

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Spring Meeting
February 27-28, 2014
Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting
National Sea Grant Office
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, Maryland

Thursday, February 27, 2014

Introductions, review agenda, approval of minutes, etc. (R. Schmitten, Chair, NSGAB)

Roll Call:

Board attendees present: Rolland Schmitten, and Leon Cammen (*ex-officio*)

Board attendees on call: Dale Baker, Patricia Birkholz, Paulinus Chigbu, Rosanne Fortner, Amber Mace, Michael Orbach, Harry Simmons, William Stubblefield, LaDon Swann (*ex-officio*)
Richard Vortmann, Richard West

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) attendees: Elizabeth Ban (Designated Federal Officer), Chelsea Berg, Elizabeth Bevan, Jonathan Eigen, Nikola Garber, Sami Grimes, Chris Hayes, Tammy Newcomer Johnson, Gene Kim, Michael Liffmann.

Other attendees:

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

Kathryn MacDonald-National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, 2020 Company, LLC

March 2013 Draft Minutes

Motion by Dr. Orbach: Approve March 2013 draft meeting minutes.

2nd Mr. Vortmann; Unanimous approval.

Motion approved.

September 2013 Draft Minutes

Mr. Schmitten asked Dr. Cammen if the NSGO's budget line has been compressed from 3 budget lines, to 1. Dr. Cammen replied, no. The NSGO still has 3 budget lines.

Motion by Dr. Stubblefield. Approve September 2013 draft meeting minutes.

2nd Patricia Birkholz; Unanimous approval.

Motion Approved.

Chair Update (R. Schmitten, Chair, NSGAB)

Mr. Schmitten noted that this is his first meeting as official Chair. Mr. Schmitten gave thanks to Dr. Nancy Rabalais for her tenure as Chair from January 1, 2011 to December 30, 2013. Under her leadership, the NSGAB was involved in many important topics, and time intensive projects, yet Dr. Rabalais still had time to run Lumcon, continue her research in the Gulf of Mexico, and named a MacArthur Fellow (otherwise known as the "Genius Grant"). Dr. Rabalais now moves on to the role as Past Chair.

Mr. Schmitten reported on the new Executive Committee members. The terms for the Executive Committee are 2 calendar-year terms, with one exception this year. The new members are as follows: Chair, Mr. Rolland Schmitten; Vice Chair, Admiral Richard West, (who offered to fill this roll for one year); Dr. Nancy Rabalais, Past Chair; and Member-at-Large, Mr. Franklyn Beal.

Mr. Schmitten thanked Dr. Stubblefield who served as the Executive Committee Member-at-Large for the past four years. Mr. Schmitten noted Dr. Stubblefield agreed to extend his tenure with the Board for an additional year as is allowed by the NSGAB's legislation. His second term ends on March 6, 2014, but he will now serve until March 6, 2015.

Mr. Schmitten reported on tasks the NSGAB has been working on since their fall 2013 Meeting. Admiral West served as Chair of the Planning, Implementation and Evaluation (PIE) Assessment

Team, along with other committee members: Mr. Dale Baker, Dr. Amber Mace and Dr. Michael Orbach. Mr. Vortmann served as chair of the Allocation 3 Committee, along with Mr. Frank Beal, Dr. William Stubblefield and Admiral Richard West. Mr. Schmitten gave thanks to both Admiral West and Mr. Vortmann who presented their findings and recommendations to the Sea Grant Association (SGA) at their October 2013 meeting in Mobile, Alabama.

Dr. Fortner stepped into chair the 2014 Biennial Report Committee. Assisting her in this effort are NSGAB members Mr. Baker, Senator Birkholz, Dr. Rabalais and Admiral West; as well as Dr. Dennis Nixon of Rhode Island Sea Grant, Dr. Jeffrey Reutter of Ohio Sea Grant, and Dr. Diana Payne of Connecticut Sea Grant.

Mr. Schmitten reported working with the staffers on the Hill, Dr. Cammen and the SGA on the NSGCP Sea Grant Reauthorization Act. Mr. Schmitten reported the NSGAB will also be hearing discussions on the AC3 Committee, the NSGO's response to the PIE Assessments and the 2014 Biennial Report.

Mr. Schmitten noted the NSGAB meeting coincided with the AGU Ocean Conference, which Dr. Rabalais and Dr. Chigbu are attending and will join the meeting when possible. Mr. Beal will also not be joining the meeting. Mr. Schmitten reviewed the agenda.

National Sea Grant College Program, Director's Update (L Cammen, NSGO)

Topic: Staff Introductions.

Dr. Cammen introduced two new Knauss Fellows', Elizabeth Bevan and Tammy Newcomer-Johnson. Dr. Cammen reported Dr. Terrance Smith, the National Marine Fisheries Service representative at the NSGO, has retired. Dr. Cammen reported the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Science and Technology office does plan to refill the position. The problem is hiring people within NOAA can be difficult and lengthy to do. It might be by the end of the calendar year by the time someone is put in the position.

Dr. Cammen reported Ms. Laura Oremland with NMFS and past Sea Grant Knauss Fellow, has stepped up and is helping with the National Sea Grant NMFS Fellow process and other tasks that should arise. Dr. Cammen noted, Ms. Amy Painter has also left the NSGO and Ms. Elizabeth Ban is acting in her position. Ms. Kathryn MacDonald, contractor for the NSGO will be Ms. Ban's second in command. The NSGO is still working on replacing the position vacated when Dr. Jim Murray retired in June 2011, and Dr. Nikola Garber is the current Acting Deputy Director.

Dr. Cammen reported the NSGO is placed under an administrative cap which limits our ability to hire additional staff. There have been reorganization considerations to help offset these restrictions. One change may include consolidating program officer roles. This particular option would involve creating a team of 3-4 program officers that would oversee all the State Sea Grant programs.

This would free up other staff members to concentrate on other aspects of what the NSGO does, such as developing the program and facilitating partnerships. Staff members would be able to focus on key responsibilities, rather than being overwhelmed with the many conflicting responsibilities they currently have. This is one of the only options available to the NSGO without the ability to hire additional staff members. These scenarios are still in the discussion phase and non-committal. By the next NSGAB meeting, the appropriate changes will have been implemented.

Topic: NSGO Efficiencies

The PIER System is currently up and running successfully. There are some tweaks to be made, but it's a very robust system. The NSGO is hearing from other NOAA offices that they would like to duplicate or buy into the system and increase the benefit.

The information from PIER is used to streamline Sea Grant. Programs enter the information and the NSGO uses it for reporting. Responding to "taskers" (requests for information about what Sea Grant Programs are doing) is a major part of NSGO responsibilities. The NSGO uses PIER

to answer these requests, rather than going to the network. The information from PIER is also used to evaluate programs. It has been a long road, but the network is starting to see the benefits.

Dr. Cammen also reported on the new NSGO website. The new site is more dynamic and functional, rather than just a static display of information. It can also work with PIER, so that impacts and accomplishments can be pulled right out of the database and shown to the public.

Topic: Auto-uploading of Project Data

Dr. Cammen announced the NSGO has come up with a solution to auto upload project data. A form has been designed in Excel format, where programs can enter their information only one time and check for accuracy. It provides immediate access to individual project information and the ability to provide summary information. This satisfies grants requirements and can be translated right into the PIER database. This form was used for the grants awarded February 1, 2014 and so far, 548 projects have been submitted using this new system.

Topic: FY 2014 Budget

Dr. Cammen reported that the FY 2014 budget for the Department of Congress was recently approved. The FY14 budget for Sea Grant will need to filter its way down from NOAA and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research before the final budget is confirmed, which should happen shortly. FY 2012 was the last pre-sequester year. Last year, after sequester, Sea Grant ended up with a \$57.3 million budget. This year there is almost a \$10 million increase.

Budget highlights:

- FY 2014 was the highest request for Sea Grant in the history of the program. The request was for \$72.7 M and Sea Grant received \$67.3 M.
- There was a small increase request to base funding and a request for a research initiative of \$4.5 million that focuses on community and coastal resilience.
- The proposal from the administration to transfer all education to NSF, which would cut \$4 million from our program, did not happen.

- The NSGO is trying to encourage programs to do more social science. This year, is it planned that the programs will receive a 50% subsidy to fund social science research as part of a national strategic initiative.
 - There are 27 programs and 55 social science projects the NSGO is funding at around \$3 M a year for the next two years
- Sea Grant received \$4.5 million for aquaculture.
- The grand challenge was put into Sea Grant on behalf of NOAA. The NSGO asked for \$10 M but received \$1 M. We are talking with other parts of NOAA and other agencies to collaborate and increase the total funding available.
- The NSGO will also provide money to each program to continue or develop climate adaptation capacity building.
- The NSGO will rebalance state program base funding. This will get programs that are relatively underfunded up to a certain, minimum level of funding.
- The FY 2015 President's budget is to be released March 5th with details to follow one week later.

Topic: Responses to PIE Assessment Report-Planning

Dr. Cammen reported the PIE Assessment Committee did a terrific job. They had a lot of material and advice. The report and response are in the briefing book. It was recommended to have a National Plan based on top-down mission requirements. Programs will then be required to create a plan that is in line with the National Plan.

Topic: Responses to PIE Assessment Report-Implementation

Dr. Cammen highlighted focus teams and how they work. Focus teams were intended to review what the network was doing and give advice on where the NSGO was falling short and what things the NSGO needed to start thinking about; and help develop partnerships with other agencies and report on what was accomplished.

Everyone agreed it was too much. As a result, the focus was just on reporting and what had been done. The idea is to make changes in how these teams operate and look at ways to redirect some of the current efforts to address/concentrate on focus team tasks.

Responses to PIE Assessment Report-Evaluation

Dr. Cammen reported the evaluation recommendation was to integrate annual reviews, site visits, and an external evaluation panel into an overall four-year evaluation process. The response stated that the annual reviews, site visits and external evaluations together are integrated in the PIE System. The site visit reviews focus on operations and evaluate how Sea Grant Programs function internally. The Performance Review Panels focus on the impact of the Sea Grant Programs and evaluate the Programs from an external perspective. The annual reviews focus on the Sea Grant Programs' progress toward their four-year plans, serving as a continuous evaluation of the programs. The NSGO does not agree that annual reviews and site visits should be scored and factored into the Program ratings. Program performance is more appropriately evaluated by an external body of experts.

Topic: Challenges for Sea Grant

Dr. Cammen reported on the challenges for Sea Grant. There are programmatic gaps within Sea Grant. The Sea Grant Knauss Fellows' presentations will talk about where Sea Grant might go within the next 20 years. The NSGAB should also be thinking about this.

Another challenge Dr. Cammen noted is NMFS interests in NOAA and extension. Sea Grant needs to discuss ways OAR and NMFS could complement each other. Dr. Cammen reported he recently attended a Senior Research Council (SRC) meeting where Sea Grant was mentioned throughout the session regardless of topic. There was particular interest in extension in education. The one specific assignment made during the meeting was to assign the NMFS office to work with the NSGO to develop a collaborative plan on how to go forward with extension.

Other challenges for Sea Grant include functioning during a period of tight budgets; rebalancing NSGO resources and re-organizing the NSGO. The NSGO is looking into alternative models and how to be more efficient if the administrative cap isn't going to move.

Topic: Questions and Comments.

Dr. Orbach complemented Chris Hayes with the work he has done with social science. Mr. Hayes has been very persistent and professional. Dr. Orbach discussed his opposition with the PIE ranking system. Dr. Orbach believes if the NSGO is trying to increase contact between the NSGO and Sea Grant Programs while continuing to issue report cards then relationships will not increase.

Dr. Mace congratulated Dr. Cammen on the budget. Dr. Mace asked Dr. Cammen to discuss what contributed to the budget increase. Dr. Cammen replied that there were several including that the administration went in with a \$72 M request. The Senate also came back with a \$72 M budget, even though it wasn't the same break down. There was a general consensus on the budget amount.

Dr. Mace asked Dr. Cammen how Sea Grant can learn from that and how can we continue to build. Dr. Cammen replied, I think it helps to say this was an initiative the network and the NSGO are pushing. If the network pushes from the outside and the NSGO pushes from the inside, then that helps.

Mr. Schmitten agreed with Dr. Cammen. Mr. Schmitten believes the Department of Commerce's Administrator understands Sea Grant, which is really helpful. Secondly, once the number goes up to the Hill it is important to hold that number. Sea Grant Programs visit the Hill when they are in D.C., which is something the NSGO can't do. A team approach is the best way to go.

Admiral West commented on PIE. Admiral West recommended that instead of using a score, use satisfactory. Admiral West feels that not all the recommendations that were discussed in the PIE Assessment Report are listed. Dr. Cammen noted that the report is in the briefing book which

goes into further detail for each recommendation. Dr. Stubblefield noted he supports Admiral West's thoughts on PIE.

Sea Grant Association Update (L. Swann, SGA)

Topic: 2014 Budget Recap

Anything here?

Topic: SGA Reauthorization Recommendations

Dr. Swann reviewed the SGA's recommendations for the NSGO Reauthorization.

They are as follows:

- No change to the 5% cap on administrative fees for the NSGO. The SGA recognizes the need for additional administrative and programmatic staff in the NSGO and suggests an alternative. The SGA suggests the NSGO Director uses the Intergovernmental Personnel Act to address necessary personnel needed as part of the program administration for the National Sea Grant Office in collaboration with and the approval of the Sea Grant colleges and institutes.
- To promote regional investments of programs using pass through of other federal funding resources.
- To remove the reporting requirements from Sections 207 and 208.
- To better clarify Sea Grant's education program (Fellowship and STEM).
- Authorized funding levels.

Topic: Allocation of Resources to State Programs

Dr. Swann noted the SGA is willing to work with the NSGAB to try and resolve issues related to the allocation of Sea Grant funding. The SGA recommends directing funds from regional and national activities to those state programs that currently fall below the level considered necessary for the "successful implementation of sea grant programs." The level is \$1.2 M as recommended in the 2003 Allocation Report.

Topic: Growth

Topic: Federal Growth

Dr. Swann reported on the Community Resilience and America's Working Waterfronts initiative. He would like to see during his time, for Sea Grant to stick with the initiative until it works. He feels the mentality has been to constantly change initiatives every year if they don't work right away. There are a lot of other federal programs that could help leverage Sea Grant. There are some programs that come with a level of risk because of politics, but they don't cost a lot for Sea Grant to be involved in. He is going to try and encourage other programs to get on board with the Weather Ready Nation Program.

Topic: Non-Federal Growth

Dr. Swann reported there is a lot of non-federal growth. The Gulf of Mexico Research Initiative was a \$5 M program that came out of the Gulf oil spill. Developing more non-federal funding partnerships is also important. Dr. Swann noted Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant shares an outreach position with Smart Growth America. The current outreach program will be working with the Institute for Business and Home Safety (IBHS).

Topic: Conceptual Model to Enhance Sea Grant Communications

Dr. Swann noted this is a very rough draft of what communicators will be providing to the SGA. The SGA plans to use \$50K to hire an external group to help with some of the messaging, and marketing of Sea Grant. The SGA is very aware of limitations placed on the NSGO and will be using network communicators for this work.

Topic: eSea Grant

Dr. Swann noted the SGA is looking for one tool to use across the programs. Currently there is a hodgepodge of program management systems that are being used by programs. The one at the top of the list is eSea Grant. The SGA hopes that long term there will be a seamless integration with PIER. It would make eSea Grant more useful for programs.

Topic: SGA Spring Meeting

Dr. Swann noted the SGA would like to build their relationship with the John A. Knauss Fellowship Alumni and there has been discussion on creating an alumni association. He also reported the 1000th fellow will be a part of the of this year's group.

Topic: Questions and Comments

Dr. Orbach noted, he agrees with the NSGO using IPA's, however it also costs money. Sea Grant needs to make the case that we are more than the sum of the individual state programs. He doesn't see a future inside the beltway for the programs without Sea Grant making that case. Dr. Orbach believes it bears directly on the staffing of the NSGO. Mr. Schmitten agreed.

Discussion of morning topics (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

Mr. Schmitten reviewed the morning topics. There was no further discussion.

Site Visits (S. Grimes, NSGO)

Topics: Sea Grant Evaluation Process; Why Site Visits; How Sea Grant Site Visits are Conducted.

Topic: Results from last site visit cycle

Ms. Grimes reported the NSGO has created one-pagers on what the Sea Grant Programs have done and how they've improved. Out of all the reports, there were 35 recommendations and 200 suggestions. Programs are required to respond to the recommendations and are not required to respond to the suggestions. Around 95% of the programs responded formally to the suggestions, and about 82 were implemented, which is 85%.

Topics: What to expect this site visit cycle; Site Visit Timeline.

March 2014: Site Visit Guidance Finalized

April 2014: Site Visits are scheduled

May and June 2014: Co-Chairs are selected

SRT Webinars are conducted by the NSGO for Programs, Advisory Board Members and Reviewers

July 2014 - Sept 2015: Site Visits are conducted

Biennial Report Update (R. Fortner, NSGAB)

Dr. Fortner thanked all of the committee members for the way they've embraced the challenge of putting together the big picture of what Sea Grant is. The committee is using a model that Admiral West set up with the first 2 Biennial Reports. Dr. Fortner reviewed the sections that are currently in draft form and other sections that will need additional information. Dr. Fortner noted, the final draft will be presented at the Fall Board Meeting. Ms. Ban clarified that the Biennial Report Subcommittee can have a call to vote on the report, but the NSGAB can't. It will be presented at the public meeting during Sea Grant Week 2014, and then the NSGO will ask the NSGAB to vote on it.

Admiral West asked if there will be a public conference call to approve the final draft around August 2014, which means the NSGAB will have to look at the draft a couple weeks before that. Any changes from that point on will be before the NSGAB. Ms. Ban replied, there will be an offline conversation to verify dates and that the NSGAB is following Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) rules.

Mr. Schmitten asked if the Virginia Sea Grant Program review for college status needs to be included in the report. Mr. Schmitten noted that the information should be put in the report due to the huge amount of time that was put into the review.

Ms. Grimes suggested adding the PIE statistics of the site visits, etc. It might be good to highlight that as well as the results of the PRP. Ms. Grimes will get Dr. Fortner the information.

Sea Grant Reauthorization Update (R Schmitten, NSGAB)

Mr. Schmitten reviewed the previous NSGAB meeting in September 2013, which included removing annual reporting requirements for Sea Grant Programs; removing the 5% administrative cap and adding \$25 M for regionalized grant projects with no match. Since then,

in late November, the Hill majority committee staff initiated contact with the SGA, NSGAB and the NSGO.

The NSGAB and the NSGO recommended the 4 items set forth. The NSGO worked on a preliminary draft for reauthorization. Changes are being made to the document. Some include: authorization at \$72M which grows to \$92.9 by 2020, as well as additional authorization of \$18M of each of those years. That has been dropped to \$6 M and now includes resilient communities and working waterfronts. In the initial authorization it was invasive species, oyster research, harmful algae blooms, and fisheries extension activities. The Advisory Board's State of Sea Grant Report to Congress is currently required every two years. The reauthorization would change it to every three years. The match of funds was not waived. The Sea Grant education mandate was strengthened regarding the Sea Grant Knauss Fellowship Program.

Mr. Schmitten noted the sense of the Senate and staff deliberations are if there is not coordination and equal view it will not be introduced. No matter how hard the issue is pressed, it was made clear from day one that it will not be lifted, but the staff were sympathetic and understand and would try to address the issue. A compromise is to increase the cap by 5.5%. Every 1% is equivalent to around \$300K. There has been talk about placement of the fellows on the Hill. Mr. Schmitten would like to see language before they can say much. He has heard they plan on placing fellows half in minority offices/committees and half in majority offices/committees to create a balance.

Mr. Schmitten asked Dr. Swann if the SGA has visited the House and if so, he would be interested in what they have to say. Dr. Swann replied there are two things the SGA has heard from the House Resources Committee and House Science Committee. To see what's in the Senate Bill is very positive and hopefully will stay in by the time it goes through the House. There was not a lot of support about the administrative cap increase. That is where the SGA came up with the IPA's. Dr. Swann realizes there is a cost for those. That cost would be outside the cap. Mr. Schmitten said he heard the same. Mr. Schmitten noted to Dr. Swann and Dr.

Cammen that if there is anything else heard regarding reauthorization that is be shared. All agreed.

Topic: Questions & Comments

Dr. Orbach asked if there is any sense in terms of money, how much IPA's will cost, not subject to the cap. Dr. Cammen responded around \$57M. This money would come from the appropriations that would otherwise go to national strategic initiatives.

Dr. Cammen pointed out the NSGO can have IPAs right now, except that the legal opinion we are going by is if the IPAs are working on programmatic aspects, for example, someone to work on the communication network plan that it does not count against the cap. If the NSGO has someone coming in doing administrative work it does come out of the cap. Dr. Cammen noted, in his experience, IPAs aren't less expensive than federal employees. Housing can cost more than a federal employee. Dr. Orbach noted that is his experience as well.

Dr. Swann noted the SGA has recognized all that and are fully aware of what Dr. Cammen is saying. Dr. Orbach asked Dr. Swann why the SGA chose that plan. Dr. Swann replied, because it is not part of the administrative cap. This is experience the Sea Grant network can use when they go back to their programs. The SGA hopes that IPAs help the office and the professional development of the individual. Dr. Swann noted there used to be more than fifteen people in the NSGO. That number the SGA is still concerned about; they are worried about having a lot of people in the NSGO.

(Break)

NOAA OAR Update (R Detrick, OAR)

Topic: Leadership Update; Budget; Sea Grant Reauthorization; NOAA's Next Generation Strategic Plan; OAR's Vision & Mission; NOAA's Research Enterprise; NOAA 5-Year Research & Development (R&D) Plan; Coordination in NOAA (OAR/NMFS).

Topic: Questions & Comments

Mr. Schmitten noted he believes Dr. Sullivan's presence really shows the relevance of NOAA. The public is more aware of NOAA. Mr. Schmitten suggested a quarterly report on what is achieved by the collaborations.

Dr. Stubblefield thanked Dr. Detrick for his presentation. Dr. Stubblefield asked if the 2012 report integrated with NOAA Coastal Programs and Dr. Sullivan's desire for integration amongst duplicate programs. Dr. Detrick replied that there is certainly reorganization going on within NOS. Dr. Holly Bamford is best to speak to about changes. They are certainly aimed at stream lining their organizational structure. What OAR has been working on is developing more effective means of managing cross line activities and one of the more successful efforts has been in the climate arena.

A Systems Administrators Climate Goal Board which oversees planning, budget, and execution of four major areas in the climate arena, has been established. It seems to be working fairly well in developing the cross NOAA Focus on the 4 climate challenges.

Public Comment Period (R. Schmitten, NSGAB, E. Ban, NSGO)

There were no public attendees or submitted public comments.

Discussion of Afternoon Topics (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

Dr. Orbach asked what the attitude is of the administrative cap issue. Mr. Schmitten replied, Dr. Sullivan supports the removal of the cap and supports the NSGO in being as strong as they can in removing the cap.

Motion by Mr. Schmitten to recess the meeting until Friday, February 28, 2014 at 1:00pm EST.

Admiral West 2nd, unanimous approval.

Motion approved.

Friday, February 28, 2014
1:00 PM– 4:00 PM EST- Open To Public

Board attendees present: Rolland Schmitten, and Leon Cammen (*ex-officio*)

Board attendees on call: Dale Baker, Patricia Birkholz, Paulinus Chigbu, Rosanne Fortner, Amber Mace, Michael Orbach, Harry Simmons, William Stubblefield, LaDon Swann (*ex-officio*)
Richard Vortmann, Richard West

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) attendees: Elizabeth Ban (Designated Federal Officer), Chelsea Berg, Elizabeth Bevan, Jonathan Eigen, Sami Grimes, Chris Hayes, Tammy Newcomer Johnson, Gene Kim, Michael Liffmann.

Other attendees:

Jennifer Maggio-National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, 2020 Company, LLC
Kathryn MacDonald-National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, 2020 Company, LLC

Allocation Committee Update (L. Cammen, NSGO and D. Vortmann, NSGAB)

Dr. Cammen noted the Allocation Committee Report is a result of a lot of work done by the SGA and NSGAB, in particular Mr. Vortmann who led the Allocation Committee III (AC3) that put together the report.

Mr. Vortmann stated that the AC3 prepared a report that was submitted to the NSGAB and agreed upon and informally sent to Dr. Cammen. Dr. Cammen presented the report to the SGA. Mr. Vortmann noted the AC3 position and the SGA's position are substantially divergent

Rebalancing Sea Grant's Base Funding Resources-FY 2014 and Beyond (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Topic: FY 2014 Rebalancing

Dr. Cammen noted what Sea Grant is really doing is rebalancing their resources. Sea Grant is potentially taking resources that exist in one part of the program and moving it to another part of the program.

Topic: Priorities for Rebalancing

Dr. Cammen pointed out that there are a lot of programs that are too small. They do well with the resources they have, but there is no question they need additional resources. Sea Grant will have to make modifications. The top priorities for the rebalancing are: 1) get the smallest programs up to a minimum of \$1M; 2) increase funding to programs that are relatively underfunded, and 3) get funding to all other programs. The only constraint is that there will be no reduction in base funding for any program.

Some constraints include programs not willing to give up any funding in order to provide the funding to another program in the network. The constraint the NSGO is operating under is no reduction in base funding for any program. If there is a major budget cut, there will be budget cuts, but what is in our control we will not be reducing funding.

Sea Grant was fortunate this year to receive a \$5 M increase in resilience research. The NSGO is intending to use that increase to feed into the base and address some of the funding issues. Those funds will still carry the requirement that they be used for competitive research.

Topic: FY 2014 Rebalancing – General Plan

Dr. Cammen noted there are a few considerations in reaching a minimum program size. There are a lot of questions on where the \$1.2M came from. The first Allocation Committee put all the programs ranked by federal base funding and \$1.2M was the median.

Dr. Cammen suggested not having a transition period. The AC3 Committee put a timeline on the decreases that suggested stretching it over an 8 year period (16 years). In future years if there is more funding available, it will adjust accordingly.

Topic: Comparison of AC3 and SGA Proposals with Rebalancing Plan for FY 2014 and Beyond

Mr. Vortmann commented on Dr. Cammen's presentation. This year it seems we have growth and we should use that growth to reach the \$1.2M. Mr. Vortmann also suggested that Sea Grant needs to deal with the states that have two programs when we are struggling to take care of one program in each state. Why not combine these programs? He also suggested that as a policy, the day the total budget doesn't have growth and there is insufficient money in the national strategic initiatives, the policy should be to take monies away from those who are in excess of funding.

Graphs: Rebalancing the Sea Grant Base

Topic: Questions & Comments

Dr. Orbach presented the question on two programs per state issue and how this could be fixed. For example, could we say we are going to give them what they get for one state and they figure out how to organize funds? How would we do it if we tried to address the issue?

Dr. Cammen replied that in 1994, Sea Grant Review Panel looked at exactly that issue. There was a lot of pressure to merge the two California programs. That didn't happen, but from that point on Sea Grant would not allow multiple programs in any other state, but that the two existing states with multiple programs would be grandfathered in.

Mr. Vortmann noted with the AC3 concept, two programs can continue to perpetuate themselves. We aren't talking about their existence; we are talking about funding to them.

Dr. Swann asked if the NSGO plans to use IPAS and how would that affect the rebalancing. Dr. Cammen replied it would come out of the 22.5% going to national activities.

Mr. Vortmann suggested the policy say if there is an increase in total budgeting than those programs doing well will not see a \$1M increase. The money will be used to bring them up to \$1M. Dr. Cammen noted the concept is to work toward achieving the needs-based distribution while also building up the merit pool to reward performance.

Dr. Orbach asked how the needs based will be reassessed from year to year.

Dr. Cammen said that if we receive increases to funding yearly, we will look at the gaps and use the money to fill those gaps until there are no more. The extra money will then be redistributed. Should there be a decrease in funding, we would decrease funding from programs that are best able to handle them. The other option is to cut funding across the board so that all programs receive the same cut.

Mr. Schmitten commended Dr. Cammen and Mr. Vortmann on their work.

NSGO Website and Public Project and Impact Search Update (E.Ban)

Topics: What's New?; Sea Grant Communication; Sea Grant Website; How've we been doing?; Network Social Media; Sea Grant Website.

Ms. Ban asked the NSGAB members if they were interested in getting the announcements on the news stories the NSGO sends out once a week. Mr. Schmitten asked to be added to the list.

Focus Area Updates (T. Newcomer Johnson and E. Bevan, NSGO Knauss Fellows)

2013 Focus Area Annual Reports:

- Healthy Coastal Ecosystems (HCE)
- Healthy Resilient Coastal Communities (HRCC)
- Sustainable Coastal Development (SCD)
- Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply (SSSS)

Dr. Kim noted the next generation of focus teams has not yet been decided. Groups will be formed, but when is unknown. The Sea Grant Fellows will play a major role in leading the teams.

Topics: Membership updates; Focus Areas; Cross Cutting Gaps; Emerging Themes.

Questions/Comments-

Ms. Newcomer Johnson asked the NSGAB what they think are the important gaps and themes for Sea Grant to grow in the future. They are looking at cross cutting gaps for potential areas that Sea Grant can work on and there are a lot of good projects, but it's difficult to work on all of them. They would like to know what the NSGAB sees as priorities in the future.

Dr. Orbach thanked Ms. Newcomer Johnson and Ms. Bevan for their presentation. Dr. Orbach asked what Sea Grant's position is on discussing the greying of the fleet.

Ms. Newcomer Johnson noted Alaska Sea Grant has played a role in bringing up this issue and there are certain things like policies that we have such as catch shares and how Sea Grant can research the effects of these on communities.

Dr. Kim noted that many Sea Grant Programs are training fisherman to become better at small business, so that a lot of business aspects such as marketing, accounting and quality control are better understood. It's not all limited to growing the fleet, but to help a more professional environment.

Mr. Schmitten listed the emerging themes he feels are important to each focus area. These include: SCD- Successful partnerships; HRCC- Regional collaborations; HCE- Sustainability outreach; and SSSS- Environmental and pollutant monitoring.

Dr. Fortner noted it is not what Sea Grant can do about the gaps and emerging issues, but what can we do with the information we are given. She hopes they will pursue something along the lines of research papers so their work goes beyond just the NSGAB.

Senator Birkholz feels it's imperative to work with coastal resilience communities. There are so many coastal communities at risk and if the Sea Grant communities aren't helping them before hand as things change, then we are in bigger trouble and will cost more to deal with. There is not enough capacity in Sea Grant or any other organization to do the work that needs to be done.

Mr. Simmons commented there are a lot of good stories under the emerging themes which may help people become more aware of their issues.

Mr. Schmitten thanked Ms. Newcomer Johnson and Ms. Bevin and welcomed them to Sea Grant.

(Break)

Sea Grant Education Impacts (R.Fortner, NSGAB)

Dr. Fortner referenced the education one-pager located in the briefing book. It is a quick explanation of what Sea Grant education is and does. It gives an overview of where Sea Grant education needs to go.

Dr. Fortner explained the meaning of what STEM is.

Topic: Sea Grant Education Impacts

Dr. Fortner reported she is looking at how to make Sea Grant education more visible and position it as unique.

Topic: Environmental Literacy and Workforce Development

Dr. Fortner noted Sea Grant needs to look hard at what they are paying for and if it feeds into the environmental literacy and workforce development focus area.

Topic: National Sea Grant Fellowships

Dr. Fortner noted we know who these people are; we have metrics on what they are doing and how these fellowships develop into a career. We don't want any more cuts to our budget. In order to avoid that we need to collect that information from our impacts the way these fellowships do.

Topic: Sea Grant Research

Topic: Planning and Evaluation

Dr. Fortner noted this section only has two education words in it. Most of the planning and evaluation section of this one pager is about the PIE Process and only speaks of education because it is a part of the process. Specifically, education efforts are well managed, cost effective and provide valuable services to stakeholders. We want to be more than that with our education efforts and the kinds of things we are doing with our evaluation does not go beyond this sentence. We want to say they are contributing to the education and are strong enough to be a part of the Sea Grant three-legged stool.

Topic: Appendix IV.

Dr. Fortner reported this section has metrics that are related to the whole program. Many of Sea Grant educators are in extension, but collectively with extension this is what we've come up with that education does this. This does not have an equal weight for a legislature to see what education does. We need better metrics. There needs to be more attention to the kinds of things

that bring Sea Grant education into a professional realm that is equal to what the rest of Sea Grant is proud of.

Sea Grant needs to expect more from their educators. She is hoping that Sea Grant transmits that to their members. This is the only way we are going to survive a consolidation of STEM is to build an education based program. We need to justify how we are doing it and that we have an impact and not just volunteer hours.

Pennsylvania Sea Grant College Status Request (D. Carlson)

Topic: College Status and Next Steps

Dr. Carlson announced Pennsylvania Sea Grant (PASG), which has institutional status, sent the NSGO a letter announcing their intention to apply for college status. This is the same exercise that we started about a year ago with Virginia Sea Grant. PASG is following their footsteps. The NSGAB has no action at this time.

Topic: Criteria for College Status

Questions/Comments

Dr. Orbach asked how budgets are handled like this and is it an open question as to whether this would be approved or not. Is it assumed they're approved if they put together a good proposal?

Dr. Cammen replied, financially, the plan doesn't distinguish between an institution and college status. PASG is underfunded and will eventually be moving toward where they want to be whether they change status or not. It would be up to the reviewers as to whether or not they are approved.

Mr. Schmitt asked how many programs are in institutional status.

Dr. Carlson replied, three programs are in institutional status, two are permanent (2nd program in state) Woods Hole Sea Grant and the University of Southern California Sea Grant. PASG is the only institution that is on track to becoming college status.

Mr. Baker asked Lake Champlain Sea Grant's status.

Dr. Cammen replied, Lake Champlain Sea Grant is currently a Coherent Area Program and are interested in becoming an institutional program, as well as Guam Sea Grant. They have both been Coherent Area Programs for about a year. By our process, they need to put in a couple years demonstrating their success before they can become an institution.

Discussion of afternoon topics and wrap up (R. Schmitt)

Mr. Schmitten thanked everyone for joining and a special thank you to Ms. Ban, Ms. Maggio and Ms. MacDonald.

Action Items:

- Sea Grant Week 2014, September 6-12, 2014.
- Sea Grant Association Meeting, March 11-12, 2014. Admiral West, Dr. Fortner and himself will attend.
- Dr. Mace, Mr. Vortmann and Dr. Orbach will discuss the concepts of a 501c3 and report on their thoughts at the next meeting.
- Dr. Fortner asked the NSGAB to look at the Biennial Report recommendations and provide feedback to her.
- Mr. Schmitten would like Dr. Cammen to circulate the reauthorization bill once it goes for hearing. Dr. Cammen reported we just heard that the mark up is not going to happen; we are up for the mark up next time.
- Ms. Ban noted she will send out the action items as a reminder. All the presentations will be posted on the website on the NSGAB webpage.

Topic: Questions and Comments

Dr. Orbach asked on the status of rebalancing. Mr. Schmitten noted the NSGAB gave their position on the AC3 position paper. Dr. Cammen replied the intent is that it will be implemented once final budget numbers are in. He is open to any advice.

Mr. Vortmann commented that he gave Dr. Cammen his thoughts and suggests a written policy statement. The policy should clarify that all programs base funding would be increased to \$1M and what would happen should the budget decrease. Dr. Cammen replied that there will be a written policy published. Dr. Orbach suggested it goes on record that the NSGAB supports Dr. Cammen movement. Dr. Cammen welcomed a motion.

Motion by Dr. Orbach: To support Dr. Cammen's proposal of rebalancing Sea Grant program funding and to take the NSGAB's comments into account.

2nd Mr. Vortmann, Unanimous approval.

Motion approved.

4:00 PM—Meeting Adjourned