

Sea Grant Review Panel Meeting

September 29, 2007

MOTION to add two new items to the agenda:

- **Message from director for SGA, NSGO, panel to talk – Panel needs to consider/respond (Robinson)**
 - **Discussion of Knauss Fellowship (Bell)**
- New agenda APPROVED unanimously.**

- **Thank you to NSGO/Leon and Amy Painter for their help in panel's report to Dr. Spinrad (Robinson)**
- **Highlights of panel's involvement/Exec. Committee (Robinson)**
 - The Executive Committee has discussed how to increase the panel's involvement.
 - Panel advised the NSGO on New Jersey which would have been delegated to the executive committee in the past.
 - Reauthorization discussion: discussed the panel's role and suggested a talk with Dr. Spinrad and the Admiral. Craig McLean and Dr. Spinrad advised panel to follow mandate.
 - How to deal with guidance from NRC? Panel suggested that it should respond to all recommendations but also develop a model to move away from rhetoric toward action.
 - The Exec. Committee discussed decided it needs data on panel's decision re: increasing admin. cap from 5-7%. This information is not yet available. Some panel members want to update that data for hill visits.

Leon's Report on Sea Grant

- One Sea Grant: Unity will help program break out of many constraints. The national strategic plan aims to reflect prioritization and focus toward unity.
- Sea Grant's visibility is increasing within NOAA (39% of VADM stories in newsletter)—partly due to NSGO data mining on SG activities. This presents a window of opportunity (in the short time that the VA will be in the office—same with Bill Hogarth who is another supporter).
- With limited resources, partnerships are key (NOAA, EPA, FEMA, etc)
- FEMA: Regional prototype, Region VI Texas. Will discuss how it went, if successful, we would propose a national program.
 - Report in NOAA that explained what was done post-Katrina—The panel should push for the release of this report (West)
 - Suggestion that SG propose to NOAA a partnership with FEMA (Bell)
 - SG should be cautious that all know the good NOAA did during Katrina before partnering with FEMA (Weis).
 - This will be a slow process. For this to sell, the regional program has to succeed for others to see the value (Cammen)
- NOAA integration (SG, CZM, CSC, NCCOS). Not a merger but looking at overlap and moving toward increased collaboration/coordination. A permanent chance in the way we do business. NOS integration is first and then we'll look at parts of NMFS
 - Request to have a copy of Emily's request and NOAA's response (West, Kudrna)

- There have been numerous collaborations (including the FEE program which is ending soon). Requests that panel step in, look at material, and make a recommendation on what to do with the program (by summer of 2008).
- MSFCMA reauthorization of 2006 and NMFS/SG Bilateral 2007- planning a meeting in November to discuss extending the program regionally. This workshop will set national agenda but then devolve into regional discussions. Expect each region to approach it differently (some already work together). They'll outline what cooperation will look like.
- NMFS/SG fellowships: 35 awarded, 14 current fellows
 - Concern over fellow's knowledge of Sea Grant. Suggestion that fellows have more than one day symposium—perhaps a month (Kudrna, Bell)
- Regional SG: Ocean Research Priority Plan released in 2007 – no problem fitting in with themes. Regional planning began last year. Two west coast regions have joined together and developing plans. By end of 2008/09 all regional plans should be complete. These are not SG regional plans but SG facilitated regional plans well beyond the scope of what SG can/should do. SG and NMFS regions coincide almost perfectly.
- SG has been working to get our regional areas to work with NOAA regions. Memos have gone out to encourage teams to work with SG teams early on.
- SG proposed reauthorization language (in review now) includes authorization for competitive regional funding for FY09 – not sure if it will survive but SG is proposing that in FY09 competitive program has: ecosystems approach, focus ORPP to a regional level, bridge gap between ORPP and local priorities, and enhance SG regional presence. Nothing has been submitted to Congress yet, though it has made it through OAR. Resources committees have been consulted and no one objected.
 - Any discussion as to including international dimensions into regional reauthorization? (Byrne) No, however, we are trying to reintroduce SG's authority to work internationally (Cammen).
 - Suggestion that SG serve as a coordinator for all NOAA regions. Panel could then help NOAA regionally and shape role of SG (West).
 - This process started as an outreach vehicle. SG is using this as a way to reinforce/enhance partnerships and push ourselves into the process.
 - Request that Mary Glackin address panel meeting 17-18 October to discuss response to RIT, Mary or Paul Doremus or both could come and talk toward end (Robinson, West).
 - To sell regionalization on the hill, we need to approach them as a whole and provide the big picture (Heath).
 - Suggestion that the panel facilitate a discussion of coastal players (Schuble)
- Reauthorization status: Negotiated draft bill with SGA and review panel, went into clearance process July 30th, looked similar to last bill, moved quickly, line office comments minimal and helpful, target is Jan. '08. We then have to find a sponsor for the bill.
 - Elevates status of panel, funds regional implementation, increases NSGO cap, international program, removes rankings, increased funds that can be awarded without match (1%-5%).
 - In draft negotiations, what was originally proposed, what had the review panel negotiated, and what was finally proposed? (Bell)
 - 3 changes proposed: Panel language should be up to date to describe what panel does. Tried to give panel more interaction with programs. Rather than providing strategic thinking and admin

requests, panel no longer has to review proposals, or review state performance and execution. There was concern over this last part so language was put back that panel had a role in program assessment. 3 year terms were objected to and 4 year terms were maintained. Language was added that panel can establish subcommittees. Cammen will pass this out tomorrow (Cammen).

- Concern that the panel did not agree to everything (Kudrna).
- Concern over the administrative cap—too limiting for National Office (West). We need to demonstrate value added (Heath).
- Budget: FY07 appropriations \$54.7 million down \$7.2 million from FY05 because of an additional \$700,000 from NOAA. Required cuts to programs (not starting new programs). FY08 President Request \$54.9m. Senate mark at \$60m and house \$58.4. Continuing resolution until mid-November.
- National program development is the most important part and that is what's getting squeezed out. National Office doesn't have much of a national presence within NOAA—this hurts SG's image as a national program. Other offices can commit people to OMB integration and it's only ad hoc with us.
 - SG needs long term cultivation to get long-term funding into SG—this needs to be communicated to SGA (Alden).
- Staff changes: Oliver and Krauk resigned. Agy out on maternity. Pearson out in December for maternity. Brown on detail. Incoming: Lugo, Knauss Program manager, IPAs Liffmann (Extension) and Hurley (Research). Other IPAs: Walker (Education 25% of time) Rayburn, Andy Lazur.
- NIMS: Went live last week, 12 programs already entered project data, integrates project reporting with impacts and performance reporting, generate annual reports, and provide key support to the integrated planning and assessment system.
- NSI Update: Aquatic Invasive Species: Cancelled, priorities came from regional panels, 52 preproposals, 10 full proposals (didn't add anything new). Oyster Disease Research: Cut in half. Anticipated about \$1 million reduced to \$500,000. 33 preproposals, 19 full proposals. Gulf of Mexico Oyster Industry: same reduction as oyster disease (no oyster competitions next year)
- NRC Response Process: Oct. 15: Comments due on RIT and panel concepts. Anyone with responses should comment on both of them together and let Cammen know. Oct. 31: RIT report complete. Nov. 14: Panel report discussed and adopted. Dec. 1: Final decision on planning/assessment system. Dec. 31: Final report ready for transmittal to congress. This is not a competition. Both systems have strengths and weaknesses. Costs seem to be similar. Major difference is site visit rating vs. panel rating. There is consensus on key process: strong strategic planning with defined national outcomes tied to program assessment.
 - The current program assessment model focuses the panel's attention first on local assessments and then national assessments. The proposed RIT model changes much of this so that there is a lot less panel effort in assessing locally and more on national assessments. We would like the panel to spend the majority of its time focusing on national assessment (state of the SG report)—there are many others that can do local assessments.
 - To do this, we'll need local knowledge more than just paper knowledge (Bell).
- Where is the panel needed? In order of priority:
 - How can SG best work with NOAA's other coastal programs? Panel should step into this. What should the primary role be? Are there lessons to be learned from states where the coastal programs work well together (best

management than can be transferred to other areas)? Should NOAA restructure its coastal programs? (Panel might as well get involved in this now as it's the future).

- Lautenbacher has to make the request of the panel to look at all of NOAA. Cammen should ask him to ask the panel (West).
- Fisheries Extension: Has the program been effective? Should it be continued? If so, are there changes to be made?
- Pennsylvania is applying for institutional status. Cammen will look to panel to review application.
- Declining emphasis on Research: Is this an across the board decrease? How can we reverse the decline? Are guidelines useful?
- Potential panel agenda:
 - Growing SG extension through partnerships: How to maintain SG model with new partnerships, can extension partnerships enhance research? Is there a need for a NOAA Extension Service?
 - Regional SG: How can we best fit in with emerging regional frameworks?
 - International SG: What should SG's role be?
 - SG and the Social Sciences: How can we provide the most value? Research? Extension? Decision-support tools? This will also be a small part of planning process.
 - Two panel roles were left out: 1). Analysis as to why the SG dollars remain constant 2). Analysis as to why SG hasn't become more integrated into NOAA over the years (Duce).
 - SGI approach as been opportunistic and reactive, we need to be more strategic (Cammen). SGI: There could be a cooperative SG program in Canada but it died (West). Panel could take up this as one of its issues right away (Bell). No one in the NSGO is responsible for international. There is no mandate, no people assigned, and no money and maybe there should be (Murray) .What are the possibilities for contracting out to universities to take advantage of these opportunities? (Byrne) National Office needs guidance as to what to do (Cammen). SG should be flexible to adjust (rapid response) or appropriate new funds for such opportunities (Stephan). There is no discretionary money. But we can petition to get rapid response funds (Cammen).
 - Request that Cammen send panel a formal letter of what he wants them to do so they can address them publicly and do so in time for federal planning (West).

Byrne's Report on Strategic Planning:

- Goal for Dec. 1st. Cammen requested them to develop few focus areas and identify any cross-cutting themes.
- Based on stakeholder input, top down or bottom up
- June 19th, first meeting. July 31st - stakeholder meeting. Conference calls every week/week and half.
- Krauk and Grimes put together a top down bottom up synthesis document. Bitsy took those documents and summarized into a single document (12-15 pages) that you can have a copy of if you want.
- These cover focus areas, not strategies, which is what this gathering is for.
- Nov. 20th meeting in DC to look at what we have.

- What are the trends, driving forces, gaps, and particular niche for SG considering all of the agencies that address coastal issues?
- Driving trends:
 - Rapid coastal development
 - Climate change
 - Globalization
 - Energy supply and demand
 - Seafood and seafood safety
 - Increased competition for coastal resources
 - Increasing pressure on coastal decision-makers
- Needs and Priorities:
 - Understanding climate change
 - Ocean education, etc.
- Gaps:
 - Social sciences
 - Communication techniques
 - Urgent response capability
 - Lack of funding/time
- Partnerships were discussed: international, federal, non-profit.
- Focus areas:
 - Sustainable, Safe Seafood Supply: This is an area where SG and NMFS could work together on.
 - Sustainable Coastal Development: Complex competition for space/resources.
 - Healthy Coastal Ecosystems: may be too broad an issue, but involves ecosystem management, land use planning, etc.
 - Coastal Hazard Resiliency:
- Stakeholder meeting: State dept., CRS, Dept Agriculture, private sector, etc.
 - Globalization received a lot of attention, affects all focus areas
 - Climate change
 - Educating population
 - Management/resiliency needs and challenges are different
- SG week goals:
 - Finding out if these are the right focus areas
 - What strategies?
 - With this input, we will put together a draft strategic plan.
- We have a tendency to think short term and for our strategic plan, we need to push for more long-term thinking in the plan.
- Additional comments:
 - Technology is a cross-cutting theme, but we didn't want to get too broad with theme areas, and its small compared to other areas.
 - SG has provided new technology to fishers which have led to over fishing—we need to emphasize sustainability (Weis).
 - We will probably measure 10-100 outcomes. Uncertain as yet.
 - We're looking for strategies, not specific actions so it will be somewhat general, but this will let programs monitor their own activities.
 - From 11 themes to 4 focus areas—are there any themes that wouldn't fit under focus areas? (Weis)
 - Biotech, ocean technology. Though they might contribute. The major things we do map into these focus areas (Cammen).
 - Aquaculture should get attention in Sustainable Seafood Supply (**Jerry**).

- We want to try and keep the plan focused and not as comprehensive as the last one.
- For SG, flexibility, timely response requires long-term thinking.
- Raising visibility of issues (changing requirements for certain degrees) is an area where the panel could play a role (Stubblefield).
- The leadership of the three groups should get together and talk after this meeting to discuss findings. This is an opportunity for the network to come together and present a strong, united message from three groups. Perhaps a letter with everyone's signature (West).
 - Whatever of detail we have, if it has consensus and was done in a transparent way, it's a huge success. This changes the culture of the program (Cammen).
 - Transparency is good, but it's not enough—we needed to talk more about RIT process and performance measures (Kudrna).
- Example strategy: coastal hazards: what needs to be in place before an event, identifying how we'll respond to such situations, etc.
- Thanks to Byrne for serving on the planning committee (Robinson, Murray).

Strategic Discussion: Decadal Thinking about Sea Grant – Looking Back/Forward - Ross Heath

- Panel spends too much time in crisis mode. We should look to the future more.
- We need to think not only about what the panel should do but other agencies roles as well.
- Past: Upward funding levels but not real dollars, about half the budget as late 1970s. In terms of purchasing power are about 1/3 of what they were in 1980. Something has to be done to reverse the trend.
 - You're talking about federal funds, but programs often get more money from other sources. (Bell).
 - We need to know what the ppp of opportunistic state funds are. That could also be a problem as programs become more dependent on interests of donors (Heath).
- Future:
 - Strengths: Long history of success, strong and diverse constituent base, strong tradition of federal relations, effective/improving internal communications (SGA), strong state and local support.
 - Weaknesses: Perceptions that SG is a “creature of Congress” without constant support from administration, support from NOAA/DOC/OMB spotty, not fully integrated with NOAA mission, viewed as outsider within NOAA. We need to address these to get more support. In addition, bureaucratic location within NOAA (OAR), NOAA not a good fit in DOC, and DOC not a strong cabinet department. Lucid case for national relevance of SG is still lacking (we shouldn't say we're doing it better, but rather show how the agencies work together well so SG doesn't look superfluous. Programmatic coordination across state boundaries is still inconsistent (programs view their resources as their own).
 - Communications could also be a weakness in articulating our role as well as a strength (Stephan).
 - NOAA has not embraced SG as an entity within NOAA, we need to provide a stronger message and encourage Lautenbacher to step up (West).

- Opportunities: Sea Grant maps well on to Ocean Commission priorities, SG was ahead of the ball on regional planning, environmental issues will continue to grow in importance, demand for effective outreach is growing in federal programs.
- Threats: Budgets aimed at deficit reduction will likely mean cuts for federal programs (particularly in the next 10-20 years—increases in national debt will aggravate this) and SG is not viewed as essential. In addition, the 2-year window for implementation of Ocean Commission recommendations has closed so SG won't benefit as much. Lastly, there isn't a strong proponent for regional programs on the hill. We need to build champions for regional planning.
 - Major strength of SG is the match—we need emphasize this. (Kudrna).
 - Yes and no. The presence of matching dollars could hurt our cause (Heath). You have to be careful that you don't prove that state funding is all that's needed (West).
- Concerns about local program autonomy and split loyalty could weaken NOAA commitment to SG—we need to be care about how we make the argument.
- SG could be the loser in the assignment of responsibilities and funding for coastal issues.
 - There isn't motivation for putting money into SG (Stephan).
 - NOAA is technical, less likely for NOAA staff to have interaction with SG. (A culture of appreciation). Should we be putting our chips in with our congressional champions? (Murray)
 - SG is seen as coastal program, which is not a major part of NOAA's mission (weather and fish). We struggle to compete (Cammen).
 - Aligning with other agencies will likely be key (Heath). We also need to find gaps in decision-making to make ourselves important. Perhaps focus on is synthesis and integration? (Jerry). SG does very little in the areas of maritime or petroleum industry. We need to look for where the money is being generated and get their support (Byrne). Coastal communities aren't demanding for more support from NOAA. They need to mobilize and become more vocal (Cammen).
- We need to get a reasonable sampling of our priorities (Duce/Heath). First, we need to have organizational responses such as building alliances so we don't look competitive or duplicative. The second is to identify the new initiatives that are important enough to get major chunks of money.
 - We need to develop our role within NOAA. The opportunity for growth is in extension and education (Kudrna).
 - Is it possible to formulate some of the non focus areas as a new initiative to get new money? i.e. biotechnology (Weis).

MOTION that Chair appoint a committee to look into some new program areas for SG to be added to the discussion tomorrow (similar to NSF process) (Bell).

Second: Kudrna

MOTION amended: Move that chair appoint a committee to look into some new program areas to SG to be added to the discussion tomorrow prior to reauthorization discussion.

APPROVED (one nay, Bell)

- SGA should hear Heath's presentation as it lays the groundwork for the next few days (West, Alden).

- One strength of SG is that it connects NOAA to the academic community. If things get tougher, extension is absorbed into NOAA, there may be very little of SG left. We need to think of the various scenarios that could play out as things get more difficult (Byrne).

Paul Anderson Presentation:

- SGA would like to host reception prior to boat reception Sunday night and invite panel and NSGO.
- Panel would something a little more tangible to come out of the meeting, as far as the direction of SG and advancing SG monetarily (Robinson).
- SGA could select delegates to listen to Heath's presentation (West).
- Accepts on behalf of panel (Robinson)

Admiral West's Presentation:

- Shared report with Robinson and Cammen, met with Baird and received comments. Other than panel's reaction, unsure what else to do with the report.
- Highlights of report:
 - SG is very vulnerable right now. Funding slope is decreasing abruptly. Neither SG nor NOAA have large commercial support and this adds to vulnerability.
 - Current problems:
 - From the hill side, some people are warm to SG but they often view it as a block grant—we need to express why SG is important to the nation.
 - NSGO, panel, SGA, and role of leadership of NOAA (need to embrace SG) are the four parts that report looks into.
 - Emily's replacement was a Knauss fellow but this won't solve the structural problem within NOAA.
 - Cammen needs to have a good relationship with OMB.
 - Lautenbacher could speak to NOAA?
 - Could Robinson talk to them (Woeste). Yes, as could Mary (West).
 - We need to be on the hill, educating the committees on our work plan on a regular basis. Leon is often restricted as to what he can say but a committee isn't. Joel suggested that we go on to the hill together re: reauthorization (Kudrna).
 - There are some issues where the panel could go with the SGA. It depends on the subject we're talking about. Regarding reauthorization, the panel and the SGA should let NSGO take care of it (West). The panel has already commented on it.
 - The bill is currently halfway through the NOAA chain (Cammen).
 - The panel should see the whole bill as proposed as the agency (West, Bell).
 - Unsure as to whether NSGO can share the bill with the panel (Cammen).
- The panel should be able to form a fact finding committee at anytime but it wasn't in the charter (Reference: Panel's charter tab number 6 in book).
 - The question to the panel is of these observations (page 3) do we ask West to carry this further to address these observations? (Robinson)
 - If we do more than what the charter says, are we disobeying FACA laws? (Byrne)
 - No one goes to jail for breaking FACA rules. We're here to help and advise—and we haven't been used that way. Fact-finding is fine, but if you get together as a panel to decide on something that affects SG is must be public (unless it's something about internal panel structure). It's not public until panel is discussing on what to do with that information (West).
 - The anger isn't violating FACA rules but not taking advantage of power granted to FACA committees (Stubblefield).

- Suggestion to amend charter by taking the charter signed Sept. 14th by commerce for hydro services as a model. Add a conflict of interest or an ethics clause, and the section on subcommittees (West).
 - Recommendation to submit without subcommittee language (Murray).
- A copy of the amended charter will be available to the panel before the end of Sea Grant Week (West).
- Discussion on closed vs. open meetings: FACA is closed if it's sequestered (i.e. budget) info or for litigation. The panel can do administration anyway it wants to So long as everyone is comfortable with it, we don't need to put it in the charter (West).
 - Close meetings judiciously (Murray).

MOTION that the panel establish a subcommittee to review the procedures manual post haste (assuming charter is voted in) for approval during conference call Nov. 14th.

SECOND: Byrne

ACCEPTED unanimously

Public Comments:

- SGA should hear Heath's presentation and the panel should hear their views (West, Alden).
- Knauss fellows—Group of fellows Woeste met with: 1) knew very little of SG and 2) weren't happy with SG. We're missing an opportunity for follow up with fellows. One suggestion that might be useful is that they spend a month of assignment on detail with NSGO doing special assignments (Woeste).
 - Heard from two fellows that they had no support from home state programs (checks weren't coming) while others said they were getting constant contact. Maybe we should talk to fellows manager (Stephan).
 - A significant portion of their orientation should be devoted to learning about SG (Weis).
 - Suggest essay that asks applicants to give an example of a SG approach/activity and show its value to motivate them to learn about SG (Alden).
 - Suggest that the fellows must stay a month with home institution and perhaps the NSGO (Bell).
 - Not sure the panel should be involved in the management of the fellowship—but I like the idea of a partial internship in the NSGO (Byrne).
 - This is the right level of advice; we can take a look at it. We do need to fix the problem, fellows need to know more about SG (Cammen).
 - We have a great new Knauss manager and we'll pass it along and ask to see it in his plan of work. And we need to review what we're doing (Murray).
 - We might also look into asking them to do something after the fellowship (Weis). Perhaps send fellows back to home institution for a week or so to build relationship (Kudrna).

Ralph Rayburn (Texas Sea Grant) Presentation:

- Knauss fellows are how we engage with national scene. This is how you can help make SG relevant to NOAA (The impetus for much of the partnership with FEMA was through a FEMA Knauss fellow).
- Propose retreat for fellows and a mentoring program—they'll be in powerful positions in government in a few years, we should make sure to help them while their fellows.

Sub-item request from Leon's talk:

- Status of NOAA post-Katrina report
- Copy of Emily's coastal management report; and the status of SG's response to her report?
- Panel briefing on the NOAA regionalization plan.
 - Oct. 17-18: Six people will meet with Paul Doremus and get back to panel.
 - If the panel has particular questions, let the NSGO know in advance (i.e. what should SG's role be) (Cammen).

Sea Grant Review Panel Meeting

September 30, 2007

Two items to add to the agenda:

- **Charter consideration**
- **Statement by Manny Hernandez-Avila**

Agenda amendments accepted unanimously

- Suggest the panel discuss subcommittee to review procedures manual (West).

Board commends Dr. Schubel for his service to the panel and the network.

Hernandez-Avila resigns due to illness. Will send resignation letter to panel and NSGO. Panel thanks Dr. Hernandez-Avila for his service to the panel and the network.

Welcome to Korean delegation (Robinson).

Overview of SG Week (Jim Murray)

- SG week almost cancelled due to budget cuts. It's more internal than past meetings: future direction, budget issues, and strategic planning. We're linking the state plans to the national plan and programs will be assessed more on their strategic plan than before. We haven't focused as much on the program assessment portion, though this is being addressed through discussions throughout the week on the RIT and COPE.

Panel's 2-year Calendar

MOTION to appoint March 6-7, 2009 for the dates for the spring meeting. And include Nov. 16-18, 2009 for a tentative date depending on SG week (Duce)

Second: Stubblefield

- All dates should be considered tentative (Weis). **Agreed by panel.**

NRC response committee Update (Kudrna)

- Panel adopted a response to NRC report in February. When the draft was released, the transmittal was reviewed as were the recommendations to complete panel's response. Comparison of COPE proposal and RIT: Not looking to adopt COPE, but to get a response from SG community. Asking SG network to send comments to the panel as well. In October panel will prepare final recommendation for Cammen/RIT committee. RIT will submit final report end of Oct. Nov. 2 panel will review and decide whether to adopt the draft on the Nov 17-18 conference call.

Paul Anderson's Presentation:

- SGA appropriations FY09 timeline with tactical opportunities for network/panel to influence particular activities. If we build a better knowledge of these opportunities, we might be more sustainable.
- Rick Devoe is the chair of the external relations committee, which supports the activities of the SGA in D.C. Reauthorization was discussed with the panel on Friday night. The NSGO has also been involved in the discussion. There is much agreement on what the language should be. Highlights from Friday's meeting:
 - One possible tactic is to meet together on the hill in Nov. with the reauthorization committees--hopefully before the bill comes out.
 - Possibility for using a stakeholder approach (engaging them in meaningful ways).
- SGA expects appropriation to be between \$55-60 million. Surprised to not get more from the House, but a strong supporter left the committee before the bill went through.
- SGA sent letter to appropriators and NOAA administrator that had 150 signatures from SG beneficiaries. Now, a letter is ready to send to conferees of more than 300 signatures.
- Plans for 2009:
 - Dear colleague letters.
 - Focus on Joint Ocean Plans and SG's contribution.
 - Highlight SG's national networking.
 - Rebuild relationship with person replacing Emily.
 - Final response to RIT—we want to be able to highlight language to congress in the future.
- SGA discussing how to make administration transition as smooth as possible.
- Looking to panel for advice on how to influence new administration and any changes in NOAA leadership (Perhaps through a subcommittee with panel and ERC—we're open to any ideas on how to build collaboration).
- Discussed possible formation of a Network Advisory Council, made up of leadership from networks who would engage networks on key issues (on timeline handout) to handle the challenge of making network components feel like a part of the decision-making process.
- Panel could also help SGA become more visible throughout the year (not just in D.C. but in the states as well), and establish some best-practices regarding external relations and share them with network.
- Assessment processes: complex and intentionally vague in some areas because we want endorsement before it is finalized. There is also some discontent with ranking systems.
- SGA is taking comments on RIT thru Oct. 14th and have final recommendation by Nov. 1 to NSGO.
- Winter meeting: we want to get in early to get more attention from staffers/members. Plan to move meetings to Feb 12-13, 2008. Hopes the panel can come at the same time. Knauss reception will probably happen occur on the 12th.

- Discussion on joint hill visits:
 - The panel can't go just to support the SGA. The panel has to agree ahead of time what they'll support (West).
 - SGA and panel could talk about only those things they have in common (Anderson).
- Discussion on RIT process:
 - There might be a blend between paper exercise for panel and focused site visits. Rankings are still frustrating though ranking wasn't addressed in report (ratings instead) (Anderson).
 - Our goal is to agree on a program and proceed. The panel would like to see the comments on the process sent directly to Kudrna and for distribution to the panel (Kudrna).
 - Cammen will want to see comments as well (Murray).

Return to Kudrna's NRC response committee presentation:

- Document with 24 recommendations from NRC (blue cover): This is the same format panel adopted in February, we're just making it a final response. Of the recommendations, there aren't significant changes:
Official changes will come from Stephan.
- Discussion on NRC recommendations:
 - Field visits are important (Alden).
 - Perhaps each site could give funds for field visits? (West)
 - Stephan and Kudrna will be writing notes regarding the Draft Report of the National Sea Grant Review Panel's NRC Review Committee and will provide a hard copy of the panel's comments.
- Return to COPE Discussion:
 - Items A-B: Is it the intention that this document go to congress? Should we keep our response clean and if we want to address other issues, send them to the Director? (Woeste)
 - This is just going to NOAA. Items will fall off the table if we don't bring them up (Kudrna). Attachments are relevant and should remain (Stephan).
 - SG should get this and perhaps NOAA but it shouldn't be part of the NRC response. Send it over separately (Byrne).

**MOTION to keep attachments separate.
Agreed.**

**MOTION: Response to NRC Recommendations Adopted as Amended
(Kudrna)**

SECOND: Byrne

MOTION PASSED unanimously

***Commend NRC response committee for work well done.**

***Special commendation for Kudrna for exemplary service.**

Draft to DOC transmittal letter

MOTION: Accept with amendments (Kudrna)

SECOND: Byrne

MOTION PASSES unanimously

MOTION that 3 amendments will be separated from NRC report and transmitted by the Chairman (Kudrna)

SECOND: Byrne

MOTION PASSES unanimously

- RIT proposal said primary goal was program improvement but panel said that it's really continued program improvement. Second difference: Paper review in D.C. vs. onsite review. In panel proposal, onsite visits are critical. Reducing field trips is advisable given budget constraints. Model visits should run about 3 days but can be reviewed on a case by case basis.
- RIT and COPE comparison:
 - The COPE would include Director participation and senior NSGO presence on visits to provide continuity. It also allows for annual appeals (by Oct. 1) submitted to reviewers and then sent to NSGO for final review. With concurrence, there would be an adjustment. One problem with the RIT is that the demanding evaluation schedule doesn't allow programs much time.
 - Cost comparison between existing PAT and RIT found that they're about the same, but RIT would cost a little more.
 - If timing is a point of comparison, it should be included in your report (Cammen).
 - Visits are important and a good opportunity to broaden SG's exposure/support. NSGO staff, panel member(s) and one or two influential people who are important to Sea Grant.
 - Outside funding for visits: Perhaps stipend provided by program would cover costs (West).
 - Panel needs to distinguish between site visits and field trips (Alden).
 - There needs to be continuity. We lose a little bit with continuity with the RIT but we gain other things (Stubblefield). Some format to establish consistency in PATs would also help (Alden). There has been no regular training at the beginning of each PAT. To increase consistency amongst PATs, there needs to be some kind of training component included (Robinson).
 - There are pros and cons with each report. The main difference is the comparability issue. That's what we're trying to get at with the written review—it's more fair/comparable for rankings. I'm concerned about making one person go to every visit: that person

becomes the de facto calibrator for ratings—not sure you want to do this (Murray).

- Paper reviews concede strengths of SG. Try to keep site visits but we need to find another way to handle the ranking situation (Alden).
- PATs works well until we have to grade programs. The issue isn't paper vs. site but finding a system where we have relative/comparable rankings systems (Cammen).
- For the Water Resources Research Institutes, consistency comes from the fact it has one group looking at all 50 states (Murray).
- The panel shouldn't focus only on finding a numerical evaluation—this will take away ability to look at a whole project for its innovation, etc. (Heath)

MOTION to release green draft sheet to SG community for review and response (Kudrna)

SECOND: Bell

APPROVED unanimously

Reauthorization Discussion:

- “Duce report revisited” – Ad Hoc NSGO Resource Study Committee Report Committee. Nothing in this report that the panel voted on (Woeste)
- Report will be brought back for review during spring meeting (Robinson).
- New title: NSGO administrative resources review committee? (Duce)

MOTION to approve draft of the Ad Hoc NSGO Resource Study Committee Report Committee report/ NSGO Administrative Resources Review Committee as amended (Woeste)

SECOND: Weis

ACCEPTED unanimously.

- Recommendation 2 from reauthorization committee: Identify nature of investments from increased fiscal resources and the impact on the SG program. What kinds of things need to be done that isn't being done that could strengthen the program?
- Panel should ask for more information on investments (what the funds are being used for) be given to the resources review committee (Alden).
- Panel should also request information on what the removal of the administrative cap would achieve and how it would be accomplished (Byrne, West).

MOTION to adopt corrected language for two of the committee recommendations: We request information on how the removal of the admin cap should be accomplished and what would be achieved if removed (Byrne).

ACCEPTED unanimously.

- Discussion on meetings with the SGA:
 - Recommendation of joint Hill visit with the SGA this fall (Woeste).
 - Panel should only go to the Hill in support of SG, not in support of individual pieces. The panel shouldn't go as FACA without Leon (West).
 - The chairman of the committee heard the SGA request and we're only bringing it to the panel for consideration (Woeste).
 - FACA rule: to go we'd have to notify NOAA. The protocol is to be invited by someone from Congress (West).
 - Suggestion to formalize relationship between the panel and the SGA—perhaps a joint committee to produce an agenda of topics we want to discuss (to provide limitations as to what we can discuss) (Byrne).

MOTION to formalize the relationship through the formation of a joint committee to decide on an agenda and report back (Byrne).

SECOND: Kudrna

ACCEPTED unanimously

- The joint committee will discuss whether or not joint visits should be on the agenda (Robinson).

AGREED: Woeste and Alden to serve as representatives on joint committee

AGREED: West agrees to approach Lautenbacher regarding panel member terms.

- Competition/recertification discussion with Paul:
 - Joint committee to undertake early work on competition and program certification.

Panel on record as asking NSGO to take action and suggest that SGA and Panel work together on this matter (Robinson)

Reauthorization committee report is accepted

Agreed to carry over the “Where Do We Go From Here” discussion to next meeting

Charter Discussion (West)

- Updated charter to include potential for subcommittees. Some wording was changed. ‘Panel members will serve at the discretion of the Under Secretary’ was added. As was “panel members will be subject to ethical standards applicable to special government employees” and language that states that panel members have to remove themselves from a vote if there's a conflict of interest. Language on subcommittees was taken word for word from the recently approved hydraulics committee charter.

MOTION to adopt charter in concept to be amended by West (Byrne)

SECOND: Woeste
ACCEPTED unanimously

AGREED: Bell and Stephan to form a committee to review the panel's procedures manual.

AGREED: To adopt Nov. 14th, 2-4pm EST as the date for the conference call to finalize recommendation regarding program review process.

Report on the Nominations Committee:

MOTION to propose a second term for Robinson as panel Chair, West for Vice Chair, and Stubblefield for Member at large (Bell)

SECOND: Jeff

ACCEPTED unanimously.

- Request that someone at OAR address per diem problem (Stephan).
- Request copy of Cammen's presentation (Alden).
- Commends Chairman for a job well done (Byrne).

MOTION to Adjourn (Stubblefield)

SECOND: Byrne