

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Spring Meeting  
October 16-17, 2017  
Draft Meeting Minutes

Embassy Suites  
605 West Oglethorpe Ave  
Savannah, GA 31401

Monday, October 16, 2017

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC 8:00am – 5:00pm EST

**8:00am - Introductions, review of agenda, approval of minutes, etc. (Dale Baker, Chair, National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB))**

Elizabeth Rohring (Designated Federal Officer) read an official federal statement explaining her role to the group. She also announced that the meeting would be voice recorded for use in completing the meeting minutes.

**Roll Call**

Members of the Advisory Board:

Dale Baker, Peter Betzer, Patricia Birkholz, Paulinus Chigbu, Rosanne Fortner, Gordon Grau, Judith Gray, Brian Helmuth, Amber Mace, Jim Murray, Michael Orbach, Dick Vortmann

Jim Hurley – President of Sea Grant Association (SGA)

Jonathan Pennock – NSGO

Elizabeth Rohring – NSGO

Eva Lipiec – NSGO

Becky Briggs – NSGO

*October 2017 Agenda*

**Mr. Baker made a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gray. All were in favor (voice vote).**

*March 2017 Meeting Minutes*

**Dr. Grau made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the March 2017 Advisory Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Mace. All were in favor (voice vote).**

**Chair's Update (Baker, NSGAB)**

*Topic: NSGAB Meeting with Department of Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross*

Mr. Baker explained that Dr. Mace, Dr. Murray, Ms. Rohring and he, with advisement from Mr. Vortmann, were set to meet with Secretary Ross in May 2017. However, Mr. Ross was not available during the scheduled meeting time. Instead the group met with Chief of Staff George Kelly. Mr. Kelly was especially interested in aquaculture and they met for about an hour. The group believed the visit to Commerce was a very valuable thing to do, and would like to meet with the Administration at least once a year. He stated that Mr. Kelly was very impressed by the information from the PIER database. Dr. Mace agreed that the Board should try to do this every year.

#### *Lake Champlain Institutional Review*

Mr. Baker discussed the July 2017 visit to Lake Champlain Sea Grant to perform an institutional review. This review was led by Dr. Mace, along with Dr. Helmuth, and Dr. Murray. Dr. Mace noted that it was an excellent visit, and that she would speak more about later the afternoon. Mr. Baker explained that it was the responsibility of the board to review and recommend programs to institutional status. Dr. Mace added that the Board has recommended approval of the Lake Champlain program to institutional status, with a Board vote later in the day.

#### *MASGC Technical Assessment Team (TAT)*

Mr. Baker also discussed his September 2017 trip to Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium (MASGC) with Dr. Murray and Dr. Orbach. He noted that he would provide more information to the Board later in the day during a presentation. He hoped that their recommendations would make a good program even better. Mr. Baker explained that the Board makes recommendations, which are then voted on by the entire Board, and presented to the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO).

#### *Further Updates to the Board*

Mr. Baker then asked the group for further updates. Dr. Murray noted that he was the NSGAB representative to the Sea Grant Extension and Communications meeting and Sea Grant Assembly meeting during the first week of October 2017. He stated that it was a great meeting and it was helpful to have the NSGAB representative at the meeting.

Mr. Baker then announced that the Savannah meeting would be his last as chairman of the Board. His term is set to end January 1, 2018, at which time, Dr. Amber Mace will become chair, and Dr. Brian Helmuth will become vice-chair. Ms. Rohring concurred and noted that Dr. Murray had one more year left in his term as member-at-large, but there will need to be a nomination for the Fall 2018 meeting for a new member-at-large.

#### **8:36am      National Sea Grant College Program (Jonathan Pennock, NSGCP Director)**

Dr. Pennock delivered an update about the National Sea Grant College Program including reflections, plans for the future (to keep Sea Grant moving forward and find its niche), and potential political leadership (Rdml Gallaudet and Barry Myers). Dr. Pennock hoped that the confirmation of NOAA leadership would stabilize Sea Grant operations moving forward.

#### *Recent Challenges*

Dr. Pennock also outlined challenges working in the current budget environment (communicating with Congress, releasing administrative actions and press releases, hiring staff, and being part of future initiatives).

#### *Hurricane Response*

Dr. Pennock also spoke about Sea Grant's response to the 2017 hurricanes, and how state programs, such as TX, FL, and PR and others were using lessons learned from Hurricane Matthew and Sandy. The disaster provided Sea Grant a huge opportunity to be a part of the response and preparedness, and would help move Sea Grant even more into that space.

#### *FY17 Accomplishments*

Dr. Pennock continued with a quick rundown of the FY17 Sea Grant accomplishments in ocean acidification research, fisheries extension, harmful algal bloom research, king tides and sea level rise, aquaculture, experiential education, and oil spill outreach. He noted the strong stakeholder support Sea Grant received through initiatives such as #whyseagrant.

#### *NSGCP Strategic Plan*

Dr. Pennock said that the NSGCP Strategic Plan was released in draft form on the website.

Dr. Pennock continued with other updates including a new network communications plan and a new clean website. All the inner workings are now on [Inside Sea Grant](#). He described the latest Sea Grant by the Numbers (2016) fact sheet, which showed increased economic benefit since 2015, with strong metrics that were consistent with previous years. He noted that the communications team was working to connect Sea Grant stories with the numbers.

#### *Staffing*

Dr. Pennock detailed the National Office Staffing Updates, including:

*On leave/on detail:* Kola Garber – Been on detail, until May 2018, Julia Wolff for FY17

*Left Sea Grant:* Chris Hayes, Julia Wolff, Mary Ann Garlic, Peg Brady (detailee), Sam Chan (IPA), and the current budget challenges that restrict ability to hire federal employees.

*Current details to Sea Grant:* Brady Phillips (with new detailee coming in the next few months), Aria Remondi (acting Assistant Director for Programs and Partnerships)

*Contractors:* to support Director, Aquaculture, and Fellowships coming soon

*NSGAB Staffing and Support:* Elizabeth Rohring and Eva Lipiec (from Jon Eigen and Mary Ann Garlic)

#### *Budget Update/Scenarios*

Dr. Pennock described the slight increase in funding in FY18 within the Senate's Budget with an increase to aquaculture, and the highest House aquaculture mark the program had ever received. He continued that with expected agency reductions, the NSGCP could potentially expect \$70.5M from these bills. Across the scenarios, spendable funds would include: if level funded - \$70.6M, at the House mark - \$68.2M, and at the Senate mark - \$74.5M

Dr. Pennock further stated that under these expectations, the funding would cover the omnibus at level funding (subtracting \$30K for Climate Change Capacity that has been taken out of the omnibus and potentially funded through a NSI). Funding amounts for the national strategic

investments (NSIs), such as aquaculture, resilience, and red snapper would have to be determined. These scenarios would allow a shift of dollars to hurricane rapid response in TX, FL, and PR, with hopefully more to come to PR (potentially \$2-3M depending on the scenario). Dr. Pennock further described that under the current Senate marks, the NSGO would be able to fund the Lake Champlain program at \$1M, as well as American lobster research, recreational fisheries research, and STEM education. Mr. Vortmann asked if any hurricane response funds make it to NOAA or Sea Grant. Dr. Pennock replied that yes, potentially, but not a guarantee. The first funds would go to NOAA facilities but there could be opportunities at the state level, such as partnering with FEMA, since they're the first agency to receive the dollars.

### *2018-2021 Omnibus*

Dr. Pennock was had concerns about releasing the FY18-21 Omnibus Federal Funding Opportunity (FFO) to the Sea Grant programs while the 2018 President's Budget has a zero budget for the National Program. He noted changes from the previous FFO including the division between the omnibus and the climate national strategic initiative and a general streamlining of the omnibus. The new FFO also:

- Focused on Base and Merit funding amounts only
- Included new requirements (NEPA and extension/communications/outreach project peer-review)
- Has a revised format for overall clarity

### *Reauthorization*

Dr. Pennock noted that congressional reauthorization of the National Sea Grant College Program was not a priority, as the appropriation was most important right now. He described the various congressional bills that had been introduced:

- Senate Bill (S. 129) - Introduced by Senator Wicker, moved through the Senate, almost identical to bill introduced last year.
  - One new amendment which adds requires Sea Grant to notify Congress of new Institutes or Colleges and receive Congressional approval.
- No current House Bill
  - Reps. Huffman and Lawrence submitted bills last year, but no updates since then.

### *NSGAB Nominations*

Dr. Pennock described the current status of nominations for future Advisory Board members, including a completed gap analysis which identified skills, regions, and industries needed to help achieve our strategic plan. He explained that 12 candidates were being vetted by NSGO for three currently open and two upcoming seats, with the hope to move nominations forward in the next few weeks. Dr. Pennock hoped to have five new members in the next year and a half. He expected to have challenges getting nominations through the Department of Commerce (DOC) and the White House, as federal advisory committees (FACs) around the government have been under greater scrutiny.

### *National Strategic Investments*

Dr. Pennock described the various National Strategic Investments (NSIs):

Aquaculture:

- 2016 - ~\$9M disbursed on 11 projects and 23 workshops
- 2017 - ~\$9.5M disbursed for 32 projects (11 for Integrated Projects to Increase Aquaculture and 21 for Addressing Impediments to Aquaculture Opportunities)
  - No proposal funded from the Great Lakes – not enough commercial participation
- 2018 – Anticipate having between \$7-11.5M to fund aquaculture and research
- Working to improve FFO process involvement, gathering input to shape focus areas of next FFO, building from 2016 visioning document, i.e. implementation

Network Visioning:

- Removal of Congressional requirement to fund red snapper research left dollars to fund visioning efforts
- State Sea Grant programs proposed 50+ ideas, narrowed down by programs, SGA, and NSGO
- Projects started Sept 1, with final reports due August 2018
- Still determining how to best engage the NSGAB with the projects, as NSGAB member travel is limited by the NSGCP travel cap – involvement to be further discussed during tomorrow's session.

Dr. Helmuth asked if visioning groups were required to look inward to see what NOAA was already doing. Dr. Pennock replied that members from NSGO were involved, but could do a better job of involving NOAA more broadly. Dr. Murray asked if the visioning were going to replace the focus areas. Dr. Pennock replied that the visioning was closer to the previous theme teams. Dr. Murray asked further if stakeholders were involved at this level. Dr. Pennock responded that stakeholders were not directly involved, but that it was a good point and could be discussed tomorrow.

Regional Integration: Dr Pennock said that these projects are alongside the NOAA Regional teams, and have less involvement with the NSGO.

### *NSGO Priorities*

Dr. Pennock described priorities of the National Sea Grant Office, such as:

- Build leadership and cohesion within staff
- Continue Program Officer engagement with programs
- Implement Communications Plan with programs, NOAA, and DOC leadership
- Improve NSGO functions and processes
- Improve NSI process
- Assess the Sea Grant library
- Continue to develop aquaculture initiatives
- Continue to develop focus teams and Communities of Practice

**9:44am      Sea Grant Association Update (Jim Hurley, President, Sea Grant Association)**

*Agenda*

Dr. Hurley walked through the Sea Grant Association (SGA) agenda.

### *The Past Seven Months*

Dr. Hurley described SGA's since the March 2017 meeting.

- SGA response to the FY18 and then the FY17 administration budget plans
  - Encourage Members of Congress to submit Programmatic Requests to appropriations subcommittees.
  - Encourage Members to sign the Zeldin-Courtney Dear Colleague Letter
    - 95 signatures
  - Additional Congressional response:
    - NOAA Wet programs Dear Colleague letter
    - APLU statement
    - National Aquaculture Association and Fishing Communities Coalition letters
    - Hirono Letter to OMB Director
    - Murphy Letter to POTUS
- Need to ensure that stakeholders are not asked too much, must prevent “stakeholder burnout”
- June 13 Capitol Hill Briefing with five panelists
  - SGA plans to host two Sea Grant hill briefings per year
- Reflections: Open communications, focus on specific actions by Member of Congress, always thank people for support, programs learned the limits of their engagement ability
- Dr. Betzer asked about the board's ability to speak with regulators and the consequences of doing so. Dr. Hurley responded that it was the right of all private citizens to do so, but they could not as representatives of universities or the board. Mr. Widder added that getting an invitation to speak was okay. Dr. Orbach reminded all members that the effort would have to be coordinated, so that all invitees were all on the same page.

### *The State of the Association*

Dr. Hurley talked about the Sea Grant association at large, including:

- Two new directors (in Pennsylvania and Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute)
- Three acting/interim directors (in Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire)
- Most directors have only been in office during the Obama Administration

Mr. Vortmann asked if the changes in directorship were due to retirements or career moves.

Dr. Hurley replied that many hires occurred in the 70s and 80s after the Clean Water Act was passed, and three long term retirements occurred in the past few years. Dr. Hurley continued:

- Many of the new directors are stepping up and getting involved
- SGA needs to ensure that regional activities continue to build
- Continue full engagement between the Networks Advisory Council (heads of COPs) and the Program Mission Committee.
- Expanded External Relations Committee from 8 to 12 participants

- Continue Program Mission Committee activities including engagement with Networks Advisory Council in a proactive way to speak about aquaculture, NSIs, and Knauss fellowship.

#### *SGA Input for the Advisory Board*

Dr. Hurley had some notes on what the NSGAB should focus in the coming months:

- Biennial Report is key (i.e. liaisons, education, etc.) for engagement with Congress and highest levels of NOAA and DOC
- Leadership activities with NSGO and SGA
- Moving Forward
  - o Keep trying to meet with NOAA administrator and highest levels of NOAA and DOC
  - o Reach out to OMB and budget examiner (Kimberly Miller) in November and early December, before the budget gets released.
- SGA will be asking delegates to update their stakeholder lists
  - o Would be great for NSGAB to create and maintain a stakeholder list

#### **10:40am      2018 Biennial Report to Congress (Rosanne Fortner, NSGAB)**

Dr. Fortner stated that she was coordinating the Biennial Report to Congress in 2018, with Ms. Gray as co-chair. Dr. Michael Orbach, Dr. Brian Helmuth, and Dr. Gordon Grau were also on the team. Dr. Fortner asked for two SGA representatives to be determined with Dr. Jim Hurley's help. The team also included NSGO representatives Brooke Carney and Elizabeth Rohring.

#### **10:50am      Break**

#### **11:03am      Georgia Sea Grant Activities (Mark Risse, Director, Georgia Sea Grant)**

Dr. Risse presented an introduction to Georgia Sea Grant including the following information:

- Welcome to Low Country
  - o Largest state east of the Mississippi
  - o Coast is 2<sup>nd</sup> fastest growing area after Atlanta
  - o Coastal population to double over next 40 years
  - o Driven by ports (2<sup>nd</sup> largest container port after LA) and military bases
  - o Economically challenged coastal counties
  - o Largest salt marsh estuaries outside of LA
- Hurricane Response
  - o No hurricane impacts since 1880s, but two 100-year storms in back-to-back years
  - o GA has the highest tidal range outside of Newfoundland
- 5 major locations for GA Sea Grant personnel
- 30 research institutes in the state
- Program integration
  - o Under VP for Public Service and Outreach
  - o Dr. Mark Risse appointed Director of Marine Outreach Programs in 2013

- o NOAA Sea Grant funding is the smallest part of the overall budget (the rest comes from state and university funds)
- Seafood landings – shrimp, blue crab, clams (via aquaculture, \$2M per year), by volume greatest landings are jellyfish
- Greatest success – shrimpers use turtle exclusion devices resulting in most documented turtle nests in Georgia in 2016
- Shellfish lab and UGA oyster hatchery – Oysters used to be a major export until the 1930s, now not on the books. Pushing oyster and shellfish aquaculture through the hatchery now.
- Healthy Coastal Ecosystems – keep water clean as we grow, Ecoscapes, septic mapping, stormwater management, water quality assessments policy and legal assistance
- Hazard resiliency – most work at the community level, everyone wants to work with GA SG on the Community Rating System, Tybee Island was the first community in Georgia to officially acknowledge and work on SLR, most recently won an award from the University Economic Development Association
- Education – expanding adult education through Coastal Stewards program
- Research – Record number of proposals from a record number of institutions, with most funding this year going to non-UGA projects.

Dr. Vortmann asked where the rest of the funding came from if national funding was the smallest part of GA SG's funding.

Dr. Risse replied that about \$1.4M came from state legislatures, \$1.6M came from a combination of philanthropic giving, income for aquarium, boat fees, and indirect cost returns, and the final \$1.2M came from NOAA.

Dr. Grau asked if GA SG was working with the development community. Dr. Risse responded that GA SG was working with a small segment of the development community, but that many of the people they were already working with were doing a good job. He stressed the need to work with those that aren't and beginning to work with the Sea Grant wide, state specific "Homeowner's Handbook." Dr. Grau noted that he could provide some contacts to help with the Handbook.

**11:41am South Carolina Sea Grant Activities (Rick DeVoe, Director, South Carolina Sea Grant)**

Mr. DeVoe presented an introduction to SC SG, including the following:

- Introduction to the program overall
  - o Consortium of 8 programs
  - o Located in Charleston, outside of a university
- Consortium has had a roller coaster ride of funding, with vetoes and partial vetoes since FY11
- High ROI
- Success due to dedicated staff, committed member institutions, supportive stakeholders and partners
- Functional units – Program Administration and Management, Program Development and Extension, Program Communications and Education Services
- Changing Face of South Carolina



- o Refresh our current Strategic Plan
- o Resilience of all kinds
- o How can we say yes if our resources are not increasing?
- Upcoming Work – Our Coastal Future Forum – determining the feasibility of a democratic process in coastal resources decision-making.
- Future needs
  - o Continue with current core values
  - o Need consortium to be stronger than ever
  - o Role of facilitator is as important as information provider
  - o Diversification of funding sources
  - o Maintain focus on theme areas
  - o Budget – both at the federal and state levels
- Margaret Davidson legacy honored by:
  - o Coastal Science and Outreach Summit
  - o Undergraduate Research Scholarship

Mr. Baker asked if being a consortium made SC SG a target for the Governor. Mr. DeVoe replied that yes, it could then be targeted by the governor. But they could also be targeted at the university as well. He noted that each program was susceptible in all different ways and that the FY11 crisis strengthened SC SG a bit.

Break until 1pm

**1:04pm      Lake Champlain Institutional Status Review Results and Vote (Amber Mace, NSGAB)**

Dr. Mace stated that the NSGAB's role was to review the Lake Champlain Sea Grant program and make recommendations on elevating their institutional status, which the NSGAB will then vote on. NSGAB would then provide those recommendations to the NSGO. The visit included Dr. Amber Mace, Dr. Jim Murray, Dr. Brian Helmuth, Ms. Elizabeth Rohring, and Mr. Jon Eigen. According to the group:

- It was clear that the program had come a long way quickly with support from University of Vermont and SUNY Plattsburgh
- The program was very collaborative
- The program had very strong support from stakeholders
- The program has primarily focused on outreach and extension so far

Dr. Helmuth stated that he was impressed by how integrated the program was in the community, and how responsive it was to the community. For example, the program worked with real estate agents to train them about flooding hazards and work alongside them.

Dr. Murray noted that he had a bit of experience with the program when he was with the NSGO, but was pleasantly surprised by the depth, integration, and scale of the program. He met with dozens of stakeholders who had a substantive and meaningful relationship with the program. He stated that it seemed like the program found its niche, between urban and suburban issues. In terms of research, the faculty had brought in substantive outside dollars (NSF, etc.), while the program had chosen to focus on outreach.

Mr. Vortmann was concerned about conflict of objectives and asked how the NSGO would balance growing a program and struggling to maintain budgets. He further asked about the impact on other programs.

Dr. Mace replied that from the reviewers perspective, the group was concerned about that well. The reviewers were convinced that an elevation in status would benefit the program, regardless if the funds were increased.

Dr. Pennock replied that the NSGO made it clear that a designation would not guarantee money. In the House mark, we would be charged with. The Senate Appropriations mark included the increased monies and had explicit language about the minimum amounts for the programs.

Mr. Vortmann asked if there were other programs where this may arise. Perhaps Guam?

Dr. Pennock responded that yes, Guam would be the next eligible program. He further noted that the territories would then be covered with Sea Grant support, with potential bi-state programs in the USVI and Marshall Islands, but not on the immediate horizon.

Dr. Helmuth was impressed that the provost had committed to evaluating how to best find funding for the director position, through the Provost's office.

Dr. Chigbu asked what the \$215K from the university was committed to.

Dr. Mace replied that the current director was a faculty position that is endowed. She further noted that position wouldn't necessarily stay with Sea Grant, so it would not support a director moving forward.

Dr. Murray replied that in terms of match, the program received \$430K from NSGO, and a state match via the University of \$215K. The program made the point that there is twice as much as that is being contributed to the program not being shown as match.

Dr. Orbach noted that it would be self-defeating to have a zero-sum attitude. He further stated that it makes sense to have Guam, etc. in the network, just in terms of leveraging the funds as it grows the program as a whole.

**Mr. Baker made a motion to approve the Board's recommendations and send to the Director. The motion was seconded by Dr. Mace. All were in favor (voice vote).**

Dr. Bowden thanked the NSGAB for the vote of confidence in the staff. He further thanked the group for the great visit. Finally he thanked Dale for starting the program in the first place.

**1:20pm          Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium Topical Advisory Team Results and Vote (Baker, NSGAB)**

Mr. Baker described the request for review from the MS-AL Sea Grant Consortium (MASGC) Director. The program asked for advice on how MASGC could improve the management of their matrix organization and how it could improve on outreach and education. Dr. Pennock asked for the NSGAB to review the program and provide recommendations. Ms. Kelly Samek from the NSGO organized 4-5 conference calls beforehand, compiled the materials and defined the questions, for a 1.5 day meeting. Mr. Baker stated that the group had an excellent review,

where they met with many folks from outreach, administration, and research and got a great overview of the program. The review resulted in seven main findings, with one major finding: MASGC needs to hire a full-time outreach person. Two of their outreach positions have retired.

Dr. Orbach stated that this type of activity is the perfect role for NSGAB. It was requested by the program, to improve an already good program, with a significant series of recommendations.

Dr. Murray felt that MASGC was a victim of their own success, with great success bringing in dollars for hurricane and disaster response and red snapper with 30+ extension agents. Director LaDon wanted new ideas about how to reorganize the program's extension efforts. The review will likely lead to favorable reviews at the next site visit.

Dr. Orbach noted that even with the recommendations, the review group gave them latitude to make specific decisions. Dr. Murray took the lead on writing up the basic requirements for the position.

Mr. Baker noted that the MASGC had 30+ people doing outreach, for a very small percent of their time, so they really needed leadership.

Mr. Vortmann asked if the recommendations surprised the Director. Dr. Orbach replied that he was not sure. Dr. Murray noted that his read of the Director's body language and enthusiasm reflected that the Director was favorably impressed by the readout. Dr. Murray thought the Director liked the recommendations and planned to implement them. Mr. Baker continued that he thought the program needed an outside group, since the Director was too close.

Dr. Orbach made a motion to approve the Board's recommendations and send to the Director. The motion was seconded by Dr. Helmuth. All were in favor (voice vote).

### **1:30pm Southeast Coastal Resilience Panel**

Mr. DeVoe introduced the panel

Clark Alexander  
Dan Burger  
Kim Jones

Paul Wolff  
Billy Keyserling  
Jill Gambill

Dr. Risse encouraged the NSGAB to think about what role programs play in disaster response and recovery and how they should be prepared to deal with that.

Dr. Clark Alexander – Director of Skidaway, background in sediment geology

- Geographic background of area
  - East Coast geology set by the rift of the Atlantic Ocean, closing which created the Appalachians, and then opening again. Created a low gradient flat-lying, sediment filled deposit.
  - Coastal plain and coastal shelf are part of the same geology, make the coast very sensitive to sea level rise (currently at 1ft/100 years, to 2-4ft/100 years).

- o Other geologic feature that make the coast more sensitive - the configuration of the coastline, small scales (funnel shaped estuaries) and arcuate shape of coastline.
- Coastal Initiatives
  - o Governor South Atlantic Alliance (NC, SC, GA, FL) – provided funding to create a hazard vulnerability tool
  - o Georgia Coastal Hazards Portal – bundled info about hazard vulnerability assessments for the public. Noted that our datasets are being used more and more by communities for CRS.

Dan Burger – SC Coastal Management Program in SC DHEC, started in Maryland with the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Director of Coastal Services division, working to develop tools and info for coastal communities.

- Initiatives
  - o Governor South Atlantic Alliance
  - o Beachfront jurisdiction program (funded through Sea Grant)
  - o Use the economic assessment of CRS to align planning processes
  - o Organized to support coastal forums throughout the county
  - o Benefit from Sea Grant legwork statewide
  - o Concerned with triple bottom-line
  - o Charleston Resilience Network (public-private coalition)
  - o Sea Grant is especially powerful in its administrative capacity, able to pull in resources (funding and data from NOAA and Homeland Security)
  - o Rely on Sea Grant for marine debris and abandoned vessels efforts

Kim Jones – Division Manager for Town of Bluffton Watershed Management

- Resiliency and Sustainability for Bluffton
  - o In terms of resiliency, we will have a tipping point. We need to start thinking about what institutions can help with that resiliency and sustainability.
  - o It's part of our vision for the town
- Introduction to Bluffton
  - o Known for the recreation and aesthetic qualities, as well as history which involves the water
  - o Economic impact - \$21 billion economic impact to the South Carolina
  - o Three coastal counties provide nearly 60% of the state total.
- Challenges of Coastal Growth and Needs
  - o Increased density and public health implications
  - o Increased impervious surface and stormwater runoff
  - o Increased flooding potential
- Potential Solutions with Sea Grant
  - o How to best implement planning guidelines
  - o Currently rewriting stormwater guidance for future development
  - o Pond Conference – how we manage ponds
  - o Our Coastal Future Forum – community engagement in terms of biodiversity, local seafood, coastal habitat, energy productions, environmental health

Paul Wolff – recovering politician on council

- Worked with Tybee Island, with the help of the \$98K from Sea Grant, as well as their extension, outreach, and research abilities.
- Approached the problem by looking at what was already happening (and less about why they were happening)
- Decided to be proactive than reactive, planned for 24 inches in 50 years. Budgeted for outreach and infrastructure planning.
- Priorities – Passed adaptation plan in 2012
  - Elevating Highway 80 with DOT (Sea Grant provided stats)
    - Have not committed
  - Raised electronics/generators for lift stations
  - Marsh protection in SW, built by dredge spoils
    - Tide gate installation and pipe replacement
    - Bulkhead consideration – too expensive and terrible for the marsh, instead recreating oyster reefs
  - Increased CRS rating, lowered premiums
    - Repetitive loss properties – more willing sellers since the hurricanes
  - Will be expanding dune restoration
  - FEMA – if Tybee Island is approved for a FEMA grant, then homeowners would be reimbursed for home elevation up to 85% for \$175K. City pays up front cost per home, and then is reimbursed.
  - Continue public outreach

Billy Keyserling – Mayor of Beaufort

- Sea Grant got us to open our eyes, not a problem for my generation but for the next
- Key priorities:
  - Education (educate the next generation),
  - Ownership (can't decide who's responsible for stormwater management),
  - Funding
- Want to double the population on the existing footprint
- Must treat the problem, like a responsible diabetic

Jill Gambill – Coastal Resilience Specialist at Georgia Sea Grant

- Communicating Storm Surge Risk
  - Hurricane Matthew surpassed the record by 1.5ft
  - Worked with colleagues to interview 60+ stakeholders, 1000s surveyed and 7 focus groups
    - Findings were packaged into outreach campaign

Ms. Lipiec asked if Jill's team could tell how many people evacuated in Hurricane Matthew vs. Hurricane Irma? Ms. Gambill responded that they were working with Georgia Power to make those estimates, but it has been very difficult.

Dr. Orbach stated that he felt like the bearer of bad news, but that as sea levels continued to rise, the money would start to flow mostly to larger municipalities, away from small communities. He asked how much conversation had there been about retreat? Mr. Wolff replied that we've been talking about it, since it won't be the communities that say no to development but rather the insurance companies that will limit the construction of new homes. Ms. Gambill responded that Tybee's plan was the first real conversation we've had about sea level rise, and we're in the very early stages of talking about it. Mr. Keyserling added that the community was talking about doubling on the existing footprint. The discussion about retreat didn't come up until recently, and he did not think the community knew they were talking about it. It came up around stormwater and moving some neighborhoods to create a bigger better catchment basin.

Ms. Gray added that it can sometimes be a struggle to get word out to other groups, so it's best to reach out to church groups as they are considered trusted source. She then asked Ms. Jones if she felt her community had the zoning in place to prevent "Hilton-Head-ification". Ms. Jones replied that through the Southern Regional planning group, all communities had to think regionally about development. However, the group is still dealing with PUDs, which the developers have the rights to do.

Dr. Murray added that in Florida, the state agencies are not allowed to use the word "climate change". He asked the panelists how they walked the line between "flooding" and "climate change" politically. Mr. Keyserling replied that speakers had to retell the issue with the evidence, i.e. hurricane impacts. He noted that North Carolina state won't be out front in terms of climate adaptation so the burden would be on local communities. Mr. DeVoe responded that his group was the first program in NC, to get the grant for climate change extension. The group was originally looking for something to do in 2006, but now the communities are coming to them, as folks are getting flooded, with students kayaking down the block and Port of Charleston issues. The time for philosophy is gone. The people are looking for solutions. Mr. Burger added that the focus is not on climate change, but rather on nuisance flooding and could point politicians and communities to tide gauges. Mr. Keyserling added that the last 12 months have been especially powerful.

Dr. Helmuth articulated that in Boston, the biggest issue is the lack of community cohesion, as no one talks to each other. He noted that it seemed like there was an opportunity for transfer of information between communities.

Mr. DeVoe agreed, stating that communities will learn by example or by engagement. They will look to each other. Dr. Alexander added that they've had a lot of success in fostering trust between these different communities, like the real estate, engineering, and development communities formally and informally. For example the group fostered a great knowledge exchange with the community of Hampton Roads, to engage with Charleston which has led to talks with other municipalities about other exchanges. Talk is necessary to build public understanding. The last 4 years have had acute events, but what happens when we don't have those events? The exchange can help with that.

Mr. DeVoe asked the NSGAB to thank the speakers

Dr. Risse closed by stating that Sea Grant was really missing the boat, as every speaker spoke about FEMA. He stated that Sea Grant must discuss the opportunities to connect with FEMA.

### **3:33pm      Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation – PIE II (Pennock, NSGO)**

- PIE II timeline and overview:
  - PIE Report from NSGAB, May 2016
  - General findings – meets federal requirements, but complex, costly and timing was off
  - NSGO waited for Director to completely onboard
  - Process was slowed by release of FY18 president's budget
  - Plan to have something in place before the FY18-21 Omnibus

Dr. Betzer asked Dr. Pennock what he meant by "the timing is off". Dr. Pennock replied that he would discuss it throughout the presentation, but that the timing and process was elongated, with decisions made years after the actions occurred.

- Challenges
  - Inadequate annual feedback
  - Site review team were valuable but inadequate weight in evaluation
  - Performance review panel reviews are too complicated and costly
  - Evaluation-based merit funding decisions at a resolution greater than the process is capable of obtaining.
  - Timing between the strategic plan and evaluations was off
- Reporting Goals
  - Annual grant reporting is required
  - Includes common metrics and measures
  - Data allows assessment of progress towards goals
- Evaluation Goals
  - Required to meet congressional mandate
  - Improves program performance
  - Informs biennial report to congress
  - But don't have an evaluation of how the overall national program works
- Planning
  - Have addressed:
    - Clarify guidance
    - State programs should develop plans based on state-level advisory committee and network plan
    - POs should be more involved
    - NSGO should review and approve plans
    - Still need improvements in strategic plan timing and how performance measures are integrated
- Implementation
  - Ongoing:
    - NSGO, with SGA and NSGAB, should take responsibility for coordinating SG activities, identify new opportunities, foster external partners, market SG

- o POs should consult with programs
- Evaluation
  - Recommendations:
    - o Improve evaluation system by utilizing and integrating all evaluation tools,
    - o Maximize collaboration and transparency
    - o Use “Standards of Excellence” as basis
- Action Steps
  - Annual reporting and review:
    - o NSGO should meet annually to qualitatively review annual program progress – Agreed, but we should consider varying levels of intensity by year.
      - Year 1: PO review and communicate results
      - Year 2: Mid-term assessment by PO and NSGO, review progress toward strategic plan and communicate results
      - Year 3: Review, check in on progress towards strategic plan, address any concerns and communicate results
      - Year 4: PO and NSGO Review and preparation of summary for use by SRT and IRP

Dr. Orbach asked if in Year 1 Dr. Pennock would be involved, as he was concerned that the POs don't have the background to work fully with each program director. Dr. Pennock responded that while he understood the concern, the POs were the ones that were already working hand in hand with the programs.

Dr. Helmuth stated that reviews should be based on momentum, as strategic plan sets the course, and reviewers should make sure the programs stay the course and account for any new changes. Dr. Pennock agreed with his statement.

Dr. Murray stated that unless the goal is to train the POs, the necessary time for each step could be cut down. Dr. Pennock replied that the NSGO would like to continue to have the meetings, but on a shorter timescale, ramping up as the years go on.

Dr. Grau reflected that the evaluation system focused programs to having to stick to a strategic plan and limit opportunistic creative changes. Dr Pennock responded that the national office has worked to be more open to that process and it has been already occurring (i.e. Texas post hurricane impacts). He noted that the national office was trying to avoid programs doing the work and then writing the strategic plan. Dr. Grau added that the national office and local programs could do better in the strategic plan to allow them to be opportunistic and creative. Dr. Helmuth stated that this point came up a lot in the discussions with the end point is evaluated against the strategic plan. The intention is to allow for opportunism on an annual basis.

Dr. Betzer added that this kind of plan allowed the national program to focus and raise the profile of the program.

- Action Steps
  - Annual reporting and review (continued):



- o Limit number of impact statements – Agreed, with a way to ensure the number does not positively or negatively impact different sized programs
- o State directors should submit 1-2 page summary of challenges and opportunities with annual report
- o NSGO should visit each of their programs annually – ongoing but challenged by travel cap
- o State directors should have opportunity to respond – agreed
- o Should be timely with our feedback – agreed

#### Site Review Team (SRT) Evaluation

- o Structure of the SRT should remain in its current form – generally agreed, but would warrant an additional team member to broaden topical expertise. Would like to continue some membership overlap between SRTs to maximize consistency in evaluation.
- o Extend SRTs over a longer time
- o Support increase to the role that the SRT plays in the evaluation process:
  - 2 day SRT and 0.5 day for SRT synthesis and debrief
  - State strategic plan
  - Annual assessments and responses (annual report)
  - 20 page briefing book (summary)
- o Provide consistency with info about funding level (base, merit, NSI, and managed funding) – NSGO recommends that the program be scaled by the breakdown of base + merit +NSI support that flows from NSGO

Dr. Grau asked if that last action would negatively impact the programs. Dr. Pennock replied that at the current time, they're actually penalized for it. The national office evaluates based on more than the dollars that Sea Grant provided.

#### Site Review Team (SRT) Evaluation (continued)

- o Site review reports should include an executive summary for consideration for the IRP – Agreed
- o NSGO also recommends that site reviews completed over a short a period as is reasonably possible following fourth year submission (October-May period).
- Action Steps

#### Evaluation

- o Inequity between evaluation of the programs at the PAT
- o Independent Review Panel (IRP) Evaluation
  - PRPs should be replaced with IRP – Agreed, but with a significant change of focus
  - Charge should include:
    - Review the SRT reports to identify potential inconsistencies in the independent SRT evaluations and provide recommendations to address problems
    - Provide an overall of the performance of the NSGCP
    - Would satisfy NOAA and OAR requirements of review

Dr. Grau agreed the plan was a good idea with one caveat: that it shouldn't knock down impressive programs. He continued that evaluating a low score a second time would be helpful. Dr. Murray noted that as chair of the original PIE system, one of the major issues that the directors brought up was the site visits (the waiting the different times, too costly, too much time). He was concerned that the new system would be going back to the PATs (Program Assessment Teams) as directors had liked that there is no scoring aspect. Dr. Orbach replied that the scoring aspect made it useful for evaluation. Dr. Murray continued that programs should be asked to report back with recommendations and their achievements. Dr. Pennock replied that he heard their concerns and it may mirror what the directors think. But he has also heard the directors ask for more evaluative value added to the SRT. Dr. Murray responded that it was his understanding that the SRT was going to be one of several aspects of evaluation, but now it seems like it's the only part of evaluation. Dr. Pennock replied that if the IRP only focuses on one program at a time, yes, it may be a duplication of effort. Dr. Murray noted that in the past the SRT would be a review as part of a suite of things, similar to PATs. This would limit it to the SRT to the only evaluation tool.

Dr. Chigbu asked what adjustments would be made if the IRP is inconsistent with the SRT. Dr. Pennock that he did not have the definitive answer yet but that it would be more informed by the annual report measures.

Dr. Vortmann verified that the IRP has the goal of comparing between the programs, instead of at an IRP for each program. Dr. Pennock replied that yes, the site review would be the primary evaluation tool.

Dr. Orbach stated he was okay with the more valuable site review, since there were other metrics to evaluate. He then asked what information the IRP would have to evaluate the programs as well as the NSGO. Dr. Pennock responded that he could see the IRP group spending a half day looking at how the NSGO is managing the lowest evaluated programs. The IRP could then look at the collective whole.

Dr. Mace requested that there be a similar list of requirements for evaluation of the NSGO management.

Dr. Vortmann noted that in terms of timeliness, the national office would need to get the review reports back to the programs as soon as possible.

Dr. Chigbu asked who would put together the group that would review the national office. Dr. Pennock replied that he could see NSGAB members perform that role.

Mr. Baker asked if there would be a final weighted score for each program. Dr. Pennock responded that the categorical score would come from the SRT and IRP, rather than have a numeric score. The scoring could be based on rating category bins (Superior, Strong in Most Standards, Meeting Standards, Unsatisfactory), since the evaluation system would not be fine enough to get to lower levels of details.

Dr. Grau noted that the new system would be a lot of effort to achieve two goals, Improving the performance of programs is important. Dr. Orbach added that a lot of these goals were to disassociate Sea Grant from Block Grants. Dr. Pennock continued that the national program should reward programs that are doing really well. Dr. Mace noted that there were many existential and fundamental questions brought up by the prospect of a new evaluation system. Dr. Pennock suggested that the national office could have a virtual meeting to get through those questions.

Timeline Moving Forward:

Oct – NSGAB and SGA Updates

Nov – Ad Hoc Working Group reviews recs and timeline details

Dec – Q&A with Program Directors

#### **4:43pm          Biennial Report 2018 (Rosanne Fortner, NSGAB)**

Dr. Fortner kicked off the discussion about the 2018 Biennial Report to Congress. She noted that the NSGAB would need to look at what Congress is doing when delivering this report. NSGAB should consider what it can do electronically and with supplemental information. She proposed considering both reducing print amounts and having any print material ready for June 1, which would mean that the 2018 report would not include 2017 metrics.

Report would still include: Sea Grant Model, response to recommendations, basis of focus areas, why the NSGO is organizationally excellent.

Would need to include: emerging opportunities, in the past that has included PRP results and SWAT.

Dr. Pennock noted that the network visioning topics would be working until the end of August 2018.

Dr. Fortner noted that conference calls for the report would start October 31 (to talk about how 2016 recommendations have been addressed). Additionally, due to comments that the SGA felt like they were in a reactive mode, the NSGAB would allow the SGA to comment on the report earlier on. Finally, Dr. Fortner would want the NSGAB to approve the 2018 recommendations (in a call on November 30/December 1), with a complete draft done by early May, to be approved by NSGAB. Dr. Pennock asked if it would work better to have the report out in January, pre-appropriations. Dr. Grau noted the report could be sent out pre and post-election. Dr. Fortner suggested the NSGAB keep moving forward with the June deadline. Both Ms. Rohring and Dr. Grau noted that it would be good to check with Legislative Affairs to determine best timing for rollout.

#### **4:58pm          Public Meeting Recessed**

National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) Spring Meeting  
October 16-17, 2017  
Meeting Minutes

Embassy Suites  
605 West Oglethorpe Ave  
Savannah, GA 31401

Tuesday, October 17, 2017

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC 8:00am – 5:00pm EST

**8:03am Call to Order and follow up from previous day's meeting (Baker, NSGAB)**

**Mr. Baker made a motion to change the agenda to adjust the schedule. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gray. All were in favor (voice vote).**

Mr. Baker asked if there were any other comments.

Dr. Grau stated that there have been many disasters in the past few weeks impacting cities. Sea Grant has done many things well, and should continue. Sea Grant should start a new initiative: Sea Grant in the Cities. Cities have just as much need as other places, yet Sea Grant hasn't strongly stepped into cities. Could result in a doubling of Sea Grant.

Mr. Baker agreed and stated that it's always been easier to place extension agents in rural area, due to the land grant model.

Dr. Betzer noted that in terms of Florida, 60% of the gas imported into the state of Florida is moved through the Port of Tampa and that it would be fantastic to expand the extension agents into that area.

Dr. Pennock replied that Sea Grant would have to put a lot of thought into determining the Sea Grant niche and then partnering with those cities in those niches. There are many things Sea Grant can do, but it would have to be targeted.

Dr. Grau noted that the work could be a part of education aspect of Sea Grant, including training extension agents to work in larger cities.

**8:12am Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) SGA Subcommittee  
(Mona Behl, Associate Director, George Sea Grant)**

Dr. Behl started off the presentation by describing the constant pressure on women, immigrants, minorities to go the extra mile. Sea Grant has already been working to include many of those kinds of people, in the communities and administratively, and try to ensure that they have fair access.

In terms of network visioning:

- Inward: How should Sea Grant make organizational changes to support that DEI resiliency? Looking at the advisory councils, research funded, etc.

- Outward: Need to critically examine the changing demographics (immigration, migration, racial and ethnic, age), changing geography, changing coastlines.

She added that Sea Grant should look to outside partners that are working on DEI more closely and should think of DEI as a stairway to resilience – through monthly calls, virtual panels, in-person meeting.

Dr. Helmuth noted that Sea Grant may want to frame it as a problem-solving issue, as some in the country sees DEI as a zero-sum game (take away from one person, to give to someone else). He continued that Sea Grant needed to bring all kinds of people to the table to solve coastal problems.

Dr. Orbach asked if there was a really good example that Dr. Behl could point to. Dr. Behl replied that the subcommittee’s white paper was organized by topic area, with highlighted case studies from within Sea Grant.

#### **8:41am NOAA Sea Grant Liaison Program Discussion (Rohring, NSGO)**

Ms. Rohring described the liaison positions and a new framework to manage liaisons in the network.

- Goal of liaison positions – facilitate NOAA research and end-users through the Sea Grant network, located at labs, science centers, national centers
- Currently have 12 liaison positions across the country

In response to NSGAB recommendations, NSGO has created a framework including:

- Liaison must have experience in science and engagement, be co-located at NOAA, part of Sea Grant staff, and help develop a work plan for research integration.
- New positions should be a need that Sea Grant can fill, must be of strategic importance with focus, at first, on extension (can be expanded past extension in the future)
- Liaisons would be integrated across the network via quarterly webinars and One NOAA programs, conference presentations, etc.
- Potential funding could include 60% from NOAA, 40% from NSGO with a required match on NSGO allocation from the hosting program

Mr. Baker reminded the group that Sea Grant needed a NSGO person to keep constant contact with each liaison. Ms. Rohring agreed and stated that in her NSGO extension lead role she has begun to do so.

Dr. Murray noted that in the past there have been issues with “sunsetting” these positions, which could be solved by a periodic competition. Groups could write a proposal, partner with Sea Grant, and fund a small part of each ongoing position. Dr. Pennock agreed that it could work, but the process would need rules of engagement. Additionally, these types of opportunities are often due to year end funding, so the process happens very quickly.

Ms. Gray noted that as someone who started a position, she would hate for folks to have to compete for their own positions, as the positions are so uncertain already. Dr. Pennock agreed and stated that a number of the liaison positions are being sunsetted based on the omnibus. He continued that the liaisons have been doing good work, so Sea Grant would be committing funds for the next two years. With the two year heads up, Sea Grant is expecting each program to come up with a coordinated plan.

Dr. Betzer added that at the 30,000 ft level, the greatest potential to raise the name of Sea Grant would be in aquaculture. He noted that it would be good to connect liaisons with folks in the industry. Ms. Rohring agreed and added that Sea Grant has been focusing on NOAA positions to start, but could move into other agencies once rules of engagement are established.

**9:02am      Open discussion about roles of the Board, new charges, and visioning for Sea Grant (Pennock, NSGO)**

Dr. Pennock previewed the year to come and how the NSGAB could be most involved. What's on the Horizon?

- Outreach to OMB, DOC, NOAA      Nov-Dec 2017
- Report to Congress      June 2018
- Complete Past Efforts
  - PIE II      Jan 2018
  - Liaison Policy      Jun 2018
- Network Visioning      Aug-Sep 2018
- Site Review Teams      Oct 2018 - May 2019
  - National Program Review
- Sea Grant Library

Dr. Mace reminded the group that when the NSGAB is not together they are often not thinking of Sea Grant. Therefore coming up with clear paths on how NSGAB can engage would be really helpful. She added that NSGAB would have more impact working within the administration rather than with Congress (since the NSGAB already has a report for Congress).

Mr. Baker added that during the last NSGAB meeting in March, NSGAB noted Sea Grant priorities including the Sea Grant library (added to the list above).

Dr. Mace asked to also add National Program Review (added to the list above).

Ms. Rohring noted that it would be helpful to have the NSGAB perspective on the network visioning, including how Sea Grant should include the NSGAB in the process.

Dr. Grau stated that he wanted to be involved, especially on the community development side.

Dr. Mace noted that there are a few ways to get involved – virtual meetings and calls, review drafts.

Dr. Murray reminded the group that the NSGAB did not have to be involved in all of projects, but could look to the future with coastal urban extension. He added that someone like Dr. Gordon Grau should be involved with that kind of thinking.

Dr. Orbach asked what had resulted from the 50 Anniversary visioning document, as the NSGAB had compiled some thoughts about what Sea Grant's role would be in 2066. He added that when the 50<sup>th</sup> event was cancelled, the thought would be that it would be picked up again in the next year. Dr. Pennock replied that, that effort was unconnected to the current network visioning. The current network visioning was a result of comments from programs about the lack of national connections and how to create partnerships within the Sea Grant niche.

Dr. Grau asked how much work it would take to tack another two days onto a biannual meeting for a visioning effort. Perhaps somewhere outside of DC, to reconstitute theme teams. Dr. Murray noted that one possibility to use this group effectively, once the reports come in, is for the group to review the reports and make recommendations on how to achieve what's in those visions. Dr. Pennock agreed it would be helpful to have the NSGAB move the visioning forward. Dr. Murray continued that the NSGAB could help out in terms of sustaining the long time effort.

Dr. Betzer added that in terms of DEI, the NSGAB has leaders with lessons learned that could be utilized.

Ms. Rohring added that there is some onus on Sea Grant to make sure the NSGAB is engaged. Dr. Grau noted that he would love to be involved more, by phone, where he could reach out to his colleagues. Ms. Rohring replied that if that method is helpful then Sea Grant could definitely support the effort. She added that the NSGAB could meet quarterly, twice in person, and twice virtually, all as public meetings with an agenda and public comments.

Dr. Pennock added that it would be helpful to have the NSGAB involved on the front end as part of virtual meetings if the Board wants to be involved, and then on the back end, as Dr. Jim Murray, had mentioned.

Dr. Murray commented that Ron Baird had the philosophy that used the advisory board members as additional staff. For instance, if there was a presentation opportunity that could not be fulfilled by the NSGO, the NSGAB could step in as partners to represent Sea Grant. Dr. Fortner added that a recommendation that could go into the next biennial report: expanded or deeper engagement between the Board and the NSGO and the programs.

Dr. Orbach noted that there were two levels of visioning: what to do next 5-10 years vs. what should Sea Grant do in 25-50 years? To do the latter, the group would need data.

Dr. Pennock asked the NSGAB how they would like to proceed. Dr. Mace replied that she believed network visioning was a priority, but so was outreach to the administration. She added that the NSGAB should be thinking about dividing and conquering, and then utilize the NSGAB priority choices to funnel the work.

Dr. Helmuth suggested that with the visioning effort, NSGAB could have a larger group to discuss and then funnel down to a smaller group to implement. They could do so over a 2 day retreat. Dr. Betzer asked if the NSGAB could extend the March meeting to have an extra 1 day retreat to talk about network visioning. Dr. Murray suggested an alternate idea, where once the NSGO and NSGAB receive the ten 10-year visions, the NSGAB could then have the 2 day retreat to review and think about a 25 year vision, and help with prioritization and implementation.

Dr. Pennock added that the NSGAB could have the midway updates from the network visioning groups and meet during the March meeting to discuss. Dr. Grau added that he thought the 2-day retreat would be helpful as the NSGAB would have the opportunity to step back and look at the larger picture.

Dr. Helmuth added that he was a big fan of the facilitator for these kinds of events. Dr. Grau agreed about having a facilitator.

Mr. Baker asked if the visioning effort had taken over the theme teams. Dr. Pennock replied that he thought they were one in the same.

Dr. Pennock added that this was an area of growth for engagement of the Advisory Board and that everyone would need to talk more on the regular calls or a separate meeting.

Dr. Mace asked when the IRP would occur for the upcoming 2018 October-May SRT travel. Dr. Pennock replied that it would occur a month or so after the reports were submitted. He added that he would look towards being done with the review cycle by the fall of 2019, 1.25 years after reporting. Dr. Mace asked if Dr. Pennock could tell her more about the programmatic review. Dr. Pennock responded that the groups would have to continue the discussion, since balancing between programs and overall review of the program are two different things. He continued that to split them into two different teams and bringing both teams up to speed seemed duplicative, so the national office was still trying to figure out a way to be more efficient.

Dr. Vortmann noted the NSGAB needed to talk about the outreach to OMB, DOC, and NOAA part of our position. He asked if NSGAB could contact DOC directly. Dr. Pennock replied that it would be most efficient for the Board to go directly to DOC leadership, with a small subset of the Board. Dr. Orbach commented that the Board should be careful that they are reaching the right audience. He continued that even though all laws state the Secretary of Commerce (SEC COM), it's a NOAA Assistant Administrator (AA) doing the work. He wanted to ensure the Board had a good relationship with the NOAA person. Dr. Murray agreed, and stated that the NSGAB should create all of those relationships, but target Secretary for aquaculture and hurricane response. Ms. Gray noted that with the goal to have SEC COM and NOAA AA support Sea Grant budget, NSGAB should ensure the NOAA budget examiner is in the room. Dr. Orbach suggested that the NSGAB does not want to ask for Sea Grant funding, but rather want to make leadership familiar with the program and show them Sea Grant's value. Ms. Rohring reminded the group that NSGAB has the ability to go to the administration directly, but cannot go to Congress unless invited.



**10:26am      New Administration Outreach and Education Plan (Baker and Mace, NSGAB)**

Dr. Mace discussed the plan to reach out to the Secretary and new NOAA political appointees. She noted that NSGAB would like to meet with the new administrator before meeting with the Secretary, as well as meeting with the OMB Budget Examiner. Dr. Pennock noted that RADM Gallaudet would be acting until the AA was confirmed, which would be a good link to NOAA. She continued that it would be good to have one trip where NSGAB meets with the budget examiner and Gallaudet.

Mr. Baker noted that the NSGAB would let Craig McLean know about the meetings for awareness.

Dr. Murray commented that ideally, in November, the NSGAB would make one trip to meet with the OMB Budget Examiner and NOAA Deputy AA. He continued that they should also try to meet with the SEC COM and potentially the Assistant Secretary (Neal Jacobs). Dr. Pennock noted that those assistants were still being placed.

**10:45am      NOAA and OAR Updates (Mr. Craig McLean, Acting Chief Scientist, NOAA; Assistant Administrator, Oceanic and Atmospheric Research)**

Mr. McLean discussed NSGAB's roles and responsibilities and the newly confirmed and incoming political appointees, including:

Julie Roberts – NOAA Director of Communications

Chris Oliver - NOAA AA Fisheries

David Holst – OAR CFO

Ko Barrett and Gary Matlock – NOAA OAR Deputy AAs

Positions still waiting to be filled:

OSTP Director

CEQ

*Budget*

Mr. McLean commented that Secretary Ross was not part of the FY18 budget planning, but he has asked follow up questions on how the rest of DOC could support NOAA aquaculture.

*Strategic Plan*

Mr. McLean noted that the plan had moved up through the DOC, and should be moved in order to provide guidance if Sea Grant were to obtain appropriations for FY18. He continued that the

Strategic Plan is currently up online in “draft” form but once Sea Grant was appropriated, the “final” format would be uploaded.

#### *Authorization*

Mr. McLean noted that two climate laws required the assessment of climate change throughout NOAA, and the failure to renew the federal advisory committee did not limit the National Climate Assessment.

#### *OAR Priorities*

Mr. McLean stated that OAR’s goal was to help other line offices reach their objectives. That included making sure that the Sea Grant network was 100% Weather Ready.

#### *NOAA Futures Contract*

Mr. McLean discussed the contract including the collection of strategic advice for future initiatives. He noted that who NOAA hires today will be with the agency for 15-20 years. Across topic areas, in fisheries, aquaculture will have a more prominent role, in weather there will be more engagement of commercial sector and in climate businesses will continue to work on the impacts.

Dr. Mace described NSGAB plans to speak to Secretary, Deputy AA, and OMB Budget Examiner. Mr. McLean replied that meeting with the examiner would be a good strategy, as they are often not subject matter experts in NOAA topics.

Dr. Pennock asked which person served as a connection between NOAA and Commerce. Mr. McLean replied that the connection was Earl Comstock, the Senior Policy Advisor between the Secretary and NOAA. He continued that Earl was well versed in NOAA subject matter.

Dr. Murray commented about NOAA’s relationship with FEMA, driven by FEMA after positive experiences with Sea Grant extension post-Katrina. He continued that at the highest levels, Sea Grant had an endorsed proposal, but the effort died with retirements. After the recent hurricanes, there may be new opportunities to restart those joint FEMA-Sea Grant efforts. The proposal included a liaison to FEMA at each of the 33 programs, working on resilience and preparedness, and would be available to disaster response. Mr. McLean replied that the Board may want to make a more directed recommendation about the connection to NOAA. He noted that the current NOAA-FEMA relationship was more in weather readiness and disaster preparedness. He further noted that some parts of Congress still believe resilience is in other hands of NOAA, and we need to remind Congress that Sea Grant has been increasing resilience and awareness for the past 50 years. He noted that it was confusing to Sea Grant constituents if the information was coming from other places.

Dr. Grau commented that in an “aging of the NOAA workforce” survey a decade ago, about 25-30% of the workforce had a Sea Grant connection. He noted that this could be the basis for a formalized recruitment office that would help bring more interest in careers at NOAA. Mr. McLean replied that this suggestion could form the basis for a recommendation from the Board.

Dr. Mace asked in light of Hurricane Supplemental funding, what roles NSGAB and Sea Grant could play. Mr. McLean responded the Sandy supplemental originally asked how NOAA could improve hurricane forecasting. If NOAA could go beyond fixing what's already broken, and prepare for future needs, that would be best.

**11:48am**      **Call ended with Craig McLean**

**11:50am**      **Public Comment Period**

No members of the public were present, and no messages were received from the public via email or air mail.

**11:55am**      **Discussion of meeting follow-up and wrap up (Baker, NSGAB)**

Mr. Baker asked the NSGO to follow-up with Craig McLean about meetings with Administration

Ms. Rohring commented that in terms of the Weather Ready nation, some Sea Grant programs have been hesitant to join. She noted that there are currently 22 of 33 programs certified as weather ready and that perhaps the NSGO could host a webinar to push those programs forward. Dr. Fortner suggested that NSGAB add the comment to the 2018 recommendations to encourage that the programs become more Weather Ready.

Dr. Mace asked in terms of parsing the resilience sphere and finding Sea Grant's niche, was Sea Grant okay with NOS leading the green, gray, blue infrastructure, while Sea grant did more of the soft side. Dr. Fortner replied that it could be recommendation to clarify NOAA roles.

Ms. Gray noted that as Sea Grant is creating the network visioning matrix for NSGAB involvement, it may be a good time to include Peter Betzer in the DEI efforts. She continued that NSGAB and NSGO should continue to talk about the rest of the opportunities in other network visioning groups.

Ms. Rohring noted that the next in-person meeting would be March 6-7, 2018, in Washington, DC.

Dr. Murray commented that there seemed to be interest in exploring the FEMA connection, but that the relationship would require dedicated staff and significant time in a sustained way. If Sea Grant was serious about that, then it would require 25-50% of someone's time and the first task would be to reach out to the folks in the network that have been working directly with FEMA. Dr. Grau added that Dennis Wong that led the coastal hazards handbooks, has strong connections with FEMA. Dr. Murray added that Hank Hodde is also very interested in that effort. Dr. Mace replied that Sea Grant Assistant Director of Programs and Partnerships Amanda McCarty had mentioned she was working on NOAA-internal partnerships. However these kinds of hurricane events, may require a shifting in prioritization.

Dr. Vortmann asked about the status of the Japan Sea Grant effort. Dr. Grau replied that Hawaii Sea Grant had a meeting 6 months ago with universities from Tokyo and Korea, so it may be best to ask Hawaii Sea Grant Director Darren Lerner.

**12:08pm Meeting Adjourned**

**Mr. Baker made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Mace. All were in favor (voice vote).**

Other Notes:

. Mr. Baker asked if the delay in finalizing the strategic plan was due to the lack of political appointees in NOAA leadership. Dr. Pennock replied that yes that was likely a factor, in addition to a zeroed budget. Dr. Murray asked if budget agreement would help facilitate the finalization, versus a continuing resolution which would perpetuate the challenges. Dr. Pennock responded that the continuing resolution would allow work to continue in FY18, but that the problem would remain in FY19, as FY18 served as the model for FY19. He continued that the federal government was currently funded through December 8<sup>th</sup>, and that historically NOAA did not have a full budget until April or May in the last decade, so the expectation would be the same next year. Dr. Orbach noted that a worst case scenario could occur if NOAA prevented work from moving forward with the expectation of a FY!9 funding battle. Dr. Pennock replied that the most current Presidential budget had no input from Congress, however since then Congress has voiced their opinion and support of Sea Grant. Dr. Pennock continued that Congress' positive input and the Sea Grant Association's outreach work will be important again. Dr. Grau asked in the National Office had thought about talking to folks that went through the Reagan administration. Dr. Pennock replied that yes, but the current situation is quite different, so those successes may not be possible at this time.