

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Spring Meeting
March 2-3, 2015
Meeting Minutes

Washington Plaza Hotel
10 Thomas Circle NW
Washington, DC 20005

Monday, May 2, 2015

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC 8:30am-4:00pm EST

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

Roll Call:

Rosanne Fortner, Richard West, Dale Baker, Amber Mace, Paulinus Chigbu, Harry Simmons
William Stubblefield, Rolland Schmitten, Richard Vortmann, Frank Beal, Nancy Rabalais,
Sylvain DeGuise (*ex-officio*), Leon Cammen (*ex-officio*)

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) attendees: Jonathan Eigen (Designated Federal Officer),
Nikola Garber, Dorn Carlson, Genevieve Fisher, Joshua Brown, Sami Grimes

Other attendees:

Jennifer Hinden-National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, Acentia
Julia Galkiewicz-National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, Acentia
Sarah Bowman-National Sea Grant Office, Knauss Fellow
Helen Cheng-National Sea Grant Office, Knauss Fellow

Welcome, introductions, review of agenda, approval of minutes (R. Schmitten, Chair, NSGAB)

Mr. Schmitten suggested moving the Focus Area Updates and the discussion on Focus Teams to earlier in the agenda. He also suggested two additional topics: discuss the Sea Grant Association (SGA) 2015 budget proposal and the future of Sea Grant.

September 2014 Draft Minutes

Questions/Comments/Changes

- Add Dr. Mace to roll call on both meeting days.
- Mr. Baker's name is included in roll call twice on day two.
- Replace "Florida Sea Grant has" to "have" on page 8 of the minutes, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence.

Motion by Mayor Simmons to approve the September 2014 draft minutes with recommended changes.

Dr. Stubblefield 2nd, unanimous approval.

Motion approved.

Mr. Schmitten announced Dr. Cammen will be retiring from the National Sea Grant Office and Dr. Stubblefield's term will be expiring with the NSGAB. Mr. Jonathan Eigen has been appointed the NSGAB's Designated Federal Officer, and Dr. Nikola Garber will move into the Acting Director position once Dr. Cammen retires. Mr. Schmitten welcomed Dr. Sylvain DeGuise to his first NSGAB meeting as the new SGA President.

Chair's Update (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

Topic: Sea Grant Heroes; Sea Grant 50th Anniversary

Mr. Schmitten summarized what is currently being discussed with the Executive Committee on Sea Grant's 50th Anniversary. He noted the Executive Committee would like to get a small group of Knauss Fellows to participate, and include, presidential proclamations, a Congressional resolution honoring Sea Grant, brochures, a 50th Anniversary Sea Grant logo (turn the eagle gold), t-shirts, highlight the different Sea Grant success stories, and highlight Knauss alumni. Mr. Schmitten will try to send out a summary to everyone on what the Executive Committee is doing for the 50th Anniversary.

Dr. DeGuise noted the plan for the 50th Anniversary is to have a year ending with Sea Grant Week in Rhode Island. Admiral West suggested getting Whitehouse & Reed, Congressmen to participate. Dr. DeGuise noted the Pell family is in the plans for Sea Grant Week in fall of 2016.

Topic: 114th Congress

Mr. Schmitten has been impressed about procedurally moving through the system, and that it all started back in October with his and Dr. Fortner's meeting with Dr. Kathryn Sullivan on Sea Grant's Reauthorization. A letter of appreciation to Dr. Sullivan followed a few days later. He and Dr. Fortner indicated Sea Grant itself could use the \$80M to do its job appropriately.

Mr. Schmitten referenced the letter to Dr. Kathryn Sullivan from the SGA, and feels the SGA has done a great job in preparing for this including visits to Sea Grant state's. The SGA asked if this was something the NSGAB can support. Mr. Schmitten asked for any comments. He feels that for the good of Sea Grant it's a good initiative and would like to say the NSGAB can support.

Dr. Cammen noted, Sea Grant has been working more closely with the National Ocean Service (NOS) over the past 8 months, which is more than we ever have since he's been with NOAA. This is because there is finally recognition from leadership, and the change in leadership with NOS.

They know what Sea Grant can do, and there are a lot of tools they can work with and Sea Grant's one of them.

Dr. Cammen noted the proposed FY16 Resilience activities funded through NOS are grants and Sea Grant will have the ability to receive some of those grants. The idea is to take advantage of everything NOAA has to offer and help the coastal communities out. Dr. Cammen noted there is \$2M for coastal conservation resiliency type work that specifically is assigned to Sea Grant and the National Estuaries Research Reserve System (NEERS), but the money will go somewhere in NOS and will get transferred. If it did come through Sea Grant, the \$45M or \$50M FY 16 President's request would require \$25M match. If it comes through NOS and then Sea Grant, there is no match requirement. People are saying it's hard to find match, but others find it a good thing.

Dr. Stubblefield feels this is a marketing issue for Sea Grant, because they are not mentioned. He feels the marketing aspect has a greater impact than just the work getting done. Mr. Schmitt noted this should be brought to Dr. Holly Bamford's attention. Dr. DeGuise mentioned Dr. Bamford, Mr. Craig McLean and Dr. W. Russell Callender are aware of this issue.

Dr. Cammen noted Dr. Callender will work directly with this topic. What Dr. Bamford established before she left NOS was a coastal roundtable that includes Coastal Zone Management (CZM), NEERS, and other external members. Everyone meets via phone once a month, and it's an open conversation. Dr. Bamford invited Sea Grant to join. Dr. Callender has continued the conversation, and it has made a big difference. The conversation last meeting revolved around the proposed FY 16 \$45M, and other groups are uncomfortable as well. Dr. Callender assured all it's a NOAA project.

Topic: The Future of Sea Grant, Are we prepared?

Mr. Schmitt noted Sea Grant is about to embark on another 4-year Strategic Plan and they do look briefly at Sea Grant's future, but there's a need to conform with the NSGO and NOAA's strategic plan, but what they don't do is look at Sea Grant as a whole. His view is that the current Strategic Plan becomes less visionary. While important, he feels Sea Grant should be asking NOAA, how we prepare for the long term.

Mr. Schmitt noted there are many reasons Sea Grant should be proactive and long term, we are in competition. The Administration is looking to modify education, the outlook for Federal and state funding is not optimistic, other programs are copying the Sea Grant model rather than embracing Sea Grant, and we should be preparing for the social and economic changes. Businesses and people are beginning to move away from coastal areas and more towards higher grounds. Certainly, Sea Grant has changed the beginning, but in an ad hoc fashion and not a holistic approach.

Mr. Schmitt would like to form a small group made up of the NSGO, SGA and NSGAB to attempt to predict challenges and formulate options to better attempt the forever changing

environment. There is a need for more money to do more and the need to do better. The big question is what Sea Grant would look like if we were to start over today.

Admiral West absolutely agrees, and feels it should be coordinated with Dr. Bamford. They also need to take a look at where we are going in the future. NOAA needs to be invited and participate. Mr. Schmitten noted he would like to wait and see what the SGA has to say about forming a small working to discuss the future of Sea Grant.

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

Topic: Staff Introductions

Dr. Cammen introduced Ms. Helen Cheng and Mrs. Sarah Bowman, the 2015 Sea Grant Knauss Fellows; with the National Sea Grant Office and, Dr. Julia Galkiewicz, Knauss Fellowship Manager/Education Lead. Dr. Cammen also introduced NOAA Leadership Competencies Development Program (LCDP) details to the NSGO, Dr. Gene Fisher; Acting Assistant Director for Operations and Mr. Devin Brakob; Acting Lead for Planning and Evaluation. The LCDP is where senior people work in other offices to build leadership capacities. There may be more LCDP details within Sea Grant in the next year. Mrs. Sami Grimes is currently on LCDP detail to NOAA's Office for Coastal Management.

Topic: FY 2015/2016 Budget

Dr. Cammen noted Sea Grant's FY15 appropriation is about as high as it's ever been and the FY16 request from the Administration nominally reduces the base, increases aquaculture and again tries to eliminate STEM education, but funding would stay in Sea Grant. The important part for this year is resilience research was singled out and is now part of the base. The grand challenge, which is the prize competition, was proposed in FY14 for \$10M and ended up being \$1M in FY15. The NSGO has been working with the XPrize foundation. They have a larger challenge that Sea Grant would like to contribute to. The prize challenge was proposed for termination in FY15 and FY16.

Admiral West asked where the STEM education money goes. Dr. Cammen noted it would go to other Sea Grant activities. Mr. Schmitten asked how much money it is. Dr. Cammen replied it's on the order of taking the Knauss Fellows out of it and graduate students out. We would make the argument that graduate students are research. It would probably be around \$1M. Admiral West asked if there's been a reaction from the Hill. Dr. Cammen replied, no, he hasn't heard anything. He's assuming the reaction would be the same as last year.

Mr. Eigen noted from a legal standpoint, as he interprets the law, Sea Grant at the moment, assuming education passes in Reauthorization, it really does come down to how NOAA guides the NSGO. The NSGO hasn't been given any guidance. Dr. Cammen noted the NOAA budget process is changing and will be pushing more collaboration.

When ideas are being put forth now, they need to show collaboration. Resilience is a good example. When Sea Grant goes to talk about the \$80M we are asking for, they are going to want to know how it's relating to what other parts of NOAA are doing. As we move forward, we will see a lot of larger topical areas, but you won't see 50-60 individual projects for different offices.

Topic: FY 15/16, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) View Point

Dr. Cammen noted when the budget was put together for this year's request; Sea Grant did not have the appropriation. When OMB is getting the budget together for FY16, they are using the FY15 budget as a starting point. They held Sea Grant's base funding, aquaculture increased by \$5M because the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) has been working on aquaculture and recognizes the importance of the big increase overall.

Topic: FY15 Budget Handout

Sea Grant is in their 2nd-year of a 4-year program. The FY 15 budget shows no STEM reduction or grand challenge. New this year, Sea Grant has the Sea Grant/National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) exchange initiative. Sea Grant personnel professions, extension, or communicators go on detail for one-month to one-year to work on a Sea Grant project. NMFS employees are able to go out and work with a Sea Grant program.

The idea is to get them better connected. Sea Grant is providing \$200K to pay for Sea Grant personnel and NMFS is providing the same to NMFS Personnel. This is the first year Sea Grant and NMFS are doing this, and it is an experiment. We both want to see what comes out of it and if this is a way to get Sea Grant better connected with NMFS.

The NSGO expects to have \$1.5M if we get the President's budget for social science or a new National Strategic Investment (NSI), but not both. When we talk about NSI's Resilience and water resources, you have to realize social science is also on the same table. This will be the second year of the social science NSI. Each program will receive \$30K for the Climate Change Core Capacity Building NSI.

Topic: Sea Grant Network Development

Dr. Cammen reported the Guam Sea Grant Site Visit team not only conducted the review, they also visited the Northern Mariana's College. Folks from the college met with the NSGO last fall and were interested in working together. Mr. Schmitten, Dr. Hartley and Mr. Liffmann all participated in the meeting. As a result of that meeting it was concluded that the college has capabilities in the area of aquaculture. They are a very small institution, but the NSGO can give them funding as a Sea Grant project, if it is warranted.

Dr. Cammen noted the next step would be to get a proposal from them and he is sure the NSGO would work with them to see if it's something worth doing. Mr. Vortmann asked if they are independent or working through Guam Sea Grant. Mr. Schmitten noted the group would rather

they have some connection with Guam Sea Grant, but we aren't sure it's reasonable. Mr. Schmitten noted they are almost 4 hours away from anywhere in Asia and are collaborating with Japan, China, etc.

Sea Grant Association Update (S. DeGuise, President, Sea Grant Association)

Topics: Past SGA Leadership; Changes in membership; Directors Years of Experience;

Dr. DeGuise noted to Dr. Cammen it was a pleasure and honor to serve with him. He also commemorated Dr. Stubblefield on their professional relationship during the time they've known each other.

Topic: Recent Past

Dr. DeGuise noted Dr. Swann set up the growth committee with the idea to grow Sea Grant to \$80M without distraction. One of them was to hire an outside communications firm, West End, to assess the network. We have not had huge success in media placement as one of the parts they were envisioning, but they have helped Sea Grant create their message before it was presented to the NOAA Administrator and members of Congress. The SGA tends to be very precise and use big words; however, West End reviewed our idea and to our surprise a two sided document with lots of pictures and semantics was better communicated. It was a good lesson learned that we don't need twelve pages of information to get our point across.

The Sea Grant programs had a budget increase in FY 2014. There's been a lot of conversation about allocation committees and a lot of hard work from the NSGAB and SGA on working to rebalance the programs. Hat's off to Dr. Cammen on his wisdom and moving it in a different direction without alienating the programs.

Topic: Priorities for 2014-2018; and NOAA Priorities

The SGA met with NOAA Leadership and were made very aware of the top 4 priorities: community and economic resilience; National Weather Service evolution; observational infrastructure; and organizational excellence. Since then everything has a consistent message of these priorities. Priorities one and four fall exactly within Sea Grant's purview.

Topic: Near Future

Dr. DeGuise noted Randy Nelson was Dean at Pixar University. The video is 12 minutes and talks about collaboration.

Topic: Where is Sea Grant on Resilience?

Dr. DeGuise reported part of the collaboration is to accept every offer that makes your partners look good. If you find someone that is rare and accomplished and are the best at something, then you can be the best at something else. Sea Grant has been able to do neat and original stuff with

resilience. He feels Sea Grant's nationwide extension network is not only giving but listening. We have a great network of communicators that are not only good at crafting the message, but the people on the ground transferring that message.

Topic: Strategic Roles for SGA; A Vision for SGA Efforts

Dr. DeGuise feels the SGA has been very effective in communicating with OAR, NOAA, and Congress. A great reflection of that is Sea Grant's budget.

Topic: Strategy: enhance communication; Some specific examples; Some difficult questions

Dr. DeGuise noted the SGA has several meetings where the committees and networks are represented, and then there's the SGA membership that interacts with current and past members. The SGA is hoping the NSGAB can reach out to membership and talk about it more than twice a year. Dr. DeGuise feels Sea Grant needs to continue to integrate a national and local communication strategy. The contract with West End is one-year, and he feels they should discuss what went right and what didn't.

Dr. DeGuise feels the SGA should participate in trying to reach out to different line offices of NOAA and to assess the role of Sea Grant and how it can be improved. Dr. DeGuise mentioned the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) positions that will be implemented within Sea Grant. If it's a year, it may be a problem, but a few weeks here and there will be easier for a lot of people.

Topic: What it will take?

Dr. Stubblefield thanked Dr. DeGuise and noted he's appreciated the vision of his predecessors. Each one had very good ideas: Dr. Swann selling Sea Grant to Congress and Dr. Pennock on partnerships. What he hasn't heard is the President actually building upon the objectives and goals of its predecessor. There's a continuity message that would be persuasive, but never represented. Dr. DeGuise replied he fully intends to work on growth and feels if the SGA changes their message every two years, they will fail. The growth principal he wants to continue to pursue is the same, resilience. Mayor Simmons reported on a new Congressional Coastal Communities Caucus that started two weeks ago. He would like to try and make the connection between the SGA and the committee.

Reauthorization (L. Cammen, NSGO; R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

Dr. Cammen reported the NSGO is still in process of Sea Grant's Reauthorization that has been discussed by the Senate Commerce Committee (SCC). where several issues were reviewed. The SCC staff was interested in the language dealing with the Knauss Fellowship placement and in looking at ways to balance the program.

At this point, no bills have been introduced this Congress. The only thing that needs to be clarified is the direct hire authority for Knauss Fellows. The proposed language would give

Executive offices, once a fellowship is complete, the ability to hire them as a federal employee. A lot of our fellows are recruited as contracts.

Mr. Schmitten noted he was told the Bill was going to be re-introduced by Senator Brian Schatz and Senator Roger Wicker. Two committees in the House; Science and Natural Resources have jurisdiction. The Science Committee is very keen on being involved. That's where the problem is right now, that committee doesn't exist. They are currently being rebuilt.

Mr. Schmitten noted the proposed legislation raises the administrative cap (CAP) .5%. The NSGAB position is still the same. Dr. Cammen noted besides the increase, the legislation gives the NSGO the authority to hire IPAs from the universities outside the CAP. IPAs are temp positions to the NSGO, and the NSGO may or may not pay their salary. According to the current legislation, administrative IPA's fall within the CAP. If the IPA is programmatic, they do not fall under the CAP. There is an issue, they are still not free.

The way the law is written is, we can pay nothing or everything. In the SGA briefing book, there is a comment that the universities would be paying for the IPA's, that's not my understanding of how it works. Dr. DeGuise noted it could be directly or indirectly. The SGA feels they are in the same situation, and they are under pressure to cap those expenses because they have to maintain their programs at a certain level. Our principal is to focus on increasing the overall funding which would be more of a permanent solution than increasing the CAP.

Our office had our education coordinator in a part time IPA position and they subsidized part of the cost, and so did the program, but it wasn't worth it. It was a common goal effort and it might be difficult to get a lot of people to commit, but if we approach it at a focus topical effort, it may be a lot more mutually productive and that might be where the university language came from. He feels the SGA is willing to contribute to the value added that the NSGO provides, however, the SGA doesn't agree that lifting the CAP is sufficient in order to do that because our expenses increase as well.

Dr. Mace replied yes, overall the pie doesn't stay the same. She thinks from the staffing prospective, the programs are limited and will have temporary staff. She feels there are constraints for the NSGO to staff itself appropriately.

Dr. Cammen noted, in the past, IPA's were in a sense competitive, but not formally. The NSGO put out a note to the network announcing an IPA position. They review the resumes and make a decision from there. It is not a NOAA formal recruitment process. There is nothing that says an IPA has to be a resident of Silver Spring, but there are things that can be gained by working on site.

The only problem he has with the concept is regardless whether it's in or out of the cap, the NSGO is still paying it and anything the NSGO pays will be cut from funding. The way the SGA ought to be looking at IPAs is as a return on investment. The network gets more resources. Rising tide floats all boats. You don't wait to see what's happened to decide if the investment is good. You make the investment first to see if it was a good decision.

Dr. Cammen noted the other implication of having a CAP tied to an annual appropriation is you have an annual budget. During the history of the budget, half the budget went down and the other half it went up. The Sea Grant programs don't see this fluctuation because the NSGO makes sure it dampens that effect. If the Sea Grant programs don't have a budget that goes up and down, up and down, you can't manage to the peak or to the average. Some years there's some additional money, but you can't hire under the circumstances to the peak amount. He feels Sea Grant has reached a plateau and now we will be more aggressive with hiring, but that is the result of an unpredictable cap.

National Sea Grant Office Staffing and Responsibilities (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Topic: Functions of the National Sea Grant Office; What is changing?

Dr. Cammen noted the four major function of the NSGO include (1) management and assessment of individual programs; (2) network leadership and coordination; (3) optimization of Sea Grant's role within NOAA; and (4) national leadership and program development. Due to inadequate staffing of the NSGO, we do not have time to accomplish the duties 3 & 4. The NSGO is realigning because we need to place more emphasis on these major functions. There are too many assignments for staff members.

Topic: NSGO Realignment Handout

Dr. Cammen referenced the NSGO organizational chart and noted some of the numbers are the same, which means the position will be shared by the same person. Circles are all personnel actions and changes. The numbers circled in green are not new positions we have to pay for, they are details. Positions 14 and 15 were filled by Mrs. Chelsea Berg and Dr. Gene Kim and do not require any additional money. There is no one currently in those positions because they've left. The positions circled in purple are IPA positions, which will be full or half time.

The focus area coordination lead and line office liaison are the same person. Two positions are planned to be NMFS detail (seafood) and NOS. The NSGO should have a name this month on who will be the NMFS liaison. The NOS person will be in charge of ecosystems and making connections with NOS. If the NSGO can negotiate that position, it will be a hire.

Mrs. Elizabeth Rohring is now the Director of Communication and will continue as such, minus the DFO responsibilities. She will only do communication and will have an assistant. Mr. Jonathan Eigen is now the Chief Financial Officer, as well as the DFO. He will have two people under him. Right now one of those positions is being filled by Dr. Joshua Brown when he's not being a program officer, and climate and hazards lead. Someone will also be supervising information technology (IT), which includes web functions and the Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation Reporting Database (PIER).

The realignment funding can be handled for up to 3 years, but what's going to happen in the 3rd and 4th year is we are going to have legislation passed for additional money. Over time salaries

go up and we are confident we can last 3 years. Beyond that, if the legislation doesn't pass we are going to have to make cuts. The thing is we've lived long enough managing the trough and at some point you can't do that and need to take a more optimistic point of view. At the end of the day we've brought in more people in the office and split up duties so people can be more specialized. We are in the midst of getting approval for the whole flock of actions.

Mr. Vortmann noted he fully supports the organizational chart and it depicts exactly what Dr. Cammen is trying to achieve. Mr. Vortmann asked Dr. Cammen to explain the split between the organizational chart. Dr. Cammen replied what we are trying to do is split things in half. Left half is all dealing with Sea Grant programs one way or another. The right side represents Sea Grant as a national program with external partners. This is external of the Sea Grant network.

Dr. DeGuise noted there are no new positions at the senior level towards the top. Is that because of budget constraints, done purposefully or we have enough growing experience. Dr. Cammen replied he tried to create a career for people to grow into senior level positions. Right now people have to leave to get advancement. It's more important to get the people at the bottom than one senior person at the top.

Dr. Mace asked about a NWS detail position. Dr. Cammen noted it's not built into the plan, but it's a possibility. The one person we have in place in the middle box is 12, Dr. Brown. He will stop doing contracts and program officer details, and concentrate on tasks of climate, weather, and hazards. If we can get a detail person from the NWS that will be terrific, and we will have those conversations.

Dr. Garber noted Dr. Gene Fisher's position is to have those conversations and see what we can do. The NMFS Sea Grant position is advertised as permanent. Just like the IPAs, there are other models that could have rotation. We want to keep some institutional knowledge, as well as rotation through the NSGO.

Mr. Baker asked Dr. Cammen if he has rationale to who he wants in the DFO position. Dr. Cammen replied traditionally that position has been filled by the Deputy Director. When Dr. James Murray retired, he made the decision that there was enough work for a Deputy Director to do without being DFO. Mrs. Rohring had the most ability at the time to change her assignment. The down side of that is that she spent most of her time as DFO and not communicating.

By putting Mr. Eigen in that position, we've elevated it back to being senior level. With that we are getting Mr. Eigen two people to work for him on the budget task. His job as CFO will give up some time to work more on the NSGAB. Also, Mrs. Jennifer Hinden will take on a larger role in helping the NSGAB. Admiral West noted someone from the NSGAB can take the DFO training to help Mr. Eigen and do a lot of the leg work.

Dr. DeGuise asked if decisions have been made or are they still in progress. Dr. Cammen noted other than the details from NMFS and NOS; every other position has to be competitive. There are a few senior level positions that are re-competing. Dr. DeGuise asked who would fill the positions for 7, 8 & 9. Dr. Cammen replied, Mr. Dorn Carlson is 7, 8 will be Mr. Chris Hayes;

and 9 is Mr. Michael Liffmann. Mr. Liffmann is retiring at the end of the year so he will have to be replaced by then.

Dr. Garber noted if anyone would like to make recommendations on who should fill the positions, please let her know and she will be sure to send out the information as it becomes available. Dr. Cammen noted the Director position will be recruited. He has no idea how quickly it will advertise, but when it gets out, it will be a national search in Science magazine and different journals. It is a really competitive position. It could go to someone in NOAA or a Sea Grant office.

Dr. Stubblefield asked if Dr. Cammen has talked with Mr. Craig McLean or Dr. Kathryn Sullivan on the mechanics of the position and their role in the NSGAB. Dr. Cammen noted there are two hiring boards that look at the applications. The first one looks at everyone and cuts down the list, the second conducts interviews. The NSGAB is not permitted to serve on the first hiring board and you can't be an official part of the group, but you can offer advice and be a part of the selection choice. Dr. Stubblefield asked if it requires Senate confirmation. Dr. Cammen replied no.

Pennsylvania Sea Grant (PA SG) Program Status (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Dr. Cammen noted Pennsylvania Sea Grant was brought into existence in early 2000 and they have made steady progress in moving through the stages to becoming a College Program. The NSGO sent a review team out in October to decide if PA SG met the standards to becoming a College Program. The review team has conducted the review and letter of recommendation. That report will come to the NSGAB for review.

The NSGAB will take action on the report, action being either to agree with the recommendation to become a Sea Grant College or reject. Once the NSGAB makes their decision, the recommendation goes to him and he makes the recommendation to NOAA for PA SG to become a designated College Program. Virginia Sea Grant went through the same process. At this point, he will defer to Admiral West for comments.

Admiral West noted the committee did a combined evaluation of the program and site review. The committee consisted of Dr. Fortner, Mr. Baker, Dr. Pennock and Mr. Eigen. The report is in the briefing book. The committee is very happy with the review and we recommend that VA SG become a College Program.

Mr. Schmitten asked if there are any comments. Dr. Cammen noted with the new allocation scheme, PA SG received a substantial bump in funding. Mayor Simmons asked if they get another bump by becoming a College Program. Dr. Cammen replied no, there is no money associated in advancing from stage to stage. The NSGO has been treating Institutional Programs equivalent to the way we treat College Programs. When Guam and Lake Champlain Sea Grant became Coherent Area Programs, they got a bump, but it's nothing formal.

Admiral West noted PA SG is really engaged with state agencies and have a lot of support from the governor. Penn State is probably one of the largest federally funded research centers. They have given PA SG a lot of support.

Motion by Mayor Simmons to recommend to Dr. Cammen that PA SG be approved as a College status program.

Dr. Mace 2nd, unanimous vote.

Motion approved.

Selection of nominating committee for 2016-2018 slate (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

Mr. Schmitten noted the nominations committee consists of the Chair and two members of the NSGAB that are chosen by the NSGAB. He has asked Mr. Beal, Dr. Rabalais as past president, and Admiral West as the third.

Motion by Mayor Simmons to approve the proposed Nominating Committee.

Dr. Mace 2nd, unanimous vote.

Motion approved.

National Strategic Investments (NSI) (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Dr. Cammen noted the NSI's that are being discussed will start next fiscal year. This year, the NSGO is booked with social science, capacity building, and aquaculture. Two are discretionary. If Sea Grant gets the President's request for next year, as requested, we would get \$1M. If Congress were to look at the budget and say we would rather put that into the base of Sea Grant, then we would have more money available for NSI's. We won't really know until we get the final appropriation.

His goal is to try and get ahead of the game so we are ready going into the next fiscal year. Also, he is trying to get the SGA and NSGAB more involved in the decision making process. You have two documents in front of you that were sent out on Friday. The process consisted of short proposals on fifteen different topics. The topics were last discussed during the 2014 fall meeting. Everyone selected preferences on resilience and water resources.

Those things were described very broadly. We are only talking about \$1.5M. What we need to do is discuss which one of these might be the third one to go forward and we will spend the next 6 months or so defining that down. These are written in the form of a request for proposal (RFP) and eventually will turn into an RFP. It has alarmed some people that there may be an RFP coming out. It's a description of the topic and the attempt to focus it down a little.

My advice is for everyone to think about three things. One, the impact the activity will have on stakeholders and two, will we be able to claim credit for doing this. If we are going to do something a lot of other people are working on, with more money than us, maybe it isn't the place we should be spending money. Lastly, does it help provide an identity or visibility for Sea

Grant. Further, narrowing it down to one of these two topics and having people working on crafting language.

Mayor Simmons asked what it means for social science. Dr. Cammen replied social science is providing an initiative. We are paying for half of the projects. The idea was to fund things, but get the social science out there as well.

Dr. Mace noted almost every aspect of water can be put into resilience. The description is very broad and not really targeting impact. She would like to discuss how many topics can be paired with resilience. She wouldn't pick something too offshore and if there is a big off shore component, you would have something more coastal.

Dr. Cammen noted his impression is that NOS is looking at giving money to regional communities to implement things. That's not really what Sea Grant does. He's been trying to partition Sea Grant out. Sea Grant tells people how to do resilience. That's got to be made clear to people.

Mr. Schmitten noted he likes the idea of tying the two together. He asked what Dr. Cammen needs from the NSGAB. Dr. Cammen replied he would like the NSGAB to go as far as they think they can go. Mr. Vortmann asked if Dr. Cammen is still looking at three potential NSI's with a maximum of 2 or 1 if they were combined. Dr. Cammen replied right now social science is done away with. This is the 2nd year of the 2 year initiative.

Dr. Mace noted Sea Grant's niche needs to be identified with resilience. She feels it would be helpful if Sea Grant played the role of narrowing the list and how the other amount will be invested. For example, you can combine the two: loss of freshwater supply, capabilities of climate change impacts affecting freshwater storage; and merging and strengthening the resilience piece.

Mayor Simmons noted the resilience piece really strikes him as something that will need a lot of legal involvement. He wants to make sure that whatever comes from this, that law components are covered. Mr. Baker noted one area Sea Grant can be unique is if they focus on an outreach initiative. Dr. Cammen noted he'll carry this advice forward to tomorrow and see what the SGA has to offer. A small committee will be put together to finalize one NSI and we'll wait to see what the budget looks like.

Discussion and wrap up of all topics (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)

Mr. Simmons brought up marketing of Sea Grant and how it can be easily done with stakeholders during site visits. Mrs. Grimes noted during site visits, we have stakeholders that come in and say great things about Sea Grant. They are speaking from the heart and it's true they are speaking on behalf of Sea Grant. It would be great if we could capture visually what the stakeholders are saying.

Dr. Cammen noted this is something that ought to be offered to the program. His concern on the program end is that it's an intense, difficult period of time and unless they think of it themselves to layer it on top, it is really throwing something in at the last moment. When we are setting up the site visit, we bring it up as something that was mentioned and if they like it fine, but they may not. Dr. DeGuise noted he will bring it up during the SGA meeting. Dr. Mace suggested the program inviting back the stakeholders to have a more thought out video.

Mr. Schmitten reiterated that the SGA initiative for the FY15 budget is to move under the guidelines of resilience and increase Sea Grant's budget to \$80M. The SGA has worked diligently with the NOAA Administration.

Mr. Schmitten noted the SGA/NSGAB Fall Meeting will be in Hawaii. The topic is resilience. Other topics could include collaboration with NOS and sharing funds, projects, qualifying for grants, etc. Dr. Mace noted another topic could be thinking about expanding partnerships in the Pacific and international partnerships. Dr. Cammen noted Sea Grant did have an international program that was repealed and taken out of legislation; and what was left in as the State programs can still have international projects. Maybe the NSGAB would like to consider having it put back in. We do have an extension agent in the Marshall Islands, and we have the Guam Coherent Area Program that is conversing with the Northern Mariana Islands.

Dr. Mace asked if there were any follow-up items with the Mariana Islands that would warrant conversation. Mr. Schmitten replied they have interest in aquaculture, that's their forte. Mr. Vortmann noted we aren't looking for tax payer money to directly fund, but maybe use it as a seed for Sea Grant to go abroad to make them aware of the model and the benefits of the model. There may be interest of other countries using the model and setting up their own programs.

Dr. Garber noted a number of the Sea Grant programs work internationally. Sea Grant has been able to move some money into the office. The NOAA OAR International Office works on Sea Grant International trips. Since we don't do it in the NSGO, and we don't have staff, it is something we want to discuss. Dr. Mace noted she would be interested in exploring and discussing that topic and inviting Korea Sea Grant.

Mr. Simmons reported another component of Hawaii Sea Grant is their coastal hazard activities, and home owner's handbook. Since coastal hazards can be a big part of coastal resilience, it's just another piece to tie into it. Dr. DeGuise noted they can discuss ongoing efforts to sell resilience to the Sea Grant Network. Dr. Brown noted Hawaii is a good place to do that because Hawaii Sea Grant has been very successful in a range of NOAA partnerships around resilience issues. Dr. Garber gave the task to Dr. Brown.

Dr. Garber asked if there are any folks on the NSGAB with international topics who can pull together concepts. Mr. Vortmann, Mr. Beal, Dr. Mace, and Dr. Fortner volunteered to take on the effort. Dr. Garber asked Dr. Fortner to pull together educational topics. Dr. Mace asked if there is a particular Sea Grant Director who is engaged in international work that may be a good addition. Dr. DeGuise replied Hawaii Sea Grant; and Dr. Cammen noted California, Florida and Washington Sea Grant Programs. Mr. Schmitten tasked Mr. Vortmann in chairing the

subcommittee and to come up with terms of reference, title and scope and to be prepared to give feedback at the next meeting.

Mr. Hayes gave a brief update on the Program Implementation and Evaluation (PIE) information he recently sent out. Mr. Hayes thanked everyone for the time they put into the site visits. The NSGO has an administrative calendar on our website, and the next Performance Review Panel will take place in October. The NSGAB will be invited to be a part of a brief look at the previous report. Mr. Schmitt noted the NSGAB has participated in 15 site visits, and asked Mr. Hayes if he is getting any feedback regarding any take home messages, what went right, what went wrong. Mr. Hayes replied only that positive interactions with the stakeholders should be better captured and utilized.

Mr. Vortmann asked if there were any recommendations. Mr. Eigen noted he's done a couple of site visits and based on the ones he's done and comments from the team, is that there are too many presentations. Dr. Rabalais brought up the topic of talking about stakeholders and formal interactions; and based on her experience, there were too many stakeholders. Dr. DeGuise commented the site visits have been positive and the directors have more knowledge about what's expected.

Public meeting recessed until 9:00 am Tuesday, March 3, 2015.

Tuesday, March 3, 2015

Roll Call:

Rosanne Fortner, Richard West, Dale Baker, Amber Mace, Paulinus Chigbu, Harry Simmons
William Stubblefield, Rolland Schmitt, Richard Vortmann, Frank Beal, Nancy Rabalais, Leon
Cammen (*ex-officio*)

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) attendees: Jonathan Eigen (Designated Federal Officer),
Nikola Garber, Dorn Carlson, Genene Fisher, Joshua Brown, Sami Grimes, Michael Liffmann,
Chris Hayes, Devin Brakob

Other attendees:

Jennifer Hinden-National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, Acentia
Julia Galkiewicz-National Sea Grant Office, Contractor, Acentia
Sarah Bowman-National Sea Grant Office, Knauss Fellow
Helen Cheng-National Sea Grant Office, Knauss Fellow

Public Comment Period

No Public Comments

Focus Area Updates (NSGO Knauss Fellows: S. Bowman, H. Cheng)

Topic: Happy 50th Anniversary

Ms. Bowman reported on significant impacts Sea Grant has accomplished in the last 50 years. These include implementing ways and methods to reduce bycatch and introducing extensive research in aquatic invasive species especially within the Great Lakes regions. Sea Grant has also played a large role in the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points alliance ensuring that the delivery of seafood was safe to eat. In addition, there have been 36 generations of Sea Grant Knauss fellows. Providing this unique and valuable experience to graduate students sets Sea Grant apart from the rest. She and Ms. Cheng plan to work with the 50th Anniversary Committee to prepare a complete list of highlights for the 2015 Fall SGA Meeting.

Topic: Updates Since Fall 2014

Mrs. Bowman reported there have been changes to the new Strategic Plan. Healthy Coastal Ecosystems stayed the same; Sustainable Coastal Development and Hazard Resilience in Coastal Communities became Resilient Communities and Economies; and Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply became Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture. The new Strategic Plan includes one new focus area, although it's not new to Sea Grant, Environmental Literacy and Workforce Development. This new focus area overlaps all other focus areas.

Topic: Healthy Coastal Ecosystems Examples, and Opportunities for Growth

Mrs. Bowman reviewed highlights of the Healthy Coastal Ecosystems Focus Area over the past 2 years. A primary pathway for Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) is movement of trailered watercraft. There are political boundaries, but these don't make sense ecologically and human behavior-wise. In the West, states have different regulations on the inspection and decontamination of trailered watercraft. The National Sea Grant Law Center partnered with 19 Western States (including some non-Sea Grant states), Regional AIS Coordinators, law enforcement, and natural resources attorneys to host a workshop on AIS and varying regulatory frameworks. The workshop resulted in calls, meetings, etc. to build a regional consensus around the issue. Over the past few years this has resulted in a model law (May 2014) and resulted in Oregon and Utah making regulatory changes.

A second issue in coastal waters is new contaminants such as pharmaceuticals and personal care products. The Sea Grant Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products (PPCPs) working group is in the process of renewing partnerships with the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) to produce joint outreach materials for animal caregivers. They are also reaching out to the Public Health Sector to educate people about the proper disposal of pharmaceuticals. Many states have organized pharmaceutical product collection programs.

While Sea Grant has been strong in healthy coastal ecosystems over the years, there are still opportunities for growth. Some of these include: the need to continue ecosystem-based management approaches; implement restoration and conservation, especially with growing concerns over freshwater availability; incorporate natural infrastructure and/or hybrid infrastructure into coastal ecological communities for the benefit of ecological communities, as

well as, to provide ecosystem services natural infrastructure to coastal communities and to continue to detect, analyze, and prevent aquatic invasive species.

Topic: Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture Examples, and Opportunities for Growth

Mrs. Bowman noted a good example of this focus area is bycatch reduction. It is sometimes costly and reduces catch per unit, but it reduces bycatch of non-targeted species. In Pacific Northwest states, entanglement of albatross species in long-line fishing rigs is a significant concern, especially for endangered species. Washington Sea Grant worked with industry to develop research projects to determine Best Management Practices (BMPs) for streamer lines in Washington.

Alaska Sea Grant previously worked with Alaska fisherman that used streamer lines to keep birds out of the zone where they could become entangled. The research was effective at reducing bycatch by 73%. Now Washington Sea Grant is involved in outreach to industry and local fisherman on the proper use of streamer lines, which became a requirement for certain vessels.

Mrs. Bowman also noted Georgia Sea Grant funded research to determine the oyster age at maturation. Oysters grow quickly in Georgia and perhaps there was a way to reduce the minimum size, while still operating a sustainable fishery. This resulted in a regulatory change at the Georgia Department of Natural Resources where minimum size requirements were reduced. In turn, this opened up a whole new market for Georgia oysters, especially the cocktail oyster market and the overall production of oysters.

Mrs. Bowman reported in order for this focus area to be more successful, Sea Grant needs to continue to have informed regulation because it is sometimes closely tied with community economies. Traditionally, Sea Grant has focused on commercial fisheries, but in the Great Lakes, recreational fishing is a large part of the regional economy. Sea Grant needs to understand how recreational fishing fits into traditional fisheries management. The fisheries extension network has increased communication among the Sea Grant programs, however, there is still occasional disconnect. The goal is to be able to share information, BMPs, etc., across the network so that each Sea Grant program can benefit from lessons learned and success stories in each program.

Topic: Resilient Communities and Economies Examples, and Opportunities for Growth

Ms. Cheng reported there have been a wide variety of plans that state Sea Grant programs have been implementing in achieving this focus area. Many states have implemented economic preparation and strategies, one example being Lake Champlain Sea Grant, which provided water resources training courses for real estate professionals. Realtors are an important group to focus educational efforts on as they regularly interact with the public and other professionals on issues of land use. Working with realtors provides improved awareness of mitigation strategies towards changes in water resources, to reduce development impact on water quality, and proficiency with the use of existing tools to identify sensitive areas.

There are also efforts from Sea Grant for coastal community adaptation. In particular, Georgia Sea Grant developed a sea level rise adaptation plan leading the City of Tybee Island to make changes to city infrastructure. This included raising the pump station for city wells, retro-fitting storm tide gates, and opening discussions with the Department of Transportation and surrounding counties to include sea level rise projections in plans. In addition to these positive actions, a recent decision to forego a proposed sea wall on the island was made after an analysis by the Georgia Sea Grant project deemed it to not be cost effective.

Ms. Cheng noted Sea Grant needs to continue to communicate with town councils, and coastal managers to create and implement these adaptation strategies. Based on recent conference calls and meetings, there is a need from the Sea Grant network to place more troops on the ground, as well as, provide ways to handle economic and legal issues to communities. Sea Grant needs to adopt mitigation measures, and create new tools and technologies to be resilient.

Topic: Environmental Literacy and Workforce Development (ELWD) Examples, and Opportunities for growth.

Ms. Cheng noted that since the creation of the ELWD focus area there have been several success stories. There has been a push to provide technical assistance and extension to the workforce, once example being to workers on the water. Many Sea Grant programs have provided training on sustainability to fishermen and vessel operators to fish and harvest in a conducive way and to be more fuel-efficient.

There has also been an effort to increase awareness in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) to groups, such as, influencing the next generation of students, to get them excited about sciences, and to bring the classroom into the field. One example being, the National Ocean Sciences Bowls (NOSB) that addresses a national gap in environmental and earth sciences at locations where students are not meeting mathematics and science standards. A participants survey done in Texas found that 75% agreed or strongly agreed that preparing for and participating in NOSB increased their interest in science, 70% agreed or strongly agreed that after participating they were much more aware of science career options, and 60% agreed or strongly agreed that they were more likely to consider a career in a scientific field.

Ms. Cheng noted Sea Grant should continue to reach out to underrepresented groups at other locations, and develop coastal marine and Great Lakes curriculums in schools, colleges, and universities. It would also be a benefit to keep track of the students who remain in the STEM field and how many of those students would contribute to workforce and/or the sciences. Sea Grant also needs to bridge the gap between research scientists who are conducting the sciences in the field, resources managers who are making assessments and management, and the community who are living within these areas.

Topic: Cross-Cutting Opportunities

Mrs. Bowman reported there are many examples of cross-cutting opportunities and a few include continuing climate adaptation work in focus areas, social science work in focus areas, exploring coastal communities' resilience, and exploring changing coastal water resources.

Topic: Cross Cutting Approaches

Mrs. Bowman noted that she and Ms. Cheng recommend that Sea Grant continue to communicate closely with targeted local groups. Expanding interaction with the native groups, as well as, specific science groups, can help us accomplish more in each focus area. Many Sea Grant Programs have Memorandums of Understanding with their Land Grant counterparts. Sea Grant Programs should continue these collaborations since land and sea are interconnected.

Mrs. Bowman also noted collaboration within NOAA and other agencies has been strong. Sea Grant should focus on how we can pool money from joint RFPs. We should think about strategic partnerships that cross-cut multiple focus areas. This will increase Sea Grant's visibility.

Ms. Cheng noted there are a variety of groups that fall under the category of education, extension, and research. One of which are students and families in impoverished and/or urban areas that may have no knowledge of natural sciences. As we continue to live in an ever-growing technological age, many students and their families, especially from urban areas are losing touch with their natural surroundings. And as our climate changes, these individuals need to be aware of this in order to adapt to changes.

Another group is native groups. These native groups may have a better knowledge of the natural areas than scientists and managers. They have a plethora of knowledge passed down from generations and have developed special bonds with land and sea. We need to appreciate this, as well as, continue to work with them in preserving the natural areas that hold traditions and spirituality among these groups. Finally, there needs to be an overall increase in stewardship from varying groups of people. We want the the community to partake in the decision making, to see more people learning and getting involved with the actions of their communities, and help contribute in impactful decisions.

Topic: Cross-Cutting Tools

Mrs. Bowman noted Sea Grant is a great network, and it gets even bigger when we encourage collaboration. She and Ms. Cheng recommend that Sea Grant continue to expand communication, collaborate with Land Grant Institutions, and within NOAA and other agencies. Sea Grant should also incorporate new technologies into education, research, and extension.

Ms. Cheng noted citizen science is extremely valuable to scientists and to resource managers. Citizen science can provide more troops on the ground and increase the help in data collection and other tasks. It is also a way to engage non-scientists, in turn creating an appreciation for their community and the activities of their community on a passionate level. Sea Grant can also be successful in continuing social science work in the focus areas. Learning how societies interact with issues associated with the environment is valuable in our decision-making. Describing,

explaining, and predicting human behavior enables Sea Grant to make a difference in coastal and Great Lakes communities.

Topic: A Look Into the Future

Mrs. Bowman noted in the year 2065, when the 86th generation of Knauss Fellows stands before the NSGAB, they will look back on the last 50 years, and what will they see. Ms. Cheng reported, she and Mrs. Bowman hope that when the 2065 Knauss Fellows create this slide, they will look back and see that communities are better prepared to cope with emerging threats economically, socially, and ecologically. We also hope our successors will present on work that communities are utilizing technologies for science and management.

Discussion

Mr. Rolland feels that Ms. Cheng and Mrs. Bowman did an outstanding job, and feels the NSGAB benefited from the presentation. He really enjoyed the cross cutting suggestions. Mr. Vortmann questions the ELWD focus area and the risk of education being removed from the budget. He would like to know what impact there would be on that particular focus area. Ms. Cheng replied, with the proposed budget in FY2016, it would be drastic. Sea Grant would not be able to reach out to schools, especially in urban areas that may have no idea of what's going on. Mr. Vortmann asked if this bad news materialized, do we need to revise some of it. It's one thing if we do it behind the scenes and another if it's advertised.

Mr. Cammen noted, what may come to pass, the NSGAB shouldn't shy away, if your advice is to continue, you should be loud and clear. Some of the Sea Grant Programs have flexibility and they will find ways to use another pot of money to do this. If this actually happened it would be the termination of a lot of the programs. Our legislation doesn't say we have to, but to make it more mandatory, we changed the word for fellowships to we must have Knauss Fellows. It may be time to put a clause in there to establish it.

Dr. Fortner noted there are several things going on. We can't say at any point STEM is going away. She would like to work with the fellows to pull out EWLD as a separate slide, and in some way establish the importance of this area, and cross-cut it with the rest of the focus areas. She would like to review the reauthorization and find the cross-cutting areas and report on the big picture. Dr. Fortner noted in the Biennial report, they put programs under categories instead of reporting on the individual program alone.

Resiliency Update and Toolkit Demonstration (J. Brown, NSGO)

Dr. Brown noted it's amazing what a \$50 Billion disaster does to a discussion. Dr. Brown referenced the items in the briefing book: Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) White House Resilience Fact sheet, NOAA Press Release on Sea Grant Resilience, 2012 National Research Council (NRC) Resilience Summary, Sea Grant \$15.9 Resilience Press Release and the SGA Fact Sheet. He remembers being in the middle of a PRP meeting while the storm was going on and at the time, we didn't necessarily realize the impact it was going to have. Not so much in

terms of damage, but in terms of policy conversation. Since then NOAA and the federal government have made a lot of investments. The NRC did provide a framework vision for 5 components for a resilient America. These topics included: support creation and maintenance, work cooperatively with public and private, incorporate resilience and promote coordinated resilience.

At the national level, Sea Grant has definitely showed the last two topics and has been doing resilience from the get go. Sea Grant has been working on resilience for 40 years plus. At the same time NOAA has made resilience one of their top requirements. Dr. Sullivan has made it one of her 4 priorities and she's narrowed it down to where she wants to focus her political capital.

Dr. Brown mentioned the NSGO is actively participating in NOAA's climate adaptation policy team and strategic climate goal in planning how to spend money. We have stepped up our partnerships with the NWS while Dr. Genene Fisher is here with Sea Grant, we will do more. In April, we will hold a meeting in Norfolk on rip current and wave run off, which is paid for by the NOAA Coastal Storms Program. This is aimed at researchers, forecasters, and emergency managers. The planning is underway but VASG, DESG, and NCSG are all key players in the planning.

Also under the Coastal Storms Program, we have had success in connecting Sea Grant in the larger effort in all the regions it has been playing. Ms. Tracy Sempier who deals with the Gulf of Mexico has become the new paradigm in the Pacific. We are now moving the program into a new region, the Mid-Atlantic, which somewhat overlaps. We work very closely with NOAA's Climate Program Office, the National Ocean Service, and the National Marine Fisheries Service to work on grants to target resilience. The NSGO was able to review the initial drafts of the RFP and make suggestions and comments to encourage it to be more meaningful to our stakeholders.

With regards to the coastal resilience grants that NOS has now, we are talking to the manager of the competition to see how we can help and encourage our programs to apply and make sure our work compliments instead of duplicates. They are looking for research that already has information which is good. Sea Grant didn't have the capacity to do the planning in the past, so there are still some gaps. We secured \$1.8M for social science at risk communication from the Sandy Supplemental that involved NY, NJ and CT Sea Grant Programs. Our individual programs have done a lot more. That was just from the national level.

Dr. Brown hoped the NSGAB has seen the resilience toolkit. It represents everything the Sea Grant Programs have submitted and is useful for resilience. We currently only have information from 18 programs. One of the concerns is it needs to be updated. We are updating it annually and trying to schedule the update into the annual reporting cycle.

We decided not to organize it by state because we want it to be a national tool kit. The other thing we did was highlight featured tools that are being used by many programs, or that our team of experts feels is particularly useful if you were a brand new person coming to Sea Grant and use stuff Sea Grant has developed. We want it to be small and tight so you can show up day one

and see the 4-6 things that will help someone do resilience the way Sea Grant does resilience. We have pulled together demonstration projects on how people have used multiple tools to become resilient.

All the projects were funded by Sea Grant and many of them have come out of the \$5M we used on demonstration projects or larger investments. The federal climate resilience tool kit which the climate office is hosting, lists many of our tools. We held a Climate Adaptation Knowledge Exchange Program and they featured many of our tools, and we are talking about how we can share knowledge. We are doing our best at this point to share a coherent picture of how Sea Grant is in the resilience area. It is challenging because each region does resilience differently. We are moving towards having the programs themselves to define what resilience means in their area and then weaving that together.

In some states Sea Grant is really big into water resources management and other states don't do it at all. The challenge to the NSGAB is how we convert this into something that is coherent and to help us address how Sea Grant is a unique partner in resilience.

Mr. Schmitten commended Dr. Brown on his presentation. Mr. Schmitten noted resilience is a topic dear to our hearts, NOAA, and Congress. We are the founding fathers of resiliency. Mr. Baker asked if there is an estimate of how many Sea Grant Extension Specialists are in the field doing resilience work. Dr. Brown noted he would say almost all extension folks are doing resilience work under the NRC Resilience because they are helping the communities address and plan for changes.

Dr. Brown noted the NRC is looking to do a National Adaptation Forum, biennial meeting in May. He managed to convince the planning committee to give Sea Grant a room for any Sea Grant folks that would like to get together and share some tools and some experiences; and have a professional development day. One of the challenges we have is how do we shape this vision for resilience across the program. Someone may think they do not qualify. Mr. Vortmann asked if Dr. Brown briefed Dr. Holly Bamford. Dr. Brown replied NOS is aware of it, not sure about Dr. Bamford, but she chairs several working groups he has briefed.

Dr. Mace asked Dr. Brown if he would share his thoughts on what makes Sea Grant unique and if he's talking about collaborating with other entities within NOAA and what do they think. Dr. Brown replied his feeling in many cases; Sea Grant is the person who does bring lots of groups together. There's also a growing understanding of the strength of our integrated research and outreach model; and Sea Grant has the resources to effectively target research. We can do it in a quick and coherent fashion, and bring people to the table and fill information gaps. They don't tend to think of us on broader geographies, they come to us on a state level. We've pushed through some regional mini grants. We are building the sense we can collaborate on a regional scale. Some of our partners that know us well see how strong we are in regional collaboration.

Admiral West noted he feels Dr. Bamford's challenge is to bring everyone together for coastal resiliency, and she needs to know about this and that it's not duplicated somewhere else. Dr.

Garber noted Mr. McLean wants all the Assistant Administrators to know about the tool and his newsletter highlighted it.

Focus Teams (L. Cammen, NSGO)

Dr. Cammen noted this discussion began during Sea Grant Week and what it amounts to in redesigning theme teams and theme team concepts, also known as focus teams. 10 years ago, we had 10 theme teams. Sea Grant topic areas were divided up into a team for just about everything. They were functioning along the titles of think tanks and were supposed to develop plans for their area.

Some developed white papers of Sea Grant activities and some didn't do much at all. The idea was they were going to be the way of telling the big story of Sea Grant. We then developed the concept of focus teams. The focus teams were intended to provide oversight guidance and forward thinking for each of the four strategic plan focus areas. It didn't really work well. They did good things but they got overtaken by their duties and in reviewing all the impacts once a year. It all makes sense in order to know what Sea Grant is doing, yet in order to do that, it's a tremendous job. That really overwhelmed everything else.

For this round of strategic planning, the team will concentrate on planning and ideas; and will still look over what we are doing and provide advice and guidance to the network. What makes sense is to get the NSGAB more involved in that and making the teams formal subcommittees of the NSGAB. This gets us around the legal uncertainty where we are using these teams to get guidance and advice which is really supposed to be the job of a Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) committee. It also gives the NSGAB an opportunity to think about the different areas we are focusing on, looking ahead and providing advice. We will have a few people in the new office alignment to help work on these committees. They will help staff the team, and help run the committee unless someone on the NSGAB has the expertise.

When this subject was brought up in the fall, there was a lot of concern on the amount of work from the NSGAB. These teams will not function the same way as before. Alternatively, we put the teams together.

Dr. Rabalais asked how many subcommittees there will be. Dr. Cammen replied he envisions four standing committees. If there is interest in building a real aquaculture plan, another group may form and cease when the work is complete. Mr. Schmitten noted he supports the focus team concepts. He asked Dr. Cammen what the reporting requirement is. Dr. Cammen replied the subcommittees would not be reporting to the NSGO, but to the NSGAB. The NSGAB could have two subcommittees per meeting and focus on two sets of topics and have another meeting to focus on the rest.

Dr. Rabalais asked if the NSGO would ask people to be a part of the focus teams as before, because she was the only one from the NSGAB and is concerned she'd be doing all the work. Dr. Cammen noted he sees the team composition more or less the same as before. It will be

composed of the Sea Grant Directors, NSGAB and other members as appropriate. He doesn't think it really matters, but it does not have to be chaired by a NSGAB member.

Dr. Mace asked if Dr. Cammen could explain how this model is more effective than the last time. Dr. Cammen replied the previous teams provided guidance and made suggestions about initiatives and looking forward. There was the feeling that you needed to know what's going on and in order to do that you have to look at 200 plus accomplishments. They ended up with a few day meeting each fall to do nothing but go over accomplishments and there wasn't enough energy to carry on the forward thinking part.

It turned into a task rather than an opportunity. What we are trying to do here is get the task part out of it. Once the NSGO is realigned, we will be able to take part in it and it will give more time for forward thinking. I think there will be more volunteers from the network. Dr. Garber noted she can see the forward thinking feeding into the next strategic plan, which will start in 2015. From not only the Sea Grant resources, but what partnerships should we be pursuing and why we should be going after it.

Dr. Rabalais feels it's a good way to go, but if these teams came up with recommendations that went through the NSGAB and to the Sea Grant Director for the next 5 years, are all the Sea Grant Directors going to complain that they don't have a part of it. Dr. Cammen replied it's up to the Directors to join the groups. Dr. Rabalais asked how the focus area groups would interact in a unified way. There may be something that could slip between the cracks that should be included in a strategic plan. Dr. Cammen replied as the subcommittees of the NSGAB you are reporting to the NSGAB as a whole and getting them to engage with each other in a discussion. If you think something fell through the cracks, you still have the NSGAB to discuss, as well as, the Strategic Planning Committee.

Dr. Rabalais noted this seems more of an opportunity for the NSGAB to look at important issues for Sea Grant rather than just taking care of business. Dr. Brown noted they were very powerful groups before. The Social Science NSI was recommended by a group as well as the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) investment in ocean renewable energy and the whole conversation of adaptation of climate. Mr. Baker asked Dr. Cammen if he foresees having a budget in the NSGO for helping manage projects, meetings, etc. Dr. Cammen replied yes, it's part of the budget.

Dr. Rabalais sees the HCE group deciding they want to start focusing on Healthy Coastal Ecosystems and ecosystems which would be outside of the box, but it would be something that could possibly go into the next Strategic Plan. Dr. Garber noted she can see these teams as in the next 5 years, or 20. Dr. Brown noted if they are give the opportunity and time, these teams would have historically gone out of their boundaries.

The following NSGAB members volunteered to take part in each focus area team:

Healthy Coastal Ecosystems- Dr. Rabalais as Co-Chair

Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture- Mr. Schmitten as Co-Chair

Resilient Communities and Economies- Mayor Simmons as Co-Chair, and Dr. Mace

Environmental Literacy and Workforce Development-Dr. Fortner as Co-Chair

Motion by Dr. Rabalais that the NSGAB create subcommittees that contribute to the focus area development into the future, and that those subcommittees report back to the NSGAB to maintain FACA authority. The NSGAB would then take those recommendations to the NSGO. There should be at least one NSGAB member on each of the focus area teams, and the NSGAB should strive to have one member co-chair the committee with someone from the NSGO.

Mr. Baker 2nd, unanimous approval.

Motion approved.

Discussion of Meeting topics and wrap-up (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)