilience, and we need to include DEI - here and more broadly.

Dr. Murray – Down the road (not that it’s a metric) when we do Site Review visits – I think adding a question that speaks to what has your programs done to address DEIJ issues would encourage the network to think about it more critically.

Dr. Helmuth – I think that’s a good idea – because what we’ve heard is that Sea Grant is ahead on this in so many ways.

Ms. Stirling – In response to Kris’ observation – Dionne Hoskins-Brown was the principal Gullah Geechee (NC, SC and northern Florida communities of former slaves and economic property groups), so we value her expertise and work. We’ve gotten a number of outside experts but Dionne is the expert on our committee. We can address that as we go forward and it’s a reasonable observation and will be taking this up in the fall. We’ll have some guidance at that time because there’s a lot of moving parts.

Ms. Norosz - Thanks because I think it’s really important to engage them, I see this work going on a lot in many of the boards I’m on. I really appreciate the work the subcommittee is doing on this because it’s really important and understand it’s not a one and done and will be going on for many years because we always need to examine what are we doing and how we are going to do this, so I’m really pleased with the attention that Sea Grant gives to this in the network.

Dr. Betzer – Jon Pennock had some good examples – Aquaculture in Alaska - that was a model that other groups can consider. I like the idea that we share best practices so we can keep building better groups.

Ms. Holmes - When thinking about the SRT’s we need to remember evaluating the years 2018-2023 and after the reviews that will be conducted in 2024, will most likely be the first time we may have a best practices recommendation – reframing the agenda may not happen until 2024; so it’s more of information in the context of structuring an SRT review/questions has to be based on the 2018-2023 strategic plan.

Ms. Gray – This is a real opportunity as strategic planning guidance is going out to the programs and so the programs will be creating the next strategic plans and is an opportunity to take advantage of that in the DEIJ community.

Ms. Stirling stated that we will be revisiting this in the Fall so that we can be very thorough as we work through it and will keep you informed. Perhaps some would like to sit in on our resilience and social justice meetings, so let me know I would value you sitting in.

Dr. Pennock thanked the committee and subcommittee.

1:50pm – 2:00pm – Resilience and Social Justice Subcommittee Membership – (Ms. Deborah Stirling, Board Chair)

Ms. Stirling provided a presentation which explained the background of the Board Resilience and Social Justice Subcommittee, the details and timeline of the subcommittee and current members of the subcommittee:

Board Representatives: Vacant (Chair), Brian Helmuth and Deb Stirling

NSGO Representatives: Summer Morlock and Brooke Carney

Network Representatives: Sam Chan (ORSG) and Linda Chilton (USC SG)

SGA Representatives: Susan Lovelace (SCSG) and Fredrika Moser (MDSG)

*External Experts: Dionne Hoskins-Brown (NOAA/NMFS) and Joan Fitzgerald (Northeastern University),
Vacant*

NSGO Staff Support: Susan Holmes

As part of the Board Education and Outreach Committee, a Resilience and Social Justice Subcommittee has been created to discuss and explore the critical but often neglected role of social justice in developing and implementing resilience strategies, and the ways that the National Sea Grant program can promote effective mechanisms to support these approaches. The Board must vote on new membership of this subcommittee. She then stated that she would like to use the remaining time to vote in new members and a new chair.

Nominations for Chair and External Expert:

Gordon Grau for Chair

Paulinus Chigbu for External Expert

Ms. Stirling proposed a motion to accept the two nominees as new members of the Resilience and Social Justice subcommittee: Kris Norosz

2nd Judy Gray

Vote: All in Favor (Motion Agreed)

Ms. Stirling then turned the meeting over to Ms. Rohring and Dr. Baker for a discussion of the Liaison Program Efforts.

2:00pm – 2:30pm – Sea Grant Federal Partnership Liaison Program – Dale Baker, NSGAB Liaison Program Review Chair and Elizabeth Rohring, Liaison Program Coordinator)

Ms. Rohring and Dr. Baker gave the background and review of the program and current programs.

Mr. Baker stated that in 2015, Acting Director Garber asked the Board to look at the Sea Grant liaison efforts and Mr. Baker was the team chair with Dr. Murray and Dr. Mace also engaged. Giving a little background – In the Board’s 2000 Report ‘A Mandate to Engage Coastal Users’ it was a concern that NOAA wasn’t doing an extensive engagement with coastal stakeholders – NOAA must recognize connecting effectively with the network is where the genesis of the liaison came from. The effort was to make NOAA leadership become more aware of Sea Grant extension and understand how it could be used to help NOAA achieve its mission.

This goes way back to the 90’s, with the first liaison positions in NOAA laboratories (NSSL, ESRL, GLERL, ARL, GFDL, AOML and PMEL). Some had little funding and some more than others. The effort grew to 13 liaisons and site coordinators. The Board team reviewed the progress of the liaisons efforts since their inception and came up with some very strong recommendations and they were implemented. It’s a very well structured process today so things have changed an awful lot.

Recommendations were to provide funding for proposals that support integration with the Sea Grant network (topically, regionally or nationally) and at least one end-user or public-private partnership in the effort to ensure relevant stakeholder gaps and needs are shared with the partner agency. Also, applicability of project impacts across the Sea Grant network through national, regional or topical partnerships. So, today there is funding, recruiting, operations, reporting and evaluation.

Based on recommendations from the Board, there are now well defined goals. There also has to be a Sea Grant host program, competition for new liaison, significant and meaningful financial contributions from all partners - this is the framework.

Based on that, there was funding to do a competitions with these requirements:

- at least one federal partner agency or program whose goals support Sea Grant strategic priorities and /or one of the Sea Grant network vision plans,
- be integrated with the Sea Grant network (topically, regionally or nationally). These things had to be applicability of project impacts across the Sea Grant network through national, regional or topical partnerships.

Competitions were held with FY21 Funding for 2-3 liaisons at up to \$100K National Sea Grant federal dollars annually for four years and +50% non-federal match, plus “substantial” federal partner funding was required. There were 11 proposals and from those proposals, 6 new liaisons were selected. FY21 there was \$1,886,524 in total funding (\$749,175 (NSGO), \$670,642 (partner) and \$466,708 (non-federal match)).

The distribution of liaisons is as follows: new liaisons:

- Department of Energy – Offshore Wind Energy Liaison
- Department of Defense - Coastal Resilience Liaison
- US Fish & Wildlife Service - Aquatic Invasive Species Liaison
- NOAA, EPA, US Geological Survey - Community Science Liaison
- NOAA NCCOS and NESDIS - Harmful Algal Bloom Liaison
- NOAA Fisheries Milford Lab - Shellfish Aquaculture Liaison.
- The remaining existing Liaisons and partners are:
- NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Lab - Ocean Acidification Liaison
- NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Lab - Tsunami Liaison
- Great Lakes Environmental Research lab/NOAA Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Team - Great Lakes Sea Grant Liaison

There are also other liaison types of positions – Climate Adaptation Services Liaison (USGS), MS-AL SG, VORTEX-SE Engagement Coordinator – about tornadoes specifically in the coastal areas in the SE. Not funding but playing a little match-making. National Water Resources Scoping Lead. New program is great. This was the first year everyone was funded in May of last year, and we’re going to start doing webinars and newsletters. It's a great program and I'm grateful to the Board for all the recommendations they made.

Questions:

Dr. Murray – I was on the original committee with Dale and agree there were some outstanding proposals submitted. Jon Pennock and Elizabeth Rohring are doing a great job in including the board’s recommendations. Providing Sea Grant extension visibility in NOAA and now other agencies.

Ms. Gray – Hitting the ground and establishing the AMOL liaison – I appreciate the structure and rationality of the process and it has made incredible strides and has created a structure for others to participate.

Ms. Stirling thanked everyone for all their hard work on this important project. She then asked that we take a short 10min break.

Break – 2:30 – Meeting Resumed at 2:40pm

2:40-3:40pm - 40% Competitive Research and Education Policy for Base Funding Committee – (Paulinus Chigbu, Committee Chair)

Dr. Chigbu went over the list of committee members, the charge to the committee, important aspects of the review, the background and the process used by the committee to establish a proposed new policy on competitive research and education funding allocations and the review of policies and guidance about research funding and their recommendations to the NSGO director.

The charge to the committee from the Sea Grant Director, is that the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (the Board) was to establish a committee of the Board to review Sea Grant’s 40% competitive research and education policy for base funding. Important aspects of the review are to assess existing and historical NSGO policies and the Board reports, which discuss the proportion of base funds focused on competitive research; examine the different ways that Sea Grant programs receive and commit funds from their varying funding streams (e.g., base, state, national competition, pass through, and other sources) and how that impacts attaining the most impactful balance between research, extension and education that is core to the Sea Grant model; and develop clear recommendations providing guidance that defines the boundaries for how Sea Grant programs should allocate competitive funds to ensure that they maintain an appropriate balance of research, extension and education (the Sea Grant ‘model’) while providing a proper level of flexibility to accommodate differences between programs.

Dr. Helmuth – Research that is peer-reviewed still counts with the 40% correct?

Dr. Chigbu – Yes

Dr. Murray – General statement. Over the years the research component of Sea Grant has diminished – then it got reduced again – what the committee is trying to do is provide the programs with minimum flexibility without putting precise percentages on them – 30% research investment that’s sort of the history and think this is acknowledging more of the research efforts -- was the committee concerned about that?

Dr. Chigbu - Based on historical data, 30-40% is what I think.

Dr. Engle - The committee had extensive discussions about this policy and there’s a wide range of views between Sea Grant and the directors. Some directors expressed what you were saying Dr. Murray, that the programs are very very different – we had conversations about education and the three legged stool of Sea Grant (the Sea Grant Model of Research/Extension/Education) and Sea Grant coming out of a very strong research evaluation – some flexibility in this is that there are different programs and degrees of funding – we heard a lot of directors had strong degrees of research in their programs, but the recommendation does address the importance and value of the three legged stool and the balance between research and education.

Dr. Betzer – Is there a need to establish some trend for the increase and validation between programs?

Dr. Chigbu – I don't remember seeing a trend between the programs and data.

Dr. Engle – A fairly flat trend and I don't recall seeing a trend either.

Dr. Pennock – My gut tells me that change has occurred but between 2000-2004 or late 1990's or 2000's. That may be something that Dr. Garber pulled together in the graphs but we have not seen in the last couple of years.

Dr. Murray – A trend to reduce research is because of a time of cut budgets and 12 years ago when budgets were tighter.

Dr. Pennock – It's been a tangled web of deferred policies. Omnibus dollars – I would say let's look at aquaculture – I don't know specifically but know we may have gotten some funds for education but the way those competitions work is geared more towards the research side. This provides pretty good guidance in order to get the base funding.

Dr. Chigbu – Some Sea Grant programs exceeded that percentage in the range of 50%, so widening the range specifically between competitive research.

Dr. Murray – The policy was slightly unclear, sort of 40% - so the question is what would you do about it if some programs didn't reach 40%? So it became how you dealt with that issue – I like what the committee did that if you are not in that range you do not meet the certification.

Ms. Gray – I think that 30-50% is an acknowledgement of where we are today. I am concerned about what was happening in the past with education – it would be nice if this was presented in a way that programs can look at the three legged stool in regards to research and education because I think the message the board wants to send is to keep the rules of the three-legged stool alive and well. But this is an awesome report and you guys did a great job.

Dr. Grau – I echo Dr. Gray and Dr. Murray and I have concerns not only of the reality but the importance that research will decline or has already declined. The need to increase salaries over time for extension personnel takes away from research and education. One way to handle this is to say this is the position we are faced with now; and think research and education can be competed in the same way and either way it gains 40%.

Ms. Holmes – A question that came in from an audience member pertains to the 30-50% and what if a program spent over 50% and does that mean that the program will not be funded because they went over the 50%?

Dr. Garber – Programs can justify why they are out of that range. 26% may be because you have a lot of state unmatched dollars but it still runs with your research competitions. Given a lot of the history and how we got to where we are today - a lot of people weren't around when we were going through those changes.

Dr. Engle – The committee also discussed the budget and administrative functions, because the over budget administrative costs has to be accounted for too. Having a balanced program and recognizing that because we need to balance education and research all around. So the balance is the responsibility

of the program – this is focused on the core omnibus funds and what expectations and the overall total program.

Ms. Norosz – There was a lot of background to catch up on, so I would like to thank everyone on the committee for helping me to understand it. Going into this, the different programs were coming up with their own calculations so this is to simplify and balance how the programs came up with their numbers. So the question is, by the advisory board wanting to add more language about a review, how will this be handled moving forward and what do we want people to follow?

Phyllis Griffin (University of California Sea Grant) – Do research trainees count in the research dollars calculation?

Dr. Garber - Yes this is part of it - if accepted by the board we can categorize things like research trainees and make it easier.

Sylvain DeGuise (Connecticut Sea Grant) – \$10 million dollars for resilience and if this is added to the base then the need and value in finding what the base is and how they add to the calculations – quantifying the dollars - NE Sea Grant programs have often pulled funding to handle research initiatives so I'm wondering how this impact is quantified in accessing the amount of research they're reporting.

Dr. Garber – Basically the third page of the report – the formula is base plus match – that is not part of your base if the resilience money come through and its added to base - a part of the recommendations will be for the national office to tell you that from the start and you'll be able to match those dollars – base, merit plus match – you can show that leverage of the whole million dollars – so those are the details as to how you will look in the briefing books with those cycles and now.

Dr. DeGuise - How will this show up in the metrics and Planning, Implementation, Evaluation Resource System (PIER) – to convince the reviewers?

Dr. Engle – We spent a lot of time talking about the importance of the PIER research competitions and that's why you'll see that language in there. We talked about the Hill and the need for education as well as research impacts. .

Dr. Pennock – For the 5 ½ years I've interacted with the Hill they have always looked towards Sea Grant for a research portfolio – we continue to sell the three legs of research but they've been asking us to do the base research and we have actually pulled education into that because it's important. I believe the Hill values research. I think it's the 30% creating a little of the conversations – I think the statement itself of focusing on research puts the stake into the ground and think it's something we can use on the Hill and beyond.

Dr. Murray – Why 30%? Why not 33-35% or 40% - why did you come up with that number?

Dr. Chigbu – I think we also considered how the Sea Grant programs have been looking at their funds with research education and extension- comments from Sea Grant directors was another factor in not going with the 30-50%.

Joshua Brown (NSGO) – Jim to your question and Gordon – there are programs right now that are below 30%, some are barely above and very few programs are in that upper range. The only program that measures that is the national office. The long-term implications of the risk and other solutions – those

other elements that are underinvested right now. If the board encourages programs to justify their programs in each funded area - that is how the committee got to the 30%. There are some programs that can't meet that right now and probably not in the coming years. Some programs reached 40% - grow to 50%...what are we shrinking - management, extension? - probably not. This was a critical challenge putting any number and that balance is really important.

Dr. Grau – The fact is in the past research was required to be 50% - I started in 1979 and been associated ever since and became Director of Hawaii and one of the first things they told me was you better work towards 50% or else your evaluations won't be good – I know it's hard supporting funds for education, outreach, research but that doesn't mean we should set a standard? We have to provide the percentage to bring that back up – I suggest we accept the recommendations but build in a requirement that research is at forefront.

Public Question– Education – research scholars, internship – education thrown around a bit is it defined in the report or even relevant in the report?

Joshua Brown – There are 5 functional areas – some programs combine the education and the extension components – we're discussing separately because education is described as formal and informal – for some programs that informal falls more into what is extension but it is both the formal and informal.

Dr. Helmuth – How much is education being researched?

Joshua Brown - Knowledge generation is knowledge generation –and therefore can be a research component.

Ms. Stirling – One of the issues is the variety we find among programs and need to retain some flexibility with those programs and how they account for certain activities. At the end of the day we should consider the effectiveness of the program and an equal amount along the way but we need a motion on the floor. Any other comments at this time or observations? This is a complicated and important set of issues the committee has to take into consideration.

Ms. Stirling then called for a Motion for the Board to accept the 40% Committee's recommendations in the report and to then have a discussion to accept and send it on to Dr. Pennock or if it needs to go back to the committee and be amended with recommendations or amended in some way.

Motion for the Board to accept the 40% Committee's recommendations: Carole Engle

2nd: Kris Norosz

Vote: All in Favor

Ms. Stirling opened the floor for further discussion of the report.

Ms. Gray – I agree with Jim and think that the full report sounds great – but when you pull the recommendations out of the report it dims the research in some way. The committee did an amazing job but we need to culminate this on research programs, extension and recommendations as a requirement.

Dr. Grau - I would like to offer an amendment to the report.

Dr. Murray – I think we should have a discussion or acknowledge if there's a way to vote for the report or amend to add a statement that by reducing the number from 40% to 30% that researches just as

important as last year. We need to figure out a way to provide that message and also abide by the committee recommendations.

Ms. Stirling – Would it be possible to add a sentence that reads differently?

Dr. Murray – Part of the issue is the messaging. Make it clear that we understand the difference in programs funding sources, etc. but at a minimum it needs to be 40%.

Dr. Grau – I agree with what you're saying but would like to go beyond that – we don't want to be in a position to hurt programs that are now 30% and below. We need to provide strong guidance that the percentage needs to increase like 5% and certain any program can accommodate that. Funding is the principle motivation to get involved in the Sea Grant enterprise. I'd love to see some vehicle through which we can restore the relevant importance of research.

Ms. Stirling – Language that included the recognition and importance to leave the language at 40% - but a statement in there over time? Kola is this doable or you'd rather have a better statement.

Ms. Garber – We can't clarify what 50% research was for a program 3 years ago, or whether it is what's happening now.

Dr. Grau – I understand that but what we're talking about is what is the university component and not the national component. What does the Sea Grant program bring to the table when it comes to the universities?

Dr. Pennock – It depends on how you measure with the programs – it is possible to say yes put that stake in the ground at 50% research – I like the clarity of the report –but I'm not sure where we are right now. You're suggesting a report that comes to me amended?

Ms. Stirling – What if we take the report as written and also charge Jim Murray, Gordon and Kola and work with the committee and recognize there is a great deal of variability within the programs – expectation that research will increase in the years – different ways that programs discuss and provide many times include and exclude what programs put in for education. Amended by language that will be worked out by the individuals mentioned – wait and not agree to the motion and instead schedule another motion in the Fall until this language has been worked out – or schedule a special meeting in the summer.

Dr. Chigbu – How will we value the program without the 50% target? Encourage them to change it by 5 points - adjust the lower limit to 30% - 4 years and 50% is the target so it's going to take more than 3 years to get to that level.

Dr. Murray – Sound like we have three options – we have a meeting on Thursday afternoon – so I suggest we play with the language and present it in the next three days.

Dr. Betzer – The one thing I found out that it's always good to have flexibility – I have found what the committee has recommended is the best way to have healthy programs in the future.

Ms. Stirling – I suggest that we suspend the action on the motion or have it withdrawn.

Dr. Carole Engle withdrew the motion for the Board to accept the 40% Committee's recommendations until the committee works through the language. Motion withdrawn and accepted by the board.

Break – 3:40pm – Meeting Resumed at 3:50pm

Ms. Stirling turned the meeting over to Darren Lerner for a Sea Grant Association (SGA) update.

3:50pm – 4:20pm - Sea Grant Association Update – (Dr. Darren Lerner - SGA)

First the Sea Grant Association is excited to have an in person meeting. We have a significant attendance with Directors. Main points this week should not surprise you – 40% report; we know Deb Stirling and Jon Pennock will be in attendance. There is a lot of interest in what might be coming in Marine Debris funding and coordination and resilience efforts. We don't have a federal budget so a lot of things are up in the air. The Network and Program Management Committee (PMC) are working with a small group of folks about current challenges and a memo should be coming out shortly about how to work around these challenges and balancing that with the opportunities coming forward. Interested in hearing how the National Sea Grant Office and Advisory board are handling their IRP findings.

Dr. Betzer – I would enjoy hearing your thoughts in reference to the 40% committee report – you've been an effective champion of building partnerships – do you think the report is building up the programs or leaving room for some programs.

Dr. Lerner - Share opinion based on experience – heard a lot of things I agreed with – Gordon's comments about 50% - importance of research as the absolute critical anchor of what Sea Grant is about. Peter and Deb heard a number of comments with the critical nature of research of what we do in all functional areas and the diversity of these programs because no two programs are alike. Additional language around that of underscoring the importance of research in this report because we realize the importance of that diversity. Bottom line is that it must be PIER reviewed and refereed.

Ms. Stirling – Ms. Stirling then thanked Darren for filling in for Susan White. She then turned the meeting over to Dr. Pennock for the NSGO update.

4:20pm – 4:50pm - National Sea Grant Office Update – (Jonathan Pennock, Director NSGO)

I know that many of you attended the pre-brief webinar so if you have any questions I'm happy to entertain them. Two other items to talk about is the match challenge for the programs – 5% match Waiver Discretion and path forward. We also need to think about FY22 appropriations uncertainty with coastal resilience and other priorities such as DEIJA, Guam Institutional Status, and Sea Grant research expectations about Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs).

The NSGO has been working on partnerships and how to move them forward with caution. We're trying to match those who want Sea Grant assistance (like DOE) with programs who have the same goals as best we can.

Dr. Murray - Are you going to talk about the recommendations for the IRP report?

Dr. Pennock – Yes, but probably at the fall meeting. We're trying to get through the 40% committee recommendation first. – The majority of the comments from the IRP were about communication issues. We have so many new directors that are unclear about our allocations process. First rule is that we can do no harm to the existing programs (reducing their funding) to provide more funding to new programs or program status changes (like Guam).

Ms. Stirling - Tomorrow is the SGA meeting and Wednesday we encourage everyone to attend the open sessions in order to understand what's going on. The 40% statement will be discussed and think it will be useful. We worked out a lot of things today which are critically important and that we need to work on. Please join Thursday's board meeting at noon for the business meeting prior to the 1:00pm public meeting. We had an extraordinary board meeting today and I look forward to seeing everyone on Thursday. She then thanked everyone for their time.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:57pm

Thursday, March 10, 2022

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC – 1:00pm – 5:30pm ET

Ms. Stirling welcomed the board back to the meeting and turned the meeting over to Susan Holmes for a briefing and roll call.

Ms. Holmes (Designated Federal Officer (DFO)) thanked everyone for their attendance and preparation for the meeting. Read an official federal statement explaining her role to the group, went over the agenda and ground rules of the meeting and took roll call of the members of the Board. She then turned the meeting over to Ms. Stirling (Board Chair) who then called the meeting to order.

Roll Call:

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

Dr. Peter Betzer, Dr. Carole Engle, Ms. Rosanne Fortner, Dr. Gordon Grau, Ms. Judith Gray, Dr. Brian Helmuth, Dr. Jim Murray, Ms. Kris Norosz, Ms. Deborah Stirling (Chair), Dr. Jonathan Pennock – (*ex officio*) Director of the National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) and Dr. Susan White – Director (NCSGCP).

Other National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) staff in attendance:

Ms. Susan Holmes – Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Board, National Sea Grant Office, Ms. Donna Brown – Project Administrator.

1:00pm – 1:05pm – Welcome, DFO Brief and Roll Call – (Deborah Stirling, (Board Chair))

Ms. Stirling provided a brief review of the amended agenda and then asked for a motion to accept the updated agenda.

Motion to accept the updated agenda: Dr. Jim Murray

2nd: Kris Norosz

Vote: All in Favor

Ms. Stirling then turned the meeting back over to Susan Holmes for the public comment period.

1:05pm – Public Comment Period- (Susan Holmes - DFO)

No public comments were received. Ms. Holmes then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Stirling.

Ms. Stirling then turned the meeting over to Dr. Pennock who provided an introduction to Joshua Brown and Doug Bell to provide an update and discussion on Marine Debris.

1:05pm – 1:55pm – Marine Debris (Informational) – (Dr. Pennock, Joshua Brown, Doug Bell)

Dr. Pennock provided some brief background on the network's feedback and who the national office has been working with in order to accomplish this plan. He mentioned that it's still pending White House approval and expected to go out to our programs to respond by October 1st. He then turned the meeting over to Doug Bell and Joshua Brown for an update.

Dr. Brown stated that the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) is our single biggest initiative in a long time. The network indicated a desire for a whole program approach to be able to integrate in those spaces. NSGO has been working with NOAA colleagues, NOAA Budget, and the Department of Commerce in order to develop a 2-year spend plan. What we plan to do has been set out in three priorities – (1) Advance Marine debris prevention and removal through Sea Grant excellence in research, education and extension, (2) Focus on stakeholders needs and existing action plans and approaches that will develop lasting impacts, and (3) Significantly expand topical-area expertise and impacts in marine debris while building on existing efforts. Of the \$10 million proposed we hope 85% will be made directly to the Network, 10% will be retained for National Investments and 5% will be retained for necessary support and administration. We are actively pursuing a new hire for grant management, coordination and reporting.

Dr. Betzer – Is the 10% carry forward money or money applied to specific areas.

Dr. Brown -We are keeping options open as to whether we will do that through fellowships, etc. We want to see what the network has been able to do and not able to do in order to address this.

Dr. Grau – Is this restricted only to sea water?

Dr. Helmuth – And are we expanding expertise in hires or up to the network?

Dr. Brown – Up to the network. Stable funding that if a program looks and can fund research and but doesn't have the capacity, then they can focus on getting an educator in place in order to make that hire.

Dr. Pennock – It can include the Great Lakes.

Dr. Brown – Our current status is that we are still waiting for congressional approval of the spend plan and the national office is preparing the RFA for immediate release once funds are made available and anticipating a "kick-off" during Sea Grant week where programs talk about what they are doing or planning to do. Part of the broader plan is to have annual meetings with all participants and synthesize results in order to help make decisions on that \$5 million. In order to maintain and deepen expertise across the network.

What we would like from the board because this is fast moving is how can we be most impactful, including approaches to sustaining impact beyond the IIJA funding, and how to integrate with DEIIJA priorities from the hill and from the NAS report because marine plastics seems to be a major interest with IIJA funding so I would love your perspectives and thoughts.

Dr. Betzer – I read recently in a Los Angeles Times article that the state of CA and the business of partnerships has been looking closely at the degree of partnerships to help expand during the 5 years – so the question is what you will be doing in the next 5 years.

Dr. Brown – We need to decide how to make it useful – what programs do you already have and what’s being developed – this could go to the Great Lakes initiative funding and it can equally vanish in less than 5 years or at the 5 year mark.

Dr. Murray – Assume these efforts are a whole lot larger – coordinating the effort concerning Marine Debris and Sea Grant’s participation?

Dr. Brown – It’s happening throughout the National Ocean Council – the marine debris piece while large – but the DEIJA is such a small portion. Our hope is as we increase the capacity of the national office they will coordinate even larger partnerships and how we can best engage.

Dr. Helmuth – There is a lot we can learn through collaborations regarding marine debris and is it possible to expand past the 5 years.

Dr. Brown – Yes we are hoping to see an innovative and thoughtful approach – hopefully this will be our discussion at kick off and programs look and say we can collaborate, but can really fund the social science synthesizing across the network. There will be opportunities as Board members and individuals and would welcome your perspective.

Dr. Pennock - We can’t spend our monies internationally - territories but not internationally. Agency level within the state and national component – a lot of money spent in Marine Debris but how is that spent.

Dr. Helmuth – An example of this is the UN Decade of the Ocean and get that flowing back to the programs.

Ms. Norosz – There is enough money to have a great impact. I’ve been involved in a lot of projects around marine debris and hope we can capitalize on it and get the word out about all the opportunities around things like citizen science, so this is a good way to get the name of Sea Grant out there and gain partnerships, recognize things that are of mutual interest.

Dr. Engle – You posed a question Joshua as to how Sea Grant can be more impactful and how to measure those impacts, I’d be curious to know how you’re going about discussing this and what impact this initiative will have.

Dr. Brown – Because these are going to be standalone grants they will be relatively easy to collect, so disentangling those can be a smaller initiative – so we have to make sure PIER has the capacity to do that. Create channels to guide the activities for research and other areas to help our programs look roughly in the direction so that we can aggregate and find a set of performance measures in order to tell us their targets.

Dr. Bell – One challenge is the pace of the spend plan - it’s difficult to make quantitative measures – so we’re using the metrics that we have and it will be good to use the stories that come from this – top line is “are we making a difference at designing state action plans?” - so I think the challenge is pace and wanting to get his structure around us.

Dr. Grau - In Hawaii most of the marine debris comes from the pacific gulf of Alaska – so it’s difficult to deal with – Mississippi garbage pack comes from other sources – one thing would be good is to quantify where that marine debris is coming from because if you don’t know where it’s coming from it would be

hard to track it. A majority of scientists from specific states would be a key part of this – organizers can charge a registration fee and pay for some things that Sea Grant can't pay for. Just my thoughts if we don't know where it's coming from it would be hard to correct the problem.

Dr. Pennock – There were a few additional words in the marine debris programs, but being able to track marine debris will be something that we can build on the backside and will be an opportunity on funds that they do have to see what programs are learning. We need to be able to figure out where things are coming from and some measures.

Dr. Grau – Studying where this is coming from and maybe in the first year the NSGO can facilitate at least a literature search to discover what's going to happen in the first year.

Dr. Brown – Those are some of the research projects that we may be asking programs to look into. People have done that work and Sea Grant might serve in some sort of capacity synthesizing what programs have done and making folks aware of literature that's already out there. We will see how quickly we can get the marine debris specialist on board and see if the library has this information already in their libraries.

Dr. Grau - Facilitating a regional approach – Alaska and CA – if Hawaii and other specific islands Washington and Alaska perhaps a regional approach would be an ideal vehicle.

Dr. Bell – Programs get started in their states and then programs can come together to see what we can do on a regional scale.

Dr. Grau – If we're one of the centers then we need to find out how to correct the problems.

Ms. Norosz - There have been major meetings held in Hawaii within the last 12 years regarding Marine Debris in oceans.

Dr. Murray – It strikes me that given there are going to be a lot of new hires in the network so there's a need for national leadership in the network, so the earlier you get a marine debris guru in the national office the better - like with NSGO leadership in aquaculture.

Dr. Brown – We talked about bringing in an early year marine debris expert for day to day duties and exploring what can come out of that sort of like LaDon Swann's position (National Aquaculture Liaison) – we hope to get that initial slug of money out to the programs first and once they have the capacity we will be able to provide these other things but yes, a synthesis component is significant. We are going to have to have a mix of senior and junior folks from the network – the moment this funding announcement goes out that community of practice will exist. The goal is like the aquaculture and climate networks vs. the other things that over time goes away.

Dr. Murray - Recommendation that you should get a senior person in there like LaDon that can lead a new national program. They need to have the stature to symbolize that.

Dr. Pennock - DEIJ in Sea Grant has done an exceptional job and the networks working with us have done a great job- we're actually proposed to have this a full time federal position but basically it's going to be very challenging (term position) because its seen as a one-time investment – hiring federal staff is not seen as very positive so we're trying to work our way through that as best we can.

Dr. Brown – Jon Pennock, Kola Garber and I are meeting and coordinating closely. So we're making sure we build a grant making relationship with our programs. There's an overlap of what we're proposing and what the Marine Debris office will do.

Dr. Pennock thanked everyone for their valuable comments and turned the meeting back over to Ms. Stirling.

Ms. Stirling then moves on to our next subject which is an update from Joshua Brown and Rosanne Fortner on Environmental Literacy and Workforce Develop (ELWD) and Education in the Sea Grant network..

1:55pm – 2:25pm – ELWD and Education Update (Informational) – (Roseanne Fortner, Joshua Brown, Anna Sosa)

Dr. Fortner stated that part of environmental literacy can't be compared to the focus areas as we know them. To make sure the educators know how you foster with your programs in fostering environmental literacy and the focus is PEOPLE. Sea Grant educators take overall literacy subject matter and the bottom line is how we can optimize the potential for environmental literacy education in Sea Grant and involve educators in planning for their future.

Dr. Brown and Dr. Ana Sosa (NSGO) – You as a board have heard a lot regarding education and environmental literacy and as we move into strategic planning you will hear a lot about that. We want to leave you enough time to discuss and think about six questions as part of our strategic planning efforts. There's a difference regarding Sea Grant education and ELWD – Sea Grant education is a functional area that supports all focus areas of the strategic plan and ELWD is a part of the strategic plan. Three big challenges in the way education functions – how do we balance education against the other five focus areas. How do we stabilize funding and education programming – this is not the best way to build a reliable program. A big one is the morale of the educators. When I thanked them for their hard work most were crying because of the challenging morale within the programs – so if we can't fix the morale problems then there won't be many successes. Challenges – Cultural identification with education vs. other functions.

Dr. Sosa – Three questions we came up with to bring forth to you are – What is the purpose/goal of our education effects? How should we talk about the education functions in our strategic plan? How do we fit the education function into all focus areas? These are the first three questions we would like to get your input on - any initial thoughts and actions?

Ms. Gray - In our discussion about equity inclusion environmental justice includes so much – in that we discuss including environmental justice, inclusion in our proposals. I've seen many requests from proposals to go out and this is one way to include it in all the focus areas.

Dr. Engle – I think back to the overall process of setting goals in Sea Grant – first question it would seem to me that those purposes and goals will change over time – what will drive it is that the focus and goals should be tied into that . Extension is more outreach technology that has a very different audience. The way to talk about it in strategic planning is to look at it amongst the programs. It's part of that three legged stool to be tied back to those stakeholders, but it's the stakeholders that should be our focus.

Dr. Grau – This might be a naïve question – It might be a good idea to have a course at the university college level, for elementary and high school teachers to be identified and can Sea Grant help support those courses in order to extend this.

Dr. Brown – Yes...there are a whole lot of education programs – but how do they work together in training the next generation of teachers – don't know of too many but that's a good point Gordon.

Dr. Grau - Many teachers are motivated to take core credit courses because it increases their income and this is one way to motivate people in order to move forward.

Dr. Sosa – In the ELWD space we came up with three questions as to how do we incorporate all Sea Grant functions in ELWD, what sets ELWD apart from other focus areas and the last is how do we better connect national and program level ELWD activities?

Dr. Murray - I do not think there is any way you can set clear boundaries in any of the focus areas because there's overlap in all of them. To me there's hundreds of arguments in those focus areas where you can put one in versus the other one.

Dr. Solsa - Great point thank you.

Dr. Betzer - Raise a profile and find out how to connect programs with research and education.

Dr. Fortner – You can't see that in the educator's network –they need to deal with the kinds of structure in their own discipline to effectively use their education as appropriate.

Ms. Stirling thanked Drs. Fortner, Brown, and Sosa for their thoughts, etc. and then requested that everyone takes a 10 minute break.

Break – 2:25pm – 2:35

2:35pm – 2:55pm – 40% Committee Report Decision – (Deb Stirling, Board Chair)

Deb Stirling stated that Dr. Grau raises an interesting and important point regarding the 40% report and it's clear that not only is it important but we're actually only scratching the surface of it. She brought up a procedural point –there is no precedent in amending the report - the board can either accept it or it can be sent back to the committee. She said that there is also precedent for a letter of transmittal that deviated from the report- it is just a transmittal to board from the NSGO.

Ms. Stirling recommended a motion to table the original motion – a motion to table – then a second motion to send the report back to the committee along with the language suggested by the sub-group.

Ms. Stirling also said that the Board would have to have a short meeting in the Spring because Dr. Chigbu is no longer on the board and therefore the committee. The Board can then review the language and content of the report and have the NSGO look at the research issues The way programs report their research varies from program to program. For example, University of MD drives their number to 50% - another program director is not allowed to do it that way so their numbers reflect that. Dr. Stirling asked the NSGO to provide the information but let the committee consider that in light of what the NSGO can come up with.

Ms. Stirling then asked for a motion to table the topic for a later meeting and send the report back to the committee or a motion to accept the 40% Committee's recommendations in the report and upon acceptance send the report to the national office.

The majority of the Board members voted on a motion to have the report returned to the committee with the proposed language. Ms. Stirling then asked that the earlier motion be withdrawn by Dr. Engle. Dr. Engle withdrew the motion.

Ms. Norosz - I think we can go ahead and submit language but be able to reflect the concerns raised yesterday that made members of the board uncomfortable with the recommendations.

Dr. Murray made a motion to send the subcommittee language back to the committee for consideration along with the report and for the national office's review.

Ms. Stirling made a motion to take the language suggested by the working group and the committee report itself to refer back to the committee.

Motion to have the report returned to the committee with the proposed language: Jim Murray

2nd: Carole Engle

Vote: All in Favor

Ms. Norosz - I'm all for sending it back to the committee – there were good concerns raised that suggest additional discussion. If we vote, are we saying as an advisory board that we accept this language?

Dr. Murray - I have no issue with the report as written or the 30-50% recommendation my concern was over the past 20 years we've gone from 50% now 40% and 30% is still in the range but 30% is now acceptable – the language should be advisory board is not endorsing the 30% - this language is trying to say that we're happy with what we got and this is saying that – enforcing the committee's message is a strong need for a Sea Grant program.

Ms. Stirling - The motion to send this language to the committee is only for consideration – no directive for the committee to do anything with it only to consider it. Based on my discussion there's a great deal more for us to learn and how these numbers were derived in the first place. There's a great deal of variation and how they determine what's research and they differ. We can get the NSGO engaged in providing that information and then I think we'll have some clear ideas in the Fall when they revisit it.

Dr. Betzer - Tremendous diversity out there - these programs are surrounded by internationally acclaimed research groups. Guam has a great program and should be a model for recognizing that diversity.

Dr. Grau– Programs make the most out of their money – it's a complex big job but an important one to determine exactly what research is – The NSGO and committee need to dive more deeply on this issue.

Ms. Stirling – The question is what constitutes research?

Dr. Murray - This language is saying up front that we aren't signaling they should increase research and this range says that's fine – but we're signaling that the status quo is ok and we don't go beyond the 30%.

Ms. Stirling – Is there sufficient comfort level to go forward with this motion: Ms. Stirling called the vote and all were in favor.

Ms. Stirling turned the meeting over to Dr. Pennock to provide an update on the strategic planning process.

2:55pm -3:55pm – Strategic Planning Update – (Jonathan Pennock, Director, Kelly Samek, NSGO)

Dr. Pennock stated that Kelly Samek will be leading the strategic planning process and he would like to get the NSGAB's thoughts and input, especially their initial views on strategic planning and to hear their perspective about how Sea Grant may be most impactful. He mentioned that Kelly will be sharing the timeline in order to get the programs where they can use it.

Kelly Samek – Over the last month and ½ a lot of work has gone into this so we think we're in a pretty good place. The 2024-2027 Strategic Planning Guidance was released on February 25th via email and available on Inside Sea Grant. We have also scheduled a webinar to be held on March 21st. The NSGO will be leading a National effort with input from the NSGAB, the programs and external stakeholders. The general process is to start with the existing 2018-2023 strategic plans, to identify focus area leads in the national office, assess existing language for relevance, and priority needs for expansion. There will be many listening sessions held in order to accomplish this.

Concurrent but Interactive efforts will move in three phases: (1) Initial Engagement and Development, (2) Reviews and (3) Refinement and Finalization. We need to be adaptable as far as deadlines and dates, so deadlines are expressing expectations and not marks for us to be punitive. Based on discussions last year, modification of the national focus areas is a possibility but we will keep in mind broader focus areas as to importance and value – the focus area leads are working together so that we won't have a lot of fatigue and run effectively. Focus area leads will lead specific engagements – relevant plans and visioning documents, discussion with others in office all to inform their recommendations on the plan. I want to use focus areas as a lens and focus on areas specific, not everything we bump up against will be resolved through the planned Sea Grant revisions.

Next Phase the initial draft plan will be available late June-August. We're aiming to have a second draft released in late August early September prior to Sea Grant week (September 11-15). The program officers will review and submit drafts by August 22nd. Last Phase – get the plans out before Sea Grant week and expect to release by Friday, September 30th. The individual programs will submit final drafts to PO's by Wednesday, October 26th and PO's will recommend approvals to the NSGCP Director, who makes the final approval expected by Wednesday, December 7th. The PIER upload and website posting will continue through January 2023.

There is a general mailbox to share your thoughts and can be sent to oar.sg-feedback@noaa.gov. She then turned the meeting back over to Dr. Pennock who discussed how we plan to move forward during this critical stage.

Dr. Pennock asked if anyone had questions in reference to Kelly's overview as for timing and what the NSGO is trying to accomplish. He noted that this process is different and the reason are that the network has a lot n their plates right now and the NSGO did not want to kick off strategic planning with

all those other things going on. He said that he believes that it will end up being a robust plan – whether they will change or stick with the existing strategic plan. There are regulations regarding what can be done under FACA without creating a subcommittee, so you all will be speaking as individual experts, not as the NSGAB as a whole. Dr. Pennock then opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Gray: I like the current focus areas and was interested to hear how social justice and equity will work in these areas and how the cross-cutting will work.

Dr. Murray: One of the opportunities in strategic planning is to get buy-in for the network and getting a sense that it's not the NSGO's plan but all of our plan. I would still look for ways to make sure they're touching base across all levels, and it would be wise to have a meeting to make sure many groups are consulted and have some ownership in this strategic plan.

Ms. Samek - We are working with Dr. Garber in her role as partnerships lead to make sure we're reaching out to those people.

Ms. Gray: The programs have already reached out to their stakeholders for input so it's already happening on a national level.

Dr. Brown - I'm working with the fishing communities coalition, they're going to help us with the whole plan. If you have any other contacts let us know.

Dr. Grau - I suggest engaging nontraditional stakeholders – ecologists always think it should be about ecology....and aquaculturists – aquaculture.

Ms. Samek - Please use the inbox to let us know contacts that we can investigate -- great fruit for thought.

Ms. Gray - Rhode Island is standing up global and climate change committees - it would be interesting to have comments from those groups.

Dr. Engle - Two comments – remind everyone that oyster farmers have a natural linkage with wine industries and oysters. Specific to aquaculture – LaDon sent out the research education and research plans and didn't get a lot of interest so there's a short timeline to bring this together. We will have challenges and what emerged is a strong need for workforce development and aquaculture and different focus areas.

Ms. Norosz – I would like to tag on to Carole's statements that employers are having a hard time finding employees so I can't help but think that we have more of a need for workforce development now than ever before – growing need.

Dr. Helmuth – Resilient economy green infrastructure - is it worth thinking about shifting around some of the different areas – most of the evaluations I did don't take in much of the green infrastructure.

Dr. Grau – Habitat and ecosystems – there are people retiring and moving to the coast. This is a huge issue and the entire area of the coast is changing so we need to figure out what is equitable sharing of the coast - so how do we build coastal communities that are safe and resilient, etc.

Ms. Stirling - Back up what Gordon said – we have the same thing going on in South Carolina – Heired properties from original slaves brought over from West Africa The fishermen and women work the land

and they are highly vulnerable from a legal standpoint because they don't have the paperwork or titles to their properties. This is happening in Georgia and northern Florida, too.

Ms. Gray – Does Marine Debris fit into Healthy Coastal Ecosystems focus area or the Resilient Communities and Economies?

Joshua – ELWD – to keep it more confusing – it's going to be a cross-cutting issue rather than one focus area.

Dr. Grau – Marine transportation – occupy space along the coast – I was told that one of the largest shipments in Great Lakes is wind turbans – perhaps the transportation of liquefied natural gas may increase in a major way and what implications that may have on the coast.

Dr. Murray - Many years ago when we did strategic plans and nested it under NOAA's strategic plan – so from a marketing standpoint for Sea Grant to show NOAA leadership we're really addressing this issue and to make sure NOAA interest is strong.

Ms. Samek – Yes we are taking that into account.

Dr. Pennonck – One of the things is to get on slightly different election cycles. NOAA expects to have their near final draft with this administration priorities. Good to have it in front of us now, but we'll be closer than we have in a while.

Ms. Gray – DEI and climate has been cross cutting issues in the last cycles – these are important but they cross everything. Any thoughts about whether DEI should be a focus area or cross-cutting? I do think it's cross-cutting like EEO which was separate from anything we're doing so I think it's better if it's cross-cutting.

Dr. Helmuth – Service delivery and co-development of solutions - those measures have to be incorporated in others such as resilience, social justice, etc.

Ms. Stirling - These are very important priorities and offer better protection for these priorities instead of silo winging it.

Dr. Murray - To me in terms of DEI impact and accountability – I think you need to think about adding just a question to the evaluation in the PIE system to get folks thinking – you should really be thinking about that and writing up an impact story in the next evaluations – I think it will be a nudge that will make them think about it, writing about it and reporting it.

Dr. Grau - Perhaps in open paragraphs – highlighting the cross-cutting issues and not really silos but cross-cutting focus areas.

Dr. Helmuth – If we don't silo DEI we need to make sure it's not lost in the shuffle – I'm not sure functionally how to do that, but make sure it's embedded to keep an eye on it.

Ms. Gray – Energy tourism marine transportation (blue economy) I think is emerging and a cross-cutting subject.

Dr. Pennock – The term has been around a while (Blue Economy) is a high priority.

Dr. Grau - The Department of Defense is another non-traditional stakeholder we might engage – challenged by sea level rise, major construction which will have a great impact.

Dr. Pennock asked if there were other comments, and said that the discussion could continue after the break. Ms. Stirling called for a 10 minute break.

Break – 3:55pm – 4:10pm

4:10pm – 4:35pm – Strategic Planning Discussion – (Jonathan Pennock, Deb Stirling, Kelly Samek)

Dr. Pennock – I wanted to make sure we didn't have any other thoughts from you all. I would like to invite Brooke to share some thoughts on Traditional and Local Ecological Knowledge (TLK).

Brooke – I've heard some great ideas coming from everyone. But to Brian's point I wanted to make sure everyone is thinking about DEIJ. I'll be meeting with all the focus area leads to develop a plan – hope that it's on your minds under the umbrella of DEIJ being intentional. I've been the go to person for the people in NOAA who are trying to do more in this space because my colleagues around the Sea Grant network have been doing this for a while – so we want to make sure we're intentional around that line of work.

Dr. Helmuth - Are you thinking about TLK as a cross-cutting area?

Brooke – Tribal and indigenous engagement – we're talking about those areas because parts of our programs are really strong in those areas.

Dr. Pennock thanked Brooke and asked if there were any other questions. He mentioned that there are structural questions about the report, like where renewable energy goes. He said Sea Grant talks about resilience all the time but that's only a part of the climate issue – any thoughts on climate and energy and how renewables can be included – cross-cutting energy in our portfolios – any thoughts there?

Ms. Gray – I view wind energy as the piece of the climate puzzle – resilient economies – we talk about it in other focus areas but that piece is where the blue economy lives and tourism is the link I have in my brain.

Dr. Pennock - Many of us think that and it's always been big – and many are engaged in that space but we will call it out directly to make sure we don't leave things in the wrong space.

Ms. Gray - I worry sometimes the way we try to slice everything down so maybe it's good to just have the focus areas and let them live under our structure because it's strong and let everything else live under them.

Dr. Helmuth - Having flexibility or the ability to link them – bend the pillars a bit to have them intersect with one another.

Dr. Grau - Resiliency has to do a lot with the way we build buildings. Is Sea Grant involved in those areas?

Ms. Stirling – I've been involved in a lot of these types of things and one thing we're looking at is designing construction buildings for the long haul. Trying to learn to live with water along our coast... Miami and Charleston are trying to do that as well as everyone else. I think we need to look at the need and kinds of materials that can intersect with water – so if you do dedicate those to your building you're

now facing 20-40 years down the road with the collapse of the condominium which happened in Florida. Areas that not anybody is interested in we're talking with the insurance industry to see if it's a real driver for new kinds of materials and a way to address issues living in those vulnerable areas.

Dr. Helmuth – I know NOAA is thinking about Blue and Green Carbon – what is Sea Grant thinking about in those areas?

Ms. Samek – That's a huge emerging area with this administration – and really taking off with federal partners and economists. Sea Grant has funded quite a bit of research and the question is should we call it out explicitly in that area.

What I would like to speak about now is the four focus areas as our core values and if there's structural things you don't like about our plans or have seen in similar plans to use as our model.

Brian –Inclusivity

Dr. Pennock - Any of you have any strategic plans that you just go WOW in structure? We want to be open minded as we move forward on this. We'll engage the board moving forward.

Deb Stirling thanks Dr. Pennock and Ms. Samek for their input.

4:35pm – 5:15pm – OAR & NOAA Leadership Update – (Craig McLean (OAR, AA))

Mr. McLean said that he will miss the engagement with the NSGAB after his upcoming retirement. He said that Sea Grant was one of the first programs in the nation that used coastal resilience and climate change as driving factors in their work. He said that the congress recognized this in their omnibus, but that they need to also understand that their direction doesn't meet the financial necessity to accomplish the work. He said that regardless, Sea Grant always seems to meet the challenge.

Mr. McLean also discussed the NOAA budget. He said that it was not as big as the President's budget, but still an increase. He said that the NOAA Administrator, Dr. Spinrad, and his team is growing. He also told the Board about the changes to OAR once he retired. Dr. Cisco Warner, the chief scientist for NMFS will be replacing Mr. McClean as Acting Assistant Administrator. Emily Manashes will be the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Labs and Programs - she's recently served as the Chief of Staff for NOAA's National Ocean Service. He said that Ms. Manashes is replacing Ko Barret, who was elevated to OAR's Climate Advisor. He also recognized the retiring NSGAB members and thanked them for their contributions.

Ms. Stirling thanked Mr. McLean for all he has done and in particular, his support of Sea Grant.

Ms. Stirling opened the floor for discussion.

The Board shared their recollections and gratitude for Mr. McLean and thanked him for his efforts over his career.

Mr. McClean thanked everyone for their comments and commitment to Sea Grant and NOAA.

5:15pm – 5:30pm – Wrap-Up – (Deborah Stirling, Board Chair)

Ms. Stirling reminded everyone of the next scheduled meeting during Sea Grant Week in Cleveland, Ohio. The Board meeting is September 11-12, 2022 and the Board is encouraged to participate in the entirety of Sea Grant week, September 10-16, 2022. She added that they will need to schedule a short meeting about the 40% research committee and that Ms. Holmes would send out a poll to find a time.

Ms. Stirling then asked the board members if they had anything they wanted to discuss before adjourning. The board members continued the discussion regarding the need for additional information and data for the 40% research committee to inform any kind of policy decision recommended to the NSGO.

Dr. Grau asked about the type of data the NSGO would be providing and if it could include base funds and match funds.

Dr. Pennock said that the NSGO has that information but would have to go through over 1000 proposals to determine the breakdown. He said that they could not easily pull that information. He also said that all of the information and data that is readily available was provided to the committee. Dr. Garber suggested that they record the webinar for others to understand the data and information on Sea Grant research. She also suggested adding this session to the Sea Grant 701 training.

Ms. Stirling said that the Board would go ahead and plan to join the webinar about research and plan on having a rich discussion and decision about the committee report at the June meeting Ms. Holmes will be scheduling.

Ms. Stirling then adjourned the meeting.

Meeting adjourned – 5:35pm