

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Fall Meeting  
September 23-24, 2013  
Meeting Minutes

Stone Lab, Gibraltar Island, Ohio  
878 Bayview Avenue  
Put-in-Bay, Ohio 43456

**Monday, September 23, 2013**

10:00 AM-Introductions, review agenda, approval of minutes, etc. (R. Schmitten, Vice Chair, NSGAB)

**Roll Call:**

Board Attendees present: Rolland Schmitten, Rosanne Fortner, Richard West, Dale Baker, Patricia Birkholz, Harry Simmons, Richard Vortmann, Paulinus Chigbu, Frank Beal, Michael Orbach, Leon Cammen (*Ex-Officio*), LaDon Swann (*Ex-Officio*).

National Sea Grant Office (NSGO): Elizabeth Ban (Designated Federal Officer), Nikola Garber, Sami Grimes.

**Other Attendees:**

Jeffrey Reutter- Director, Ohio Sea Grant

Christopher Winslow-Assistant Director, Ohio Sea Grant

Frank Lichtkippler- Extension, Program Lead Coordinator, Ohio Sea Grant

Jill Jentes- Assistant Director, Communications Coordinator, Ohio Sea Grant

Holly Bamford- Assistant Administrator, National Ocean Service

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

**March Draft Minutes (No Approval)**

Mr. Schmitten tasked Dr. Chigbu and Dr. Fortner to review the minutes and send changes to Ms. Ban, in one week. The March 2013 minutes will be approved at the 2014 Spring Meeting.

**Chair Update (R. Schmitten, Vice Chair, NSGAB)**

Mr. Schmitten commemorated Dr. Nancy Rabalais, Chair, NSGAB on a recent published article on her career. He reported Ex Mayor Jeremy Harris resigned from the Board and Dr. Amber Mace will be able to attend the Spring meeting, after minor surgery. A thank you was given to Dr. Jeff Reutter and the Ohio Sea Grant staff for hosting the National Sea Grant Advisory Board meeting.

Mr. Schmitten reported the new National Sea Grant College Program website is active and has a lot of information on what is happening within Sea Grant, the staff, Federal Advisory Committee Act, etc. He recently participated in Sea Grant's Town Hall Meeting where a report to the Sea Grant community was given by Dr. Leon Cammen. There were a few minor technical glitches, but otherwise well done and informative. Mr. Schmitten asked everyone to mark their calendars

for Sea Grant Week, September 8-12, 2014 in Clearwater Beach, FL. Mr. Schmitten thanked Ms. Ban and Ms. Maggio for an excellent job in putting the meeting together.

### **National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) Report (L. Cammen, NSGO)**

*Topic: Year in Review: Social Science Initiative; Completion of Sea Grant Network.*

Admiral West asked Dr. Swann if coherent area programs can be a part of the Sea Grant Association (SGA). Dr. Swann replied yes, by Charter.

*Topic: FY2013 Performance Measures and Metrics handout*

Dr. Stubblefield asked if the economic benefits are credible between jobs created or retained. Mrs. Grimes replied every program was asked how they measured their jobs created or retained. If it wasn't credible their number wasn't included. Sea Grant is trying to better define their performance metrics. All of the metrics were reviewed by the Performance Metrics Committee and are expected to create firmer definitions. Admiral West recommended the Biennial Report include a handout with a hyperlink to better define where the numbers came from and what criteria is used.

*Topic: Year in Review: 4-Year Performance Review; Sea Grant's New Website; Congressional Briefings.*

Sea Grant's Budget: Mr. Vortmann asked if the \$57.3 M included the entire Sea Grant budget; and if research projects funded for graduate students are included in STEM. Dr. Cammen replied, yes. He noted education, including Knauss, is not required or mandated; it's something we "may" do, but not have to do. Sea Grant's proposal in the upcoming reauthorization is to change "may" to "shall" and strengthen the mandate for education. It may help defend the education program. In order to do that, the proposed legislative changes have to go through OMB, which may help us get their attention.

### **Sea Grant Association Update (LaDon Swann, SGA)**

*Topic: The Focus of the SGA; Potential (Sea Grant); Sea Grant as Business; The Role of Marketing in a \$20 M Expansion;*

Dr. Swann noted the SGA has a budget to conduct briefings on the Hill. They have worked with Senator C.J. Hess, Rachel Silverstein and Catherine Barrett, who organized the briefings

Emily Smail from Senator Wicker's office asked Dr. Swann if Sea Grant would be interested in managing a hazards resilient portal. Dr. Swann told her yes, but wasn't sure where it would lead. He thinks a lot of people are starting to recognize Sea Grant. Dr. Orbach asked if there was a timeline for the plan. Dr. Swann replied, the end of the year.

Mr. Vortmann asked how many offices the SGA visited a year, and if the idea was for each member to visit their own delegations. Dr. Swann replied the SGA visits all the offices within their delegation. In particular, Dr. Swann visited 7 offices last year in DC.

**Planning, Implementation & Evaluation (PIE) Program Assessment Committee Report, Discussion and Vote (S. Grimes, NSGO; R. West, NSGAB)**

Topics: Committee; Review process; Sea Grant Planning & Evaluation History, Review of the NOAA National Sea Grant Office; Sea Grant PIE Requirements from Legislation; Overall Committee Assessment of the 2010-2013 PIE Process; Planning; and Implementation.

It was discussed that the focus teams are expensive and time-intensive for the programs. Dr. Swann noted, as co-chair of the Hazards Focus Team, there are a couple of things the teams did really well, such as the stories that fed the State of Sea Grant Report. Dr. Cammen noted the original intent was to develop a National Plan and put together a group of people to look at a section of that plan. It was to get the network involved and give them authority and responsibility. Dr. Orbach asked about making focus areas specifically regional. Mrs. Grimes responded, the focus teams have functional areas and regions in each, which made them larger. The idea is to have a co-chair and someone from the national office.

Evaluation: Admiral West noted there are several documents to review in order to make an evaluation/assessment into a 4 year program and network evaluation. Mrs. Grimes stated that the idea is use one, general board that is made up of external evaluators. They look at the site visit, NSGO annual review and then the Performance Review Panel (PRP) materials. All of this information will be a part of the 4 year evaluation.

Dr. Cammen noted the site visits are still a part of the process because directors have said that they like the feedback. They provide management recommendations and all programs have improved. Mr. Simmons noted that it provides the opportunity to see if they are actually doing what they are reporting on.

Dr. Cammen noted these are all good suggestions. We need to streamline the process and focus on exactly what is different here and what the intent is. The next step is to actually hear from the rest of the directors.

**Motion by Mr. Vortmann: Approve the recommendations of the PIE Assessment Committee Report and forward to Dr. Cammen.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Mr. Simmons, Vote: 1 opposed (Dr. Orbach), 9 approved.**

**Motion approved.**

## **Virginia Sea Grant (VASG) College Status Report, Discussion and Vote (H. Simmons, NSGAB)**

Mr. Simmons noted the committee consisted of himself, Dr. Fortner, Dr. Chigbu, Dr. Stubblefield and overseen by Mr. Carlson from the NSGO. A formal letter was sent to Dr. Nancy Rabalais on their recommendation from the committee. Mr. Simmons noted, previously the Virginia program was decertified and has since then started a new structure, which includes 2 other universities.

Mr. Simmons listed several highlights from the committee's visit. He stated that VASG has strong support from the institutions that were present and are held in high regard. The program has a Virginia Coastal Policy Program partnership that gives law students hands on experience. They have relationships where they work with other federal and state agencies. The committee believes these relationships are very strong. VASG is meeting or exceeding expectations in their PRP report.

**Motion by Mr. Simmons: Approve the Virginia Sea Grant College Status Report Committee's recommendation to be certified as a Sea Grant College and forward recommendation to Dr. Cammen.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Mr. Beal; Unanimous approval.**

**Motion Approved.**

## **Discussion of morning topics (R. Schmitten, NSGAB)**

Mr. Schmitten reviewed morning topics.

- Mrs. Grimes and Ms. Ban will work to make sure they have solid definitions on how they get their metrics and measures with hyperlinks.
- Dr. Fortner, Mrs. Berg and Ms. Ban are involved in working on an education communication product. It will discuss what Sea Grant does in STEM education and how it is an integral part in the program.
- Dr. Swann requested 2 NSGAB members to be a part of the Growth Committee. Roles and responsibilities will need to be defined for the committee. Mayor Simmons was selected and Mr. Schmitten and Dr. Rabalais will also assist.

## **Ohio Sea Grant Presentations**

Presentation by Dr. Jeffrey Reutter, Director, Ohio Sea Grant.

Presentation by Dr. Christopher J. Winslow, Assistant Director, Ohio Sea Grant.

Presentation by Jill Jentes, Assistant Director, Ohio Sea grant Communications.

Presentation by Frank Lichtkippler, Ohio Sea Grant Extension.

## **Sea Grant Reauthorization Planning (L. Cammen, NSGO; R.Schmitt, NSGAB)**

Mr. Schmitt reported the previous committee consisted of Senator Birkholz, Mr. Simmons and himself. The current Sea Grant Reauthorization is until 2014 and the new reauthorization is expected to be complete this year. The NSGAB has been notified from the Senate that the process has started and they have requested information from the NSGO, NSGAB and SGA. Mr. Schmitt responded on behalf of the NSGAB that no agreement has been made. Those on the Hill need a response right away. The current committee is comprised of Dr. Rabalais, Dr. Stubblefield, Mr. Schmitt, Senator Birkholz, Mr. Simmons and Dr. Garber.

Dr. Swann noted the SGA met with the House and discussed going back in December to talk to OMB and some others, but there have been no decisions yet. Dr. Swann believes that it is imperative that SG is reauthorized. Mr. Vortmann asked if there is intention to provide a draft to the Hill staff on our changes. Mr. Schmitt replied, yes and a committee will put together a document.

Dr. Cammen reported the Sea Grant Office needs reauthorization. If it is not, then that would be putting the program at risk. He met with both NOAA Legislative Affairs and committee staff and has heard nothing but good feedback. Everyone at NOAA with whom he has spoken thought it was a good idea to do it. If it looks like the reauthorization might fail, the proposed legislation can be withdrawn.

There are 4 items that the NSGO is recommending:

- 1) Revise Knauss language to: The Secretary *shall* award marine policy fellowships;
- 2) Remove annual reporting requirements on new Sea Grant states (network is completed)
- 3) Remove 5% administrative cap
- 4) Add \$25M for regionalization projects

Mr. Vortmann asked for an explanation of regional and the purpose of changing the legislation. Dr. Cammen replied we already have the discretion to do that, but the change would be funding specific to implement the regional plans we have. It would be exempt from the matching requirement. Match funding has been one of the constraints for some programs.

The Board said that the NSGO, NSGAB and SGA should come to a consensus. Dr. Cammen noted last time we had a few joint meetings with the congressional staff, NSGAB and SGA in the same room and laid what was agreed upon and what wasn't. They left it up to the congressional staff to sort it out. It was a transparent process. Mr. Schmitt noted that it is desirable to be as closely aligned with the others as possible. He would like to have two people make presentations to the SGA. Mr. Schmitt suggested that he and Dr. Stubblefield visit the Hill, and Mr. Vortmann and Admiral West report to the SGA.

Dr. Cammen handed out and reviewed the documents: Sea Grant FY 2015-2020 Reauthorization Discussion document and the Impact of the Administrative Cap on the NSGO (attached) . Dr. Cammen would like to let the SGA know what the administrative cap is costing the network in

terms of missed opportunities due to the lack of staffing in the NSGO. Dr. Swann agreed with the justification on how to remove the cap from the Allocation Committee report.

Dr. Cammen noted Sea Grant programs have the same pressures that the NSGO have: they have to go out and find money, manage programs, but they don't have a cap. It is up to the discretion of the program director to determine the necessary amount for administrative costs. If you look at the history of what Sea Grant programs spend on their administration, their budget is going up. The NSGO doesn't have the authority to make the same decisions.

Mr. Schmitten asked if the NSGAB was in harmony in their position with the other parts of Sea Grant. Admiral West noted the NSGAB's decision has been documented twice. Mr. Schmitten noted that removal of the cap was rejected both times and perhaps the argument needs to be strengthened to change that.

### **Discussion of afternoon topics and wrap-up (R.Schmitten, NSGAB)**

#### **NSGAB Assignments:**

Knauss Selection Panel: Dr. Fortner and Mr. Beal

SG Reauthorization committee: Mr. Schmitten, Chair; Senator Birkholz, Dr. Rabalais, Mr. Simmons, Dr. Stubblefield, Dr. Garber (NSGO).

VA College Status review committee: committee excused.

Biennial Report Committee: Mr. Baker, Senator Birkholz, Dr. Mace, Dr. Garber (NSGO), Admiral West (only as needed), Mr. Schmitten (Ex-Officio). Dr. Fortner volunteered to be Chair.

Nominating Committee: Mr. Schmitten

PIE Assessment Committee: Admiral West and Dr. Stubblefield (Dr. Orbach will be excused)

Performance Metrics Committee: Dr. Rabalais.

Explore ways to get funding with no formal charge from Dr. Cammen. Mr. Vortmann nominated Dr. Mace for Chair. It was asked to Ms. Ban if this would be an external 501 C3 to raise funds for Sea Grant programs. Ms. Ban will check past meeting minutes. Dr. Stubblefield recommended Mr. Simmons fill in if need be. Mr. Simmons replied he will be a member of the committee, but will not take lead.

SGA Growth Committee: Mr. Simmons (Dr. Rabalais and Mr. Schmitten will be there for representation when needed)

NOAA Science Advisory Board Meetings: Admiral West and Dr. Stubblefield (backup)

Senior Research Council: Dr. Cammen and Admiral West (backup)

Board representative for Sea Grant Week 2014: Mr. Baker.

Board representation for the new Focus Areas Starting January 2014:

Resilient Communities and Economies: Mr. Simmons and Dr. Mace

Healthy Coastal Ecosystems: Mr. Baker and Dr. Chigbu

Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture: Dr. Orbach

Environmental Literacy and Workforce Development: Dr. Fortner and Dr. Chigbu

Communications representative: Mr. Harry Simmons

Extension representative: Mr. Baker

Education representative: Dr. Fortner

Important Upcoming Dates:

2014 NSGAB Spring Meeting, Feb 27-28, 2014

2014 SGA Spring Meeting, March 11-12, 2014

2014 NSGAB Fall Meeting and Sea Grant Week, Sept 8-12, 2014

**September 23, 2013**

**9:00 AM- 3:00 PM—Open to Public**

**Allocation Committee Report, Discussion and Vote (D. Vortmann, NSGAB, L. Cammen, NSGO)**

Presentation presented by Mr. Vortmann. *AC-3 Committee Members; Director's Charge; AC 2's Principles; Recommendations; Unresolved Issues; Concluding Summary; Preserve a Program in Every State; "Needs Based"; Minimum Allocation to Each State; Regional Research; Merit Pool; Total Direct Allocation to States; and Impact of Inflation and Declining Purchasing Power of Budget Appropriations.*

Impact of Declining Purchasing Power of Budget Appropriations: Mr. Simmons asked under the current set-up, how many states are getting less than \$800 K. Mr. Stubblefield replied, 2 programs and that a committee did a study in 2002 which concluded that \$800K is the lowest amount for sustaining programs. Dr. Cammen said the current minimum established for a program was \$1.2 M and the decision was made by ranking the programs and finding the medium.

Dr. Stubblefield noted both Admiral West and Mr. Vortmann did a great job in coming to a consensus for the PIE and Allocation Committees. Mr. Vortmann mentioned the SGA members were actively involved.

**Motion by Mr. Simmons: Approve the Allocation Committee Report as presented to the Board and forward to Dr. Cammen. 2<sup>nd</sup> Dr. Fortner.**

**Vote: Unanimous Approval.**

**Motion approved.**

**National Ocean Service Reorganization, (Holly Bamford, NOAA)**

Mr. Schmitt introduced Dr. Bamford.

Dr. Bamford noted there have been a lot of changes that have impacted coastal programs, budget and developed core mandated priorities.

*NOS Internal Assessment; Summary: NOS Internal Changes; Cross-cutting Priorities (Handout); Coastal Preparedness, Response, Recovery and Resiliency; Coastal Intelligence Network; and Coastal Partner Roundtable.*

Mr. Stubblefield noted to Dr. Bamford her overview was very informative. Coastal intelligence, she mentioned is one of the functions of harbor pilots coming in and ask if it is different from the PORTS (Physical Oceanographic Real Time System) project years ago? Dr. Bamford replied the PORTS project is the foundation of the Coastal Intelligence network. Sensors are placed within a port to provide real time to a pilot navigating into the port including time, current, space, etc. A majority of the sensors are owned and operated by NOAA and the CO-Ops (Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services) Program.

NOAA is expanding PORTS to ingest more information. Dr. Stubblefield noted Dr. Bamford mentioned Norfolk and sea level rise. There was recent discussion about the awareness of Norfolk and tide water area and how Virginia Sea Grant plans to respond to sea level rise. This would be a marvelous partnership between what you are offering and the tide water officials. Dr. Bamford agreed and noted DOD has been working on this.

Mr. Schmitt asked Dr. Bamford how the coral program is doing. Dr. Bamford replied the program and budget are doing well and they still have an executive board run by a program manager at NOS. Dr. Swann asked Dr. Bamford how they will sustain programs like block grants in the future, given the fiscal climate. Dr. Bamford replied that in order to move forward NOS will need to build a consortium agreement with partners, and figure out how to align the dollars towards a common goal. NOAA needs to collectively look at the resources we are putting out and how they intersect.

Dr. Swann asked Dr. Bamford if she would like to speak to the SGA during the March 2014 meeting. Dr. Bamford replied she would like to talk to the SGA and she will also be following up with Dr. Cammen and see if Sea Grant would like to be a part of the monthly Coastal Partner Roundtable. Mr. Schmitt and Dr. Stubblefield thanked Dr. Bamford for her time and presentation.



### **Mission of the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (D. West, NSGAB; E.Ban, NSGO)**

Ms. Ban gave a brief presentation to the Advisory Board on their rules, regulations and mission.

Ms. Ban noted business meetings are not under FACA rules because we are not providing advice to NOAA. Dr. Cammen pointed out that if anything is not done according to FACA, Ms. Ban is responsible, not the Board. Her main job as the DFO is to ensure compliance with FACA and the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Ms. Ban noted the Charter is required for us to operate as a Board and developed by the agency. DOC can and does frequently change things we put into it. Mr. Schmitten pointed out the Charter has to be resubmitted every two years in order to extend the Board. Ms. Ban replied there is no end date for this Board. The Board exists until Congress says otherwise. The current charter is good until September 2014. Revisions need to be submitted by April for approval.

Mr. Baker asked what the difference is between the panel and advisory board. Dr. Cammen replied when Sea Grant was established that was when the National Review Panel was established and served in the function of technical review of Sea Grant science projects. The Review Panel would go out and do site reviews. Admiral West said that the Board should request their current duties and responsibilities be put in the legislation.

### **Nominating Committee Slate, Discussion and Vote (H.Simmons, NSGAB)**

Ms. Ban noted there are 3 positions to fill. The new appointees are as follows:

- Chair: Mr. Schmitten.
- Vice Chair: Admiral West (one year). Ms. Ban noted there will need to be a vote during the Fall 2014 meeting to replace Admiral West for a 1 or 2 year term.
- Member at Large: Mr. Beal

**Motion by Mr. Beal: Vote on the new appointees. 2<sup>nd</sup> Dr. Fortner**

**Vote: unanimous approval.**

**Motion approved.**

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

There were no public attendees or submitted public comments.

### **Biennial Report to Congress Discussion (D.West, NSGAB; N.Garber, NSGO)**

Biennial Report Subcommittee: Rosanne Fortner (Chair) Rollie Schmitten (ex-officio), Dick West, Dale Baker, Patty Birkholz, Amber Mace, Dennis Nixon – Rhode Island Sea Grant, Diana Payne – Connecticut Sea Grant, Jeff Reutter – Ohio Sea Grant, Mark Wiley – New Hampshire Sea Grant, Kola Garber - NSGO

Dr. Fortner shared the next steps for the Biennial Report to Congress with the Board:

- Read 2010 and 2012 reports and decide if contents/layout/format is ok
- Think of new themes to focus on (Sandy, STEM, Completion of SG Network, Reauthorization, PIE, AC3, New Recommendations & Responses)
- Get impacts from Focus Teams (after receiving them from Gabe/Hank)
- Assign sections for review/rewriting
- Check into online options to reduce need for printed copies
- Focus Areas – Use new and old. New plan, so use that as organization everything will fit in new headers even though it will be reported under new Focus Areas
  - six impacts from each focus area
- Call late October

### **Sea Grant Education Impacts (R.Fortner, NSGO)**

Dr. Fortner reported, the Sea Grant educators' network created a plan to strengthen Sea Grant education. Dr. Fortner explained that there isn't enough information on how effective STEM education is within Sea Grant. She reviewed the recommended President's Budget initiative that would consolidate federal education programs.

Dr. Fortner made several proposals to improve and strengthen Sea Grant Education.

- 1) Every program should meet specific criteria, so they aren't on the chopping block when the budget is reviewed. In order to start a program in education or to continue, an educator should be able to come up with literature justification of what they want to do or a needs assessment amongst their target audience or surveys.
- 2) The need for Sea Grant education programs must be made clear. In our advisory service, we make sure our Sea Grant agents are transferring the results of research to an audience; the same thing should be done with education. Someone should say why they need Sea Grant dollars and this should be tied to what is happening in Sea Grant.
- 3) Educators and programs need to demonstrate impacts beyond a count of participants and estimated indirect effects. What we don't know is how they use their information and how it effects their learning cycle. Once we have the information, we need a publication of the evaluation results in an appropriate form. Not all of our educators have this expertise, but it does exist in this network. It will come down to writing a proposal for what you want to do.

Dr. Fortner proposed an ad hoc or subcommittee to get ideas on how to stabilize Sea Grant education programs that are effective and make them visible when the budget comes out again.

This type of information needs to be readily available and also something that should be included in the Biennial Report.

Ms. Ban noted she is working with Mrs. Chelsea Berg on an education document with Dr. Fortner and Diana Payne of Connecticut Sea Grant.

**Sea Grant Reauthorization Planning Continued (L. Cammen, NSGO; R. Schmitten NSGAB)**

Mr. Schmitten asked the Board if they would like to take action in supporting the 4 items laid out by Dr. Cammen prior to going to the Hill, or delay. Mr. Schmitten reviewed the 4 items suggested.

**Motion by Mr. Schmitten: To support the 4 items reviewed by Dr. Cammen.  
2<sup>nd</sup> Dr. Stubblefield, 10 approved.  
Motion approved.**

**Closing Remarks**

Mr. Schmitten thanked everyone who attended the meeting. Dr. Orbach thanked the NSGO staff for the great job they did with the PRP process.

**3:00 – Meeting Adjourned**