

National Sea Grant Review Panel Special Meeting
Monday, July 16, 2007
12:00-2:00 p.m. EDST
Telephone Conference Call

Panel Members Present: Robin Alden, Peter Bell, John Byrne, Robert Duce, Ross Heath, Frank Kudrna, Nathaniel E. Robinson, Jeffrey Stephan, William Stubblefield, Judith Weis, John Woeste, Richard West

Panel Members Absent: Manuel Hernandez-Avila, Jerry Schubel, Geraldine Knatz

Ex-Officio Panel Members: Leon Cammen (NSGCP Director)

Ex-Officio Panel Member Absent: Paul Anderson (SGA President)

Designated Federal Official: James Murray (Deputy NSGCP Director)

Other Attendees (NSGO Staff): Dorn Carlson, Jamie Krauk, Amy Painter, Melissa Pearson

Call to Order (Nat Robinson, Chairman)

- Opening of Meeting
- Roll Call – determination that a quorum was present
- Purpose of Special Meeting
- Approval of Meeting Agenda
 - Revise to reverse order of items.
 - No objections voiced

Consideration: Reauthorization Committee Report (Dr. John Woeste)

- Assistant Administrator Rick Spinrad requested advice from the Sea Grant Review Panel regarding Sea Grant Reauthorization
- The Reauthorization Committee worked to put together a report on this reauthorization – this section of the meeting will discuss this draft response.
- Overview of the Reauthorization Committee activities:
 - Met with several Hill committees to discuss concerns about the Sea Grant Program, and incorporated these issues into the discussion draft document provided to the panel members.
 - Held 3 telephone conference calls to work on the issues, and discuss a draft copy of the legislation provided by the NSGO.
 - Offered a working draft to the whole panel for comments, and feedback was incorporated into the current draft.

Discussion of the Draft Report

- Overall Comments
 - Document needs an Executive Summary.

- Agreement that document should be completed in professional format to be used in multiple areas.
- **MAIN MOTION** – that the draft 6/25/07 report be approved/adopted (Woeste). 2nd (Judy Weis). Discussion ensued.
- Document discussed Section by Section.
- **Item 1. Title**
 - Concerns expressed that the term “review” reflects the Panel’s role in program evaluation and review.
 - General agreement that the issue is with the Panel maintaining an identity with the ‘review’ function rather than on the group’s specific title.
 - General agreement that the word ‘Board’ more accurately reflects the continuous nature of the group rather than the word ‘Panel’.
 - Discussion of rights of the committee under existing FACA rules
 - The NSGO Director reviewed the history of the Sea Grant Review Panel – that when the Review Panel was initially set up, the group reviewed all proposals that came into the NSGO. The proposed name change aims to bring the language of the legislation up to date with the current role and function of the Panel as an advisory group. Reiteration of assurance that the Panel will continue to be involved in evaluation and review of programs.
 - Clarification by Reauthorization Committee that the report reflects opinions received from various Panel members, and not necessarily the views of the members of the Committee.
 - **FAILED MOTION** – for name to remain unchanged (Bell, 2nd-Byrne). **VOTE** on motion to keep name as it currently is: Majority Nay (voice vote).
 - **FAILED MOTION** – no comment on name (implying concurrence with Leon’s proposed language). (Weis) Fail for lack of a 2nd.
 - **FAILED MOTION** – accept recommendation #1 of committee (Woeste) . 2nd (Alden). **VOTE**: nays have it.
 - **APPROVED MOTION** – accept name National Sea Grant Advisory Board (Byrne, 2nd-Weis). Move the question. **VOTE** – Ayes have it.
- **Item 2. Panel’s Role/Duties**
 - **MOTION** to approve the Committee’s recommendation (striking the language on establishment) (Woeste, 2nd-Alden).
 - Discussion –
 - Clarification on what language was intended for the discussion paper v. the language for the actual legislation. The 1st sentence of the “proposed by the NSGO” language should be stricken, as this was discussion and not intended as legislation language.
 - **MOTION Amendment** – move only on parts B and C (Woeste, Alden concur). **VOTE** – ayes have it unanimously.

- Item 3. Membership, Terms and Powers
 - The committee felt Panel terms should remain at 4 years and member should serve until replaced. However, NOAA and the Department need to resolve the issues regarding appointment of new members to the panel that cause lengthening in the actual length of service.
 - **MOTION** to accept this recommendation (Woeste, 2nd-Byrne). Discussion – none voiced. **VOTE** – all ayes.

- Item 4. Board's Ability to include non-Board Members for Developing Advice
 - The committee supports this change.
 - **MOTION** to accept this recommendation (Woeste, 2nd-Duce). Discussion – none voiced. **VOTE** – all ayes.

- Item 5. Enhance Capabilities of the National Sea Grant Office: Increasing the Administrative Cap
 - Proposed change would increase the administrative cap from 5% to 7%. Based on feedback, the Committee recommended an increase to 6%.
 - **MOTION** – accept 6% (Woeste, 2nd-Bell)
 - Discussion – Propose amendment to change 6% to 7%. Member believes it is important that the Panel support the NSGO on this, and that the 1% increase is insufficient to carry out the large number of tasks assigned to the NSGO.
 - **MOTION** – to accept an amendment that would put the recommended increase at 7% (Bell, 2nd-Weis).
 - Discussion of Amendment – general agreement among members. Clarification that this is a *cap* – and that the NSGO has a responsibility to manage administrative costs appropriately, and that the Panel has a role to assure this occurs.
 - **VOTE on Amendment** – all ayes. This supersedes the original motion.

- Item 6. Misnumbered in draft – this item does not exist. (Amend rest of numbers to correct for this)

- Item 7. Regional Programs
 - The NSGO proposed this change, and the committee recommended support.
 - **MOTION** to accept this recommendation (Woeste, 2nd-Weis).
 - **Discussion** – remove the \$25M, to reflect that NSGO is requesting provision without funding amount demarcated. No objections voiced.
 - **VOTE** – all ayes.

- Item 8. Sea Grant International Programs
 - **MOTION** to accept this recommendation (Woeste, 2nd-Heath). Discussion – none voiced. **VOTE** – all ayes.

- Item 9. Remove State Program Ranking Constraints
 - **MOTION** to accept this recommendation (Woeste, 2nd-Alden). Discussion – none voiced. **VOTE** – all ayes.
- Item 10. Increase NOAA's ability to make Sea Grant Awards without Requiring Matching Funds
 - **MOTION** to accept this recommendation (Woeste, 2nd-Weis). Discussion – none voiced. **VOTE** – all ayes.

Additional Discussion of the Committee Draft Report

- Discussion of appropriate approach to the question of International efforts – need to make clear that all parties agree this is a worthwhile endeavor *if* new funds are made available.
- **MOTION** – include provision in letter to recommend appropriate authorization levels – start at \$100M and increase 5% each year (Woeste, 2nd-Stephan) Discussion – none voiced. **VOTE** – ayes have it unanimous.
- **APPROVAL OF MAIN MOTION** AS AMENDED – acceptance of Committee recommendations as amended (with inclusion of an Executive Summary) (Woeste, 2nd-Weis). Discussion – none voiced. **VOTE** – ayes have it unanimous.
- Additional Comments:
 - Concern expressed that the level of granularity in the legislation language is too high. John Woeste, Reauthorization Committee Chair will work with committee members and the Panel Chair to address this concern.
 - Panel chair thanked the committee for their hard work, and the chair also thanked the panel for their discipline, respect for adhering to the teleconference call ground rules, and for maintaining collective focus.

Consideration: NJ Special Review Team Report and Proposed Letter of Advice (Dr. Ross Heath and Chairman Robinson)

- Dr. Heath, the Chair of the Special Review Team (SRT), discussed the amendments to the original draft report. Specifically, Panel comments were inserted into the draft text as italics to address concerns over any apparent disconnect in tone between the SRT report and the Panel's response. Resulting document is still not a finished product. The insertion of Panel's comments into the SRT report was in response to concerns expressed about the disconnect between the Panel's recommendations and the tone of the SRT report. The intent was to combine the Panel comments with the SRT report to demonstrate unity of documents. Still not a smooth doc. Think way to address might be to direct the SRT to re-look at the report in light of panel comments.
- **MOTION** – to accept the original SRT report (Byrne, 2nd-Kudrna)
- Discussion:
 - Discussion on how SRT report and Panel comments should be presented. The Panel considered 3 options: (1) Use the document as presented, with the Panel response inserted as italics, (2) utilize the SRT draft report as a base document, and weave the Panel response into this document to provide a single document, (3) leave the SRT draft document as originally

written, and create an entirely separate document detailing the Panels response and proposed course of action.

- General agreement that the Panel is transmitting the SRT report, and *also* making recommendations for follow up actions (Option 3).
- Agreement that the group wants to
 - Avoid the appearance that the Panel is in any way altering a report prepared by a SRT,
 - Preserve the distinction between the SRT report and the Panel recommendations, and
 - Maintain clarity that the final advice to Leon are the recommendations provided by the Panel.
- **ACTION** – accept the original SRT report. general agreement. **VOTE** – unanimous ayes.
- **MOTION** – that the Panel direct the Chair of SRT to prepare a separate report incorporating the concerns of the Panel in a final Panel report. (Byrne, 2nd-Kudrna). Discussion – none. **VOTE** – unanimous ayes.
- A suggestion was voiced to move the information about consequences to the end of the document, as a ‘recommended course of action’ section.
- Clarification on the process for using these documents was made -- that the two documents will be transmitted to the Director of the NSGO, who will then determine how to forward the information to NJSG.

1:55-2:00 Wrap-up / Adjournment

- Panel members discussed issues related to the impression (on the Hill and at OMB) that Sea Grant is a ‘block grant’ program.
- Discussion of potential additional future Panel meetings. Clarification that holding closed Panel meetings is a difficult undertaking, requiring a minimum 90 days advance processing.
- The Panel Chair thanked members for their participation, and concluded the meeting.

National Sea Grant Review Panel Preparatory Meeting
Tuesday, June 26, 2007
2:00-4:00 p.m. EDST
Telephone Conference Call

Panel Members Present: Robin Alden, Peter Bell, John Byrne, Robert Duce, Ross Heath, Frank Kudrna, Nathaniel E. Robinson, Jeffrey Stephan, William Stubblefield, Judith Weis, John Woeste, Richard West

Panel Members Absent: Manuel Hernandez-Avila, Jerry Schubel, Geraldine Knatz

Ex-Officio Panel Members: Leon Cammen (NSGCP Director) and Paul Anderson (SGA President)

Designated Federal Official: James Murray (Deputy NSGCP Director)

Other Attendees (NSGO Staff): Jamie Krauk and Amy Painter

Call to Order (Nat Robinson, Chairman)

- Opening of Meeting
- Roll Call
- Purpose of Special Meeting
- Discussion of the NJSG SRT Report

The Panel's discussion and feedback is summarized as follows:

1. Regarding the Draft Letter of Advice, tie/connect the proposed action provisions to the Report's Findings of Facts.
2. Add supporting background information. In addition to the supporting background to illustrate the historical performance problem, the background will bolster the Report's Findings of Facts and strengthen the suggested action provisions.
3. The Draft Letter should demonstrate that A) the NJSG program performance is a long-term problem and that B) the recommendations to the Director will reflect that the Panel's advice is based on knowledge gained from NSGO's records (previous PATs and TATs) and related credible sources – not just the SRT Report
4. The objective is to demonstrate a more direct nexus between the Draft Letter and the SRT Report. The Draft Letter is to be revised in accordance with the aforementioned feedback. The Panel's Chair will consult with the SRT Chair and distributed the revised Draft Letter to the Panel for consideration at our Special Meeting scheduled for Monday, July 16.