



National Association of Marine Laboratories

c/o Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA 02543

Secretary / Treasurer
Dr. Alan M. Kuzirian

(508) 289-7480; FAX: 289-7900
email: akuziria@mbl.edu

Synopsis and Action Item List
National Association of Marine Laboratories (NAML)
Board of Directors Meeting
Crown Plaza Hotel, Washington, DC
19-20 February 2002

	Page No.
1. Opening of the Meeting	1
2. Regional Reports	1-2
3. NAML Business Meeting	2-3
• Secretary and Treasurer's Reports	
• NAML Directory	
• NAML and National Issues	
• Federal Legislative Committee	
• OBFS Partnership	
• OCEAN's Day 2002	
• LabNet/CastNet	
3. Ocean Commission — Dr. Tom Kitsos,	3-5
4. AIBS Presentation — Richard O'Grady	5-6
5. Sea Grant Presentation — Rick DeVoe	6-7
6. OCEAN.US — Dr. Larry Atkinson	7
7. NOAA National Oceanographic Data Center (NODC) — Lee Dantzler	7-8
8. NOAA-NOS — Margaret Davidson	8-9
9. NASULGC — Kerry Bolognese	9-10
10. CORE — Penny Dalton	10-11
11. NERRS — Laurie McGilvary	11-12
12. NSF — Gerald Selzer	12
13. Summary Discussion	12-13
• Action Items	
Appendix I — Meeting Attendees	14

National Association of Marine Laboratories c/o Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA 02543

Secretary / Treasurer
Dr. Alan M. Kuzirian

(508) 289-7480; FAX: 289-7900
email: akuziria@mbl.edu

National Association of Marine Laboratories (NAML) Board of Directors Meeting Crown Plaza Hotel, Washington, DC 19-20 February 2002

The annual meeting began with a continental breakfast in the McPherson Square Room and with meetings of the Regional Associations. The regions met in different areas of the room to conduct their business agenda.

Madilyn opened the formal session of the meeting, discussed the Agenda changes, and asked for additional agenda items. Bob Van Dolah added education to the list. She noted to the invited presenters that we would be a small group and there would be a great opportunity for discussion. She discussed the topics and various guests that would be present. She expressed hope there would be in-depth discussions of the topics and the development of good working relationships between the invited groups and NAML. Jeff Reutter asked that if it were important, we would be briefed to ask the right questions of the guests. In a spirit of cordiality, introductions were made around the room.

1. Regional Reports

WAML — Tim Nelson presenter: WAML has been working on developing a K-12 education program which can be found at the Wrigley Lab's webpage. There is a list of participating labs with links back to each home institution. Tim mentioned that they plan to have the other regions submit their information as well, but the call from Tony Michaels had not yet gone out. WAML plans to begin another webpage using Tony's template to list amenities at each lab for visiting scientists looking for a place to go and work, and hopefully would cater to those with special needs. Their next meeting would be in mid-August at Catalina. They will discuss webpage design, marine safety, especially boating and diving procedures and AAUS regulations. Biodiversity issues to include generating lists of marine species collected each year would also be slated. State regulators would be invited and it was hoped that the species lists might be useful to them and assist them in formulating regulations pertaining to collecting permits. They planned to welcome at the meeting their plant operations and maintenance directors who would have the opportunity to meet and share common issues. They anticipated that 12 or more labs would be represented as the California contingent were not able to attend the Alaska meeting.

SAML — Bob Van Dolah presenter: Mote Marine Laboratory would be the host lab for the May meeting. They would follow their usual format of covering both External and Internal issues: anticipated External topics would be a report from the Outcome Committee on Ocean Policy with discussions of common themes and other issues important to SAML. Also covered would be web databases, CastNet, LabNet, and HABSOS. Bob mentioned that the ocean observing systems would be coming online and internet communications and that they would discuss an NIEHS initiative on human health funded equally between NSF and NIH. Internal Issues would include business managers discussing grant management, lab fees and an operations survey. Use of SAML funds for student awards for attending meetings and presentation awards would also be covered as well as means to maintain interest in attending meetings. SAML noted that there has been a decline in numbers recently; down to 20-30 directors from 30-50 in the past.

NEAMGLL — Alan Kuzirian presenter: the NEAMGLL Membership Directory was discussed and the changes desired for its format. It was decided that a PDF format would be preferred with both electronic and printed forms available. Also discussed was the resolve to continue to generate topical whitepaper reports. Assistance with the effort is planned through collaborations with SUNY-Buffalo, Sea Grant and their technical writing staff. Also planned is the pursuit of putting together an Invasive Species Conference with MIT Sea Grant as a co-sponsor. The NEAMGLL effort would focus on the investigating not just the occurrences of exotic introductions into the Northeast, but to study the processes that allow exotics to be invasive.

2. NAML Business Meeting

NAML Secretary and Treasurer's Reports — Alan Kuzirian distributed the Minutes from the Sixth Biennial Meeting of NAML, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Newport Oregon; Lavern Weber, host. He also distributed a Yearly Treasurer's Report for 2001. The main points of each were briefly discussed and they were subsequently accepted by a unanimous vote.

NAML Directory — The NAML Directory was discussed and it was decided that it would be beneficial to have the directory on the Webpage as a PDF file that could be download. The list of the Board of Directors would be added and that Alternate Delegates would be requested from the other regions. Madilyn and Alan would fast-track having printed copies of the Directory for distribution. It was noted that the NAML Membership has continued to increase, but as with SAML, attendance has been a problem. Cost was brought up as a factor as well as the time-factor necessary for travel. This is especially true for the WAML members who also have significant time zone changes.

Guest — Dr. H. Lee Dantzler, Director, NOAA National Oceanographic Data Center, Silver Spring, MD is introduced as a guest who was scheduled to speak to the Meeting later that afternoon. He was pleased to be able to join the Meeting for the day.

NAML and National Issues — This topic was opened for discussion. Lobbying for 501 (c)(3) non-profits is a important issue with strict guidelines. However, it was asked whether NAML should be more pro-active supporting issues that affect labs. Should NAML change the business model that has been used in the past? The Ocean Commission testimony is a new venture for NAML. In general, there are issues that consistently reoccur at meetings. The primary one for 2002 was Sea Grant and where it will reside in the Federal Agency structure. Should NAML support a particular point on that and other issues are major questions.

Jeff Reutter supported the issues but what did we leave out others? Ohio Sea Grant does a day-long science presentation to legislators, staff, and others. Almost universally, their response is to ask how can they help Sea Grant as well. Often, we do not make that point clearly. The question always is, "do we enter the legislature arena asking for help?" Gordon Fraser said that the influence of science and scientists on science policy is decreasing, and that is not beneficial for we need to have informed policy making.

Kumar Mahadevan mentioned the NAML DC Committee hadn't worked well in the past, but should be re-constituted and its members should make visits to federal legislators. NAML should bring issues to them and ask to be included on the discussion of and decisions on important issues. NAML has grass-roots support and uses member volunteerism, unlike CORE that pays lobbyists. Kumar recommended using the DC Committee structure for political issues again. NAML needs to be active in communicating with, and bringing issues to legislators.

It was suggested that we could join forces with CORE on specific issues. Madilyn noted that she sent copies of her testimony to CORE and Sea Grant. NAML could certainly support CORE on most issues especially those pertaining to funding issues. Coastal issues now overlap with CORE's blue water agenda. CORE certainly recognizes the size of our membership, if not our treasury.

It was decided to reconstitute the **Federal Legislative Committee**, and to define our strengths in concrete terms. Dan Baden was used as a successful example of how Federal involvement worked for him. At first, Dan started working on issues locally, then he was invited to DC. Sentiments among the attendees generally supported a NAML/CORE affiliation because of their stature. Jeff stated that he feels personally connected to DC, but is always amazed at what is going here; too large in scope to encompass it all.

The new Federal Legislative Committee was staffed by: Kumar Mahadevan, Jeff Reutter, and Dan Baden will serve. Tim Nelson will find a good WAML representative. Kumar will initiate the Committee for this year. Networking of the NAML membership with the DC Legislative contingent is necessary. A list of congressional districts with labs and legislators should be drawn up. Gordon noted that the Committee Structure of Congress is also important, as are the Student interns who are charged with gathering information. The Committee should formulate a list of names and bring it to the NAML membership with appropriate issues for us to address.

The Federal Committee Structure and NAML White papers could effectively be combined to make our point. Ocean Commission hearings can be used to keep bringing up common issues. Just the attendance of NAML members at the meeting is also beneficial, whether they testify or not. At the meeting where Madilyn testified, Admiral Watkins asked for NAML members to attend other hearings. Jeff asked that we **formalize** an association with today's guests and their programs. We

must stay with that kind of program for the long-term; 5-10 years. The personal touch should be revisited at the state level by having NAML members contact their legislators.

OBFS Partnership — OBFS wanted to plan the Staffer Forum correctly, so it was decided to postpone it until next. Sedra Shapiro was putting together a booklet on how to navigate the system correctly. "Environmental Sensing" is the topic suggested by OBFS and Madilyn. Email will be sent to memberships for comments. September 11 and the subsequent events pushed the timeline beyond the drop-dead date for the year 2002. Jeff suggested a Sea Grant and CORE combination as well. A Reception with them held in 2003, a month later than our usual time is possible. We could present a broader focus with them rather than being more focused with OBFS. Which one is better or would both be good to do? There was consensus that we ask the DC'ites what the topic might be.

OCEAN's Day 2002 — We have been invited by CORE to join them in June 2002. NAML could have a presence at the event and it would be possible to post a display if we wish. They wish as many as possible to participate, but all invitees have an ocean science orientation. Often some agency partners don't attend, and the industry partners are also sometimes not well represented.

LabNet/CastNet — Madilyn presented the topic including the history and scope of LabNet, the details of the Southern Universities Research Association, SURA, and their regional framework for an observation database network, CastNet. Its premise is to facilitate linkages between the members into an observation network for those who need data management assistance, hardware assistance, and to those that need help getting hard data into digital formats. The grant that was secured also offers assistance with institutional difficulties for those participating in the program.

3. Ocean Commission — Dr. Tom Kitsos, Executive Director

Tom distributed handouts of the regional meeting schedules and a list of the Florida participants and Scientific Advisory Panel members. The list of Panel members was ratified at FL meeting. It consists of Federal agency contact persons with ocean connections. This Ocean Commission was formed by the Clinton Administration and is an extension of the original Stratten Commission (35 years ago). There are 8 Congressional nominees and 8 from the Executive branch. It has as a directive to take testimony around the country with at least 6 specified locations; Florida was chosen by the OC. Other sites include, New Orleans in March, Boston/Woods Hole area in July. The remainder will be set by other non-government organizations and trade organizations. The law directs that a formal report be published, and include recommendations for a National Ocean Policy. It is currently scheduled to be released on 21 March 2003, but may not be formally released in April 2003 to allow for a 120 extension for Presidential review.

Provisions that are dictated by Law include: assessment of current, and planned facilities around ocean and human resources; evaluation of laws touching ocean and potential conflicts. Tricom is the hired PR firm, and Ballard's Jason Project is an OC promoter. There are three working groups: research (Paul Sandifer head); marine education and resources; and policy and governance. Port security may also be discussed. The K-12 Education Program is aimed at strengthening marine education. There will be an investment working group to look at recommendations from education and government groups that will make recommendation on how to implement the suggested and approved programs. Science review panels will review of the materials handed in looking for sound science. If it is not there, it will be removed. Tom said he is encouraged about the nature of the project, but somewhat afraid of the deadline and amount of work it will entail.

Madilyn asked what is the most important problems and are there solutions. Tom answered that blending of testimony is starting immediately. Each presenter is allowed to give their testimony, but then are questioned on specific points. They are looking for policies in conflict, and will recommendations, and possible solutions. The OC Panel **does not** want to hear about needed programs and requests for more money. Ask yourself, if you were on the panel, what do you want to hear about and what is important. Issues like: coastal governance; should Sea Grant be transferred to NSF; what is the role of the Coast Guard; marine science and budget process, are all legitimate topics for presentation. They looking for areas of greatest impact and solutions to major problems.

Bob asked how to avoid redundancy; by changing the agenda? Tom said that the topic of Coast growth is one issue that will not change. The topics of economic development, offshore natural resources, especially gas-oil in Gulf, fisheries issues including sea food restaurants, as well

as marine sanctuaries and management issues of protected areas will keep the program varied. Science education with its connection to coastal issues and the broad issue of state and coastal management programs will have to be covered along with the CZM at federal level.

Kumar asked if they thought they could rise above the impact of 11 September. Tom responded that they would probably work in obscurity in the beginning, but expected that their work would come to the forefront close to the time of the report. He mentioned that there had been a good response from stakeholders already. Tom recounted that the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) resulted from NOAA's Stratton Commission. It was noted that a PEW Commission was also doing a similar study and the question was asked if they planned to communicate with them. Tom answered that the PEW group had much narrower issues, but that they were watching them and would incorporate common points.

Tom mentioned that their PR firm had hired Bob Ballard's firm for the Jason Project to increase public awareness of the Commission. They had gotten good press coverage in Florida from it, as well as Charleston. He did note that it was a slow evolution.

Bob asked how NAML could assist. Tom thought NAML would be an effective means to get issues to Commission from the scientific community. Questions were asked about written testimony and how would it be handled? The answer was that written testimony is considered important and would certainly be read. Often material sent is sent out to the commissioners for their reading and responses. Although all 16 members went to Charleston, it might not happen for all meetings. Tom recommended a single page letter to Adm. Watkins would be good. They might end up turning down people to avoid duplication of testimony. A website is available [www.oceancommission.gov]. Minutes of meetings will be published on web. They suggest that oral testimony be accompanied by a written affidavit for record. However, the two need not be the same there could be two separate points made.

How are speakers chosen asked Brian Melzian? The Commissioner from the region does the initial work of screening requests. Those chosen are sent to DC for review to insure proper coverage. There will be a consensus agreement between Adm. Watkin's staff and the commissioners to avoid repetitious topics. However oil/gas issues have large geographic overlaps, so that topic may be heard several times (FL, Gulf of Mexico, CA).

Mote Marine Laboratory will be a site host, so NAML should be able to talk one-on-one with the commissioners. It will be important to state Problems clearly and then offer solutions, although some informal discussion will be fine and expected. There will be site visits occurring the day before the hearings. Puerto Rico and Caribbean will be included in Florida visit. Commissioners and DC staff members as well attend the site visits; usually split in half to visit two sites. Florida is special with a third groups going to Puerto Rico; both Florida coasts will be covered (east-Atlantic/west-Gulf).

Tom Baden is scheduled to send a letter to Adm. Watkins about the human health and the oceans funding program between NIH and NIEHS with copies to those commissioners who also might take interest in this. Jeff Reutter recommended that NAML and Sea Grant can help the OC's PR firm with meeting notification in the hearing areas. Individual press releases would be acceptable to the OC, but it would help to notify them so the information is factual correct. It would also give them heads-up as to information being distributed and be a gesture of courtesy. Information can be sent to Kate Naughten; 202/418-3442 for the PR officers.

It was brought to our attention that the Commission is moving rapidly in forming their regional agenda and lining up speakers. The other NAML regions need to act quickly if they are to be scheduled. Kumar volunteered to bring NAML points to the Commissioners when they come to Mote. Kumar said that the Sea Grant issue is an important issue and the move should not be recommended or supported. Rick DeVoe should be asked his views at the afternoon session.

Dan suggested that Agencies don't work together well and there is duplication of effort. How can this issue be addressed and can NAML offer any suggestions. Also discussed was NAML's assistance on the issue of capitalization of facilities (infrastructure support) and educating the next generation in marine sciences. The current NSF facilities grants do not cover education, only research so how can marine labs obtain funds for educational infrastructure? This should be a cornerstone issue for the OC review. One solution suggested by Dan Baden would be to spend time to formulate solutions creatively within the current agency structure. There should be a true effort to foster interagency cooperation for common goals (research, education, etc.), and for pooling money and awards towards those goals.

Lunch

4. AIBS Presentation — Richard O’Grady, Executive Director, and Public Policy Representatives, Ellen Paul, and Adrienne Froelich

Richard told the group that AIBS started in 1947 as a branch of the NAC with a BoD of 13 biologists. It now has >6000 individual members, plus 86 societal members. It has an umbrella role to organize an array of services and collective action initiatives like education, conducting meetings as well as government affairs, and policy work.

1999 presidents of societies held a retreat funded by the Packard Foundation. It was attended by 57 persons and produced 11 initiatives that each bought into a collective working arrangement with AIBS. It has a DC office and staff to serve the membership. They champion legislation and do some lobbying that is allowed under 501(c)(3) status. AIBS determined that they needed to undertake a funding initiative for public policy activities and needed to increase their staff accordingly. They asked their member societies to help fund it by increasing their contributions by 10. By last fall, they had gotten all the funds necessary to add staff and start the initiative. ASLO contributed \$20K and so Adrienne devotes some work time for them.

AIBS has a biweekly emailing (600-700 transmissions) is part of their member services. Their *Watch Column* is published monthly as part of *Biosciences*. It has a lenient copyright, so it can be duplicated for distribution. We were told that AIBS was pleased to have NAML as a member. One of their missions is to serve as a communication nexus within DC for member societies and to assist in information transfer between members. Richard offered use of their conference room for small NAML meetings.

Ellen Paul: Ellen trained as a lawyer, gave overview of some of their program areas. She told the group that AIBS now has an annual budget of \$250000 from a of 86 members. It is similar in scope to FASEB now. She emphasized that numbers do count, and so it was beneficial to be a member. The rhetorical question, “how do they determine what is needed?” was addressed. In the Science Policy arena they tackle everything from funding levels, regulations, data quality and data release issues to instructing members on knowing their your rights. They are now involved in the Evolution Question with students interns focused on with the arguments between creationism and intelligent design versus evolution. Ellen said that the creationists were back in force with a new sophisticated approach, “intelligent design”. A lawyer is their spokesperson and has written a book on how to teach and test restrictions. They have undertaken these issues on their own, but it is being done with input and approval from the Board. Another new initiative relates to the application of ‘Science to Policy’. The NIH model will be adopted on issues affecting public health. The NIH Consensus Development Council will meet next month to present this issue.

AIBS uses direct support from members to push their own program and issues. Briefings are available, as are white-papers on topics or legislation. It was noted that they assisted NAML and OBFS last year with Invasive Species topic for the Staffers Forum. They are pleased to assist, but their time is limited because there are only two of them who work only half-time.

Adrienne Froelich: Adrienne related that she actually has a PhD in aquatics, and had Sea Grant fellowship in DC, plus a NOAA background as well. She publishes through ASLO an aquatic policy newsletter, *Policy Updates*. She also has connections with the Amer. Fish. Soc. and ERF. Often it is her job to facilitate speakers from Agencies for legislators and key subcommittees. Adrienne noted that AIBS was the first to protest Sea Grant move to NSF. She emphasized the point that AIBS does provide it own analysis of legislation and the effects of regulations.. They don’t just cut and paste from others.

Discussion: Bob asked about their 11 initiatives and their selection process. The answer was that it was by consensus, so they had to be reviewed and ratified by the societies’ members as well. Four were on policy matters directly, including making the case for the biological sciences. It was noted that the Community of Science funding Opportunities, was started by Johns Hopkins but then spun-off to a private company that makes available funding opportunities. Subscription to the lists is available through the society. Biological education is another focus point and undergraduate curriculum development in biology. They helped support the National Ecological Observation Network (NEON) because it sort of fell under their mega-project initiative.

Jeff Reutter brought up the subject of coalition building, different ways to do it, and how to make an impact on the Federal scene and legislation. Jeff agreed that AIBS would be very useful to NAML. He assured them we would reciprocate if they ever needed something. Ellen said that Regulatory legislation is the most complex and usually they have only 30-60 day periods to comment. Most societies don't have the ability to respond fast enough. Preparation time is key for a quick response that has meaning.

Adrienne asked about the Ocean Commission and what Tom Kitsos said. She commented that public written statements are OK. Getting on the panel must be done quickly. Assisting in reviewing facilities and human resources at marine labs is one area where NAML could especially be helpful. Many scientists get focused on their research and do not pay attention to bricks and mortar issues. It would put NAML in good light if we could help. Any request for more money, must be accompanied by a strongly worded argument for WHY it is needed. Any testimony must give concrete examples of what is or isn't being funded, and what its impact would be if it were. They suggested that an aquatic versions of NEON would be good, especially in light of the threat of bioterrorism. These are large ticket items that cannot be funded by ROIs.

5. Sea Grant Presentation — Rick DeVoe, President, National Sea Grant Association

Rick said that he was pleased to be asked to speak. Recalled how that the association between the two groups had begun during the early years of NAML, but that our active collaboration had languished somewhat; a condition he wants to remedy.

Rick noted that Sea Grant began in 1966 as a Congressional entity under NOAA, with 30 programs and 300 member universities. Institutions first become Sea grant projects sites and then move up to assume Sea Grant college designation. The Secretary of Commerce must sign off on that status. Since then, Sea Grant has received more money for greater than 300 university labs encompassing about 3000 scientists, and individuals.

Its mission is to: develop external relationships especially on Capital Hill, and now through the NGOs and NOAA itself; 2. Set programmatic priorities for its members and; 3. Encourage and promote professional development. They sponsor, Sea Grant Week yearly which is designed to engaged everyone in the program for better effect. Sea Grant now has a review panel for internal review as does the Extension and Educators Program; new policy. There are 9 top layers in Sea Grant. Each is a series of thematic areas with white-papers to identify issues and how Sea Grant fits into the solutions. The One-pagers offer use as a good communication tool; available through the NOAA research office. In 1998, Sea Grant received a reauthorization bill for 5 years. This will come come up again 2003. Process oriented issues must be developed and they must become politically astute because President Reagan was able to keep Sea Grant out of the Executive budget for 6 years. It is now funded within the appropriation's budget.

The recent proposal to move Sea Grant to NSF has been thought about extensively, with some thinking that the move might actually get them a budget increase. Bush's Agenda for science is not advocacy, but is for education. However, the main focus point for Bush are the applied aspects of research. There is a plan somewhere in the Bush administration, but it is not defined or let out yet. The transfer is certainly budget based, and whether it meets their criteria is not known.

Ocean Commission is looking for ideas on how the government can do business more effectively. There is a House bill (HR-3389) for Sea Grant re-authorization for the next 5 years with increases and its remaining in NOAA. The House Science Committee (HUD, NSF) is interested in how they will receive it.

Rick stated and everyone agreed that the Integrity of the Sea Grant Program must be maintained; where it is not totally the issue. Congress really isn't really sure about buying into the program, but Sea Grant isn't going to let them change their minds. The Coastal Ocean Program (COP) would be moved with this bill. Unfortunately the base budgets for science are NOT growing. There is still talk that it might be beneficial to move Sea Grant if the integrity can be preserved. However, the Sea Grant colleges would probably go, as well as the Extension division. It was noted that the lack of rigor of the funded science has been a major criticism for Sea Grant. However, the Extension division is recognized as a major leg of its program. However, a three-legged stool, cannot stand on two!

The Ses Grant Association has been its political arm. They are looking for coalitions and will probably contract with CORE to provide the political service. They are interested in NAML's

help and friendship also. Jeff told Rick that the feeling is mutual; the sentiments were reiterated by Madilyn.

The discussion next focused on, "where do we start?", the Ocean Commission, and how do we get the science into the Ocean Observing systems? Everyone agreed that data collection and management are needed. Talked also centered on the possibilities of hosting a joint meeting next year in March, to include collaboration on the reception.

6. National and Regional Observing Systems; OCEAN.US — Dr. Larry Atkinson

Larry noted that OCEAN.US is a small office involved in research. It is an Interagency, National Oceanographic Partnership Program (NOPP). There are 14 agencies involved with common interests including, National Ocean Research Leadership Council (NORLC); NSF, NOAA, and Commerce. 1999 reports were commissioned. It focuses on the integration of sustained routine, and consistent ocean observing systems. There are 7 themes; detecting, forecasting climate variability; safe and efficient marine operations; national security; managing marine resources; restoring and preserving healthy ecosystems; mitigating natural hazards; and ensuring public health. CORE, the Ocean Caucus, Research Observatories, and the Commission on Ocean Policy are all involved. They have an OSTP mandate to develop an inter-agency plan to coordinate ocean observing system. In 2000/01, the Integrated Ocean Observation Program Office (Ocean.US) was formed. They have a workshop scheduled in March 2002, with 110 people coming to do: 1. national security and all it entails related to observation systems like basic measurements that many people need (temperature, salinity, HABs, etc.) and, 2. Managing Resources to include fisheries and marine protected areas. They have a Federal infrastructure with regional nodes of observational systems to meet the needs of the military, EPA, NOAA, sanitation priorities, global climate studies and individual researchers. In summary their role is to implement a multi-user design plan (NOAA, NDF, MMS, NASA, USGS, DOE, USCG, USACE; GOOS).

NAML's Role in collaboration with them might entail: tracking OCEAN.US activities and Ocean Commission for its members; and 2. assigning a point person for interaction. NAML could issue statements of its role in a national federation of observation systems. Important dates for them are: March, for Ocean.US workshop; Spring, for a letter and report to Congress; and summer for sponsored workshops. Larry noted that LabNet could be used to link the data to make it usable. CastNet currently allows the systems to interact and become compatible.

Larry stated that a national consensus on ocean observation systems must be put together because it is fragmented now. The Ocean Commission may and can help if they adopt the concept. A Weather Service for the ocean is basically what is being asked for and done; Meteorology of the Sea.

7. NOAA National Oceanographic Data Center (NODC) — Lee Dantzler, Director

Lee thanked us for letting him sit in for the day. He has been in his position now for 1 year. He noted that previously, NODC was not realizing the potential that was there. Electronic distribution of data was not being done. It was trying to provide service to the end user. It is now changed from science communication to public education, government and commercial end-users. It is a world data center for Oceanography International. Currently, foreign customers are pleased but the US universities, etc. are not happy. They feel it is too restrictive or that data has not been or is being collected. Realtime streaming data is being requested currently in the US. NOAA has most of the systems that they need to make data accessible. Gulf of Mexico, GoMOOS, and the Hawaiian Ocean Observation Systems are the most complex and best assembled.

They provide a service, essentially migrating the data to make it useful and accessible, as well as archiving data for physical safety and long-time retrieval. They currently use Metadata Management Engine (internet medium). An on-line service is their first effort. They will receive any electronic data that can be "ftp'd" or is on a website, then reformat it to make it useful by being transposed to a common platform. Reference data, ocean climatologies, coastal climatologies, and regional atlases are currently being worked on. They provide and absorb the related costs for this service. However, if they harvest any of the data, it then becomes public domain for unrestricted use. There is a NOAA Central Library being planned. The worst situation is to have to become data archeologists. This happens when the software is gone, and so too the investigator, and no one else wants to bother with the data sets. In general, standards and protocol format standards are not developed to where they want to have to decide which to commit to. They want to work with

NAML labs and have them be a beta test sites for this program. Infrastructure capabilities will be very varied and will not be standardized and they are aware of that. However, they are willing to work with what is there, and do not want to change it all. Lee would like to work with CastNet as a primary test of the system for harvesting and curating the data. Internships for students to work on this project are available as are IPA experiences.

Dinner

**Board of Directors Meeting
Crown Plaza Hotel, Washington, DC
20 February 2002**

The meeting began with a discussion of whether we wanted to send a letter supporting the request, not to move Sea Grant into NSF. The consensus was that we should poll the membership and see if they also supported the letter. It was suggested that the one-pager from Sea Grant could be sent. Alan said he would provide the notes and a synopsis of the discussion to go with it.

The dates for next year's (2003) meetings were also discussed. Margaret Davidson thought strongly that the joint meetings with other societies were excellent. Budget demands with the change in national priorities will have everyone feeling the crunch.

8. NOAA-NOS — Margaret Davidson, Director National Ocean Service; Ocean Services & Coastal Zone Management

Margaret thanked us for the invitation having been associated with NAML/SAML for a long time. Margaret stressed that the national priority has switched to security, and so other budgets will have to be reduced. However, she did say that the NOAA budget was OK, and also EPA; approximately \$3.5B. There will be budget accounting adjustments, including retirement funds, for Sea Grant to NSF. Homeland security will affect them by allowing them to get bathymetric capabilities in the Gulf. There will also be a new vessel for NMFS which will be deployed to the NE. Satellite sensor systems will also be upgraded along the coast. The brown murky imaging of estuaries, etc. will be improved. HABS, coral reefs in shallow waters and climate observation systems (\$16M for bluewater) will be a reality. The NOS problem will be addressed and solutions to the network obtained. NEERS budget will be \$26M, with \$16M for operation and the remainder to research and land acquisition. System monitoring plans will increase with more going to observations. \$45M will be directed to marine sanctuaries, and Margaret said she is pushing monitoring functions for them also and engaging academia. \$14M will go to HABS, with most of that money going to grants, and on a little being shunted for internal use. This issue is popular on Capital Hill. HABSOS in the Gulf is trying to couple with EPA, and USGS and trying to get the programs inter-related. GoMOOS in Maine will get money for HABS too. NMFS is spending most of their own funds on themselves. Coral reef programs will get \$34M. There are designated funds for coral reef mapping in the Caribbean and Hawaii. Most will be done by contract. Coral reef database information and work on reefs will be coordinated with USGS, who are also doing the same thing. Coastal Ocean Program budget is set at \$18.8M.

Admiral Lautenbacher is coming to NOAA from CORE. Margaret is optimistic about his coming, and perhaps some good changes will come of it. Margaret favors collaborations between Climate and Coastal Observation and Ocean.US. Tom Malone will go from NOAA to Ocean.US and bring his expertise with GOOS and international GOOS. He will integrate with NOS and their Bathymetric observation and sanctuaries observation programs. The integration of these systems will mimic those systems with portals like in California for monitoring water quality observations; single web-portals to take you wherever the data is located, automatically. There will be a GoMOOS portal also. GoMOOS is centralized, but California is diffuse with data located at each observation site. Many programs want OBS, but none are integrated; from climate observations to coastal monitoring. Margaret noted that all these programs were initiated on the Hill, so they must be managed effectively so confusion and overlap are kept low. There is also a GIS systems development between NOAA and USGS which are trying to be kept seamless. FEMA will now be

involved with security issues, but also for coastal mapping and erosion studies. OBS is driving it. National Ocean Economics Project with collaboration with MIT, Woods Hole, and the Gulf of Maine people will study how the overall US economy is impacted by and coupled to the oceans. There will be a Sea Grant and state coastal zone managers program that will also be coupled with the national NOAA programs. It is called, "Living on the Edge" a coastal program to be run in September 2002, in Boston. NAML is certainly invited to attend. Continued will be the collaborations with Sea Grant on education. One topic will be the weather impacts when large storms hit large amounts of people; the NW-weather will impact fish, in the East, weather will impact people.

Margaret noted that partnerships are the only way to survive: there is less money and more problems. Coastal impact studies are not increasing, and funds are shrinking. Therefore, interagency cooperation will be necessary to keep good science in the coastal zone moving; mutualism is a good term to apply. NOAA is looking to fund longer-term grants; not 3-5 yrs, but 5-8 years. It is a OMB kind of strategy (long-term high return, marketing strategy) which will carry better on the Hill. Everyone knows, scientists do this better than the Feds do. Cooperation between feds and scientists should be fostered. Metadata is now the standard so that everyone can work with it. It must become available quickly for federal use. Scientists cannot sit on the data while a publication is waiting to be written and published.

Margaret mentioned that there is a potential public policy issue dealing with whether the military satellite mapping (NEMA) program will supercede NOAA/USGS programs, and therefore will access to the data for our work be limited for security reasons. NAML should also watch this issue.

In summary, Margaret noted that cooperation between agencies and institutions is needed especially along the coast and between coastal observation systems. Scientists are still using shoe-box technology and doing a great job, but they are competing for limited funds as are the federal agencies themselves. Everyone must come together to make things work more effectively, and with must better credibility.

Discussion: Kumar asked about education. Margaret said that NEERS and the reserve sanctuaries have education and she is pushing them to work with Sea Grant. NOAA has not much in the way of education. Gordon Fraser asked about cooperative programs between NOAA labs in the Lakes and that Steve Brandt is pushing for scientist exchange programs. Margaret said she would like to see it happen.

The Sea Grant issue was discussed including HR-3385 for its re-authorization. The issue is not on the Senate docket yet. It will have to move through the process and then the projected outcome will become clearer.

Madilyn asked about NAML partnerships, especially with agencies like NOAA. LabNet and its metadata program need to move forward and so the Coastal Observation program. How do NAML labs fit into this. There is not a framework currently in the government to hang these programs on. Margaret suggested that NAML and OBFS could foster this by working with legislators and agency people to get it done. They have issued a challenge for us to meet with the Admiral before the internal review is complete. We need to do that.

9. NASULGC — Kerry Bolognese, Associate Director, Federal Relations Marine & Environmental Affairs

Madilyn asked Kerry to stress opportunities for partnerships as that has been the theme of the meeting. Kerry agreed and thanked us for the invitation to come and speak. Kerry stressed that NAML is important to NASULGC, and there was a move to have the NAML the president sit on the Board of Oceans & Atmosphere.

NASULGC has as members, 214 members, including 75 land grant colleges, 17 African-American land grants, plus major universities. It is one of 6 higher education associations in DC that are governed by University Presidents. They hold monthly meeting to discuss major issues. National Security is the current issue; Homeland Security, as is the issue of whether the transfer of Sea Grant is not meant to be not a transfer of a program but only of funds. The move would have major impacts on Sea Grant colleges which are also NASULGC colleges. A letter opposing the transfer has already been sent. It highlights the change in the complexion of the association and its relationship to the public and its outreach programs.

Kerry mentioned a Food and Society Initiative. It is designed to raise funds related to food and agriculture sciences a USDA, EPA, NOAA, and NIH partnership. There is also a Millennium Act on information technology sharing. In general there is a usually a split between the Environment and Natural Resources, and Higher education. Boards govern the activities of each directorate under each major division.

Adm. Lautenbacher is looking to universities for big projects (like climate observation networks) related to Homeland security. That dimension is being stressed to the hilt. Climate Observation Systems is one of his big favorites. An example is weather in Afganistan and how it affects military operations there and it uses at home. There was an important workshop held on Oceans and Coasts, and a white-paper on sustainable development and interagency cooperation for the Administration. NASULGC has a close cooperation with the NOAA Science Advisory Board. Inviting international scientists to the Board for added breath is being considered by the Admiral. Partnership workshops between NOAA and Universities are good and they support it. They have one with USGS.

Discussion: Madilyn praised Kerry's work and how he gets people to work together. As a facilitator, he is effective and also a good advisor. It was noted that NASULGC will give testimony to the Ocean Commission. They are putting together a written statement now from the Board of Oceans and Atmosphere (BOA). They will present in the state of Washington. Appropriation bill information is an excellent topic as they are called in for discussions and input. Jeff suggested that NAML give input to NASULGC on how the appropriations affect our labs. It would be more persuasive than if just they had that information. Although there is a close association between Sea Grant and the BOA, a broader perspective, like from NAML, CORE, SURA is really better. Liasons between our new Legislative Committee and Kerry would be appreciated said Jeff. Kerry welcomed the opportunity. Are there new areas to pursue asked Madilyn? Kerry noted that for Federal relations programs by societies like NASULGC, etc., cooperation is needed and it does work! The umbrella nature of the larger whole does have impact on the Hill. Kerry welcomes those kinds of workings. Legislators need to know who supports a piece of legislation and who is against it! With tht information, there is a greater comfort level produced for the legislator. Penny Dalton says there is usually more trouble trying to get a consensus within her organization. Once that is done, then it is easy to move it on.

10. CORE — Penny Dalton, Vice Prsident and Technical Advisor

Penny gave an update on what they have been doing and on their, "Census on Marine Life" research program. She said the 66 members represent the major oceanographic universities, however, < 20% of their budget comes from members. Their \$3-4M budget is derived from managing federal programs, like the Nocen Partnership Programs: 14 programs with a \$50M total budget. Penny mentioned the National Ocean Bowl started by Adm. Watkins; the theme being, "Census of Marine life". It is a collaboration between public and Federal education programs on ocean matters. Adm. Watkns is now head of the Ocean Commission, and Adm. Lautenbacher has gone to NOAA.

Penny noted that the Federal Budget and authorization appropriations are their biggest job. She said that ONR had lost its head who retired, and there is uncertainty about funding continuing for them, especially in light of September 11. NSF is budget strategizing like NIH did, but not the Marine Research Equipment Account; it will be underfunded by emphasis on ocean observation systems. There is a great need to get it into the NSF budget; ship budgets as well.

Penny noted that most people she knew were uncomfortable with the anticipated move of Sea Grant to NSF. Thge general position is that NOAA needs Sea Grant, and so it should remain there. The prior NRC report also said that. CORE uses their membership as a resource on all kinds of issues and that certainly is being done here. Gerald Selzer asked what is pushing it? Penny said he should tell us. As far as anyone can tell, it is an OMB initiative. It is in line with the other Administration backed changes designed in effect to increase efficiency and reward NSF for a good job. It is thought of as a consolidation of external research into one agency

The Ocean OBS program has occupied CORE's time, especially at Commerce. They have been looking for conflicts between program scopes within the bill. Ther will be a total budget review by the Senate. The House asked for it by Agency, which is much more difficult. Interagency coordination is being pushed, and how much will their programs cost. National Ocean Partnership

re-authorization bill screening is taking place. It has an education component similar to the NSF-COSI program.

CORE has an initiative from the Sloan Foundation on the "Census of Marine Life" (\$50M/yr). It stemmed from a NAC report on biodiversity allowing biotechnology to understand biodiversity in the oceans; what was there is there, and what will be there in the future. They will solicit nomination for the Board. She noted that the Gulf of Maine is a major target area because of Fisheries studies and its long history. It will be a good area for testing new methods for sustaining biodiversity.

Discussion: Gordon asked if the Great Lakes were excluded. Penny said no, because there is no one pushing to get a program into the Lakes.

At the Public Policy meeting in Oregon, it was mentioned to undertake a MOU between CORE and NAML. It could resemble the standard model used between CORE-NASULGC and USGS. NAML would be the third party. It was decided that we would pursue the concept.

Penny advised that the National Ocean Day is being formed currently. Last year it was done quickly with NEERS, Sloan, and CORE. Targeted is June 5-6 for this year and will center on two topics: ocean education and coral reefs. Madilyn asked if they wanted help. It was accepted and Penny asked that we give them a contact person; Madilyn would it).

It was noted that Legislative Education (i.e., lobbying) has not been a NAML endeavor, but there is a need to play our partnerships to good benefit. How can we do it effectively? It was agreed that networking was the best way, and then to go and meet with the players and members to remove divergent opinions and unit into a coalition of consensus. Next, you then have to have a recognized message. You then must define the purposes of the coalitions. Workshop dialogs are one way CORE is trying. Bob Van Dolah said we should poll the membership and then proceed together. Brian Melzian suggested that perhaps there should be a NAML representative present at the CORE annual meeting. That would be considered.

11. NERRS — Laurie McGilvary, Chief, Estuarine Reserves Division

Handouts were distributed highlighting their Programs and their Partnership report. The Reserve Systems were formed in 1972 by the Coastal Zone Management Act. These areas were set aside and protected for long-term research and resource stewardship. They are owned by state agencies or universities with operating funds provided by NOAA. The systems have large out-reach and education programs from K-adult as well as interships.

Each has a Monitoring Program: an abiotic or physical data component; and a biotic one comprising ecological-diversity, habitat, eutrophication; land use changes, like geographic information, systems data layers. Since 2000, their budget has increased significantly because they finally reached critical mass, and the ERR Association of directors to educate legislators. NOAA has separated them from marine sanctuaries. NH-Rep Judd on appropriation Committee took up their favor.

They use their research money to establish Graduate research programs; two per reserve. There are National priority categories which range from point source pollution, to the social science of resource and land use. There is a Coastal training component used to make informed decisions by planners, elected officials, NGOs resource managers, and developers; Sea Grant cooperation is provided here.

For their biological monitoring programs, they use YSI data loggers, and measure nutrients including chlorophyll-a, plus physical/climatology data. For land-use studies, they measure habitat change with GIS systems; it is telemetry, real-time change monitoring. Water-quality data ranges from 1996-98 and contains hypoxia studies for each reserve. The Gulf of Mexico sites were most effective. There is Web access to all their sites for the data: [<http://inlet.geol.sc.edu/cdmohome.html>].

They held a national Invasive Species Workshop and identified common issues and how to design it. The Workshop report is available. Biological monitoring needs to be sampled regularly to obtain early invasion detection and prohibit success. As with the other agencies and societies, partnerships are needed because of budget constraints. System wide, cooperation is now the model for NERRS.

The NEERS systems provide a unique opportunity to study Restoration Science and its role because they have the advantage as being reference sites with monitoring capability to study the process. They plan to expand the systems; biogeographic representation is mandated. Now that

funding has increased they are considering adding more sites. Gaps occur in the Gulf of Mexico along the western side (Texas), and especially in the Great Lakes with only one site in Ohio.

Discussion: It was asked by Madilyn if there were any cooperative discussions with NSF or NOAA to have LTERs in Estuarine reserves? Laurie said there is a cooperative agreement with NOAA through John Knauss. Some sanctuaries are underutilized because of the remoteness of the sites, others however, are very well utilized, especially near universities. About half of the NERRS have NAML connections.

12. NSF — Gerald Selzer, Program Director, Biological Field Stations & Marine Laboratories

Tom Callahan (now Phil Yund from Darling Center, Univ. of Maine, Walpole, ME) was the original administrator. It has a \$2.3M/yr budget with \$1.8M from the biology directorate, and the remainder from Ocean sciences. The funds are directed more toward bricks-and-mortar. The Program announcement was redone with increases in the funding levels to \$500K. Last year they funded one for \$300K. Cost-sharing is still required, but they now use a sliding scale; 25% up to \$180K, then it goes up to about 50% for the largest awards. The deadline is March 22 for 2002, and it will be tight because of time-line. The applications are now limited to one proposal/institution/year. The RFP is now changed from encompassing research programs only, to include ones also supporting education (K-12 through graduate level). However, stations that have no research at all will usually not do well. Gerald says to send them in anyway. It was asked by Denis, if visiting scientist programs counted? Yes was the answer, as long as there is no overhead exchange because they would then use the host's infrastructure. User fees are one way to cover the costs, but it doesn't offset the criteria of the application. "Improvements" is in the title, and so initial startup funds are not usually handled well. However, planning grants to start new field stations, etc., they will support that. \$25K is usually allowed for these so data and impacts can be used to justify the improvements or startup for stations. Gerald noted that there is a detailed announcement on how to proceed here at the meeting, and that it is available on the OBFS website.

Judy Skog also assists in running the program. Success rate on awards is high (40-45%). The upper limit was raised to come closer to actual building costs, but that will also lower the award rate. They want to see what the impact will be and where that will lead for their overall budget level. Last year the funding rate was 28% with the higher awards. The success rate has to be higher for this type of program because of the effort it takes to write it versus grants for ROIs. Overall, only about 1/3 of the number of requests come from marine labs, the majority are from field stations. In general, NSF was not too encouraging about doing much to alleviate the situation of generating facility funds. Review panels ultimately have the final say in what awards are made; scientific merit is still applied even on facilities grants. The award money does come out of Research money, and not education money which is a separate division. Therefore, the review panels more often tend to look at research requests to fund, and not straight forward education improvements.

It was asked how this program would integrate with NEON? The answer was simply that it will be a biology program, and marine labs will be eligible to apply for funding. However, NEON is a network of linked sites, and not a single location. A program announcement will come out this summer.


Madilyn asked if we could get money numbers to actually document what is needed in the marine lab community, would it help? She recounted that NAML did include infrastructure support in our testimony to the Ocean Commission. Gerald said it would not in itself help with a high award rate. The biodiversity approach might help and use of a better marketing strategy would too. It is difficult to make arguments for bricks and mortar and whether one application is better science than another. Perhaps for some of the other programs it might be better to apply. However, it would be recommended to include a link button to NSF and their programs like OBFS does. Small awards are routinely made and that also contributes to the high success rate. It is done because of the match requirement!

13. Summary Discussion and Action Items

- It was moved and passed that we form a new Federal Legislative Committee staffed by, Kumar Mahadevan, Jeff Reutter, and Dan Baden. A WAML representative will be added by Tim Nelson.

- Ideas for next year's meeting should be discussed at the Regional Meetings
- Scheduling for next year and who to meet with; Sea Grant, OBFS, CORE needs to be decided.
- It was moved and seconded (Jeff Reutter/Al Answini) to address the topic of infrastructure facilities support be brought to Ocean Commission and to encourage: 1. that a mechanism be found to allow this to occur, and 2. that it not be assigned to any particular agency. Madilyn will check with Paul Sandifer to see how and when to present this. The vote was unanimous.
- It was further moved and seconded (Jeff Reutter/Tim Nelson respectively) to have NAML's next meeting occur with the aquatic community and societies, and/or with OBFS next spring and to co-host the Staffer Forum and Congressional Reception. The motion carried.
- Also it was resolved to complimented Madilyn on a well- run meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan M. Kuzirian, PhD
NAML, Secretary/Treasurer

Appendix I
Attendee List: BoD Meeting, 19-20 February 2002

NAML Members

Albert Answini, Marine Science
Consortium, Wallops Island, VA
Daniel G. Baden (SAML), Center for Marine
Science, Wilmington, NC
Margaret Davidson, NOAA, Coastal
Services Center, Charleston, SC
Madilyn Fletcher, Baruch Inst., Marine
Biol., U-SC, Columbia, SC
Gordon S. Fraser, Great Lakes Center,
SUNY, Buffalo, NY
Alan M. Kuzirian, Marine Biol. Lab, Woods
Hole, MA
Junda Lin, Vero Beach Marine Laboratory,
Melbourne, FL
Kumar Mahadevan, Mote Marine Lab,
Sarasota, FL
Timothy Nelson, Blakely Island Field Sta.,
Seattle Pacific U., Seattle WA
Jeffery Reutter, FT Stone Lab., Ohio State
Univ., Put-in-Bay, OH

Dennis A. Thoney (WAML), Telonicher
Marine Laboratory, Trinidad, CA
Robert Van Dolah, Marine Div., SC Dept.
Nat. Resour. Charleston, SC

Science Community

Larry Atkinson, OCEANS.US, National and
Regional Observing Systems
Kerry Bolognese, NASULGC
Penny Dalton, CORE
Lee Dantzler, NOAA-National
Oceanographic Data Center
Rick DeVoe, Sea Grant Association
Adrienne Froelich, AIBS
Tom Kitsos, Oceans Commission
Laurie McGilvary, NEERS
Richard O'Grady, AIBS
Ellen Paul, AIBS
Gerald Selzer, NSF-Biological Field
Stations and Marine Laboratories
Judy Skog, NSF-Biology Division



National Association of Marine Laboratories


c/o Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA 02543

Secretary / Treasurer
Dr. Alan M. Kuzirian

(508) 289-7480; FAX: 289-7900
email: akuziria@mbi.edu

17 March 2003

Memorandum

To: NAML Board of Directors
From: Alan M. Kuzirian, Ph.D. 
Date: 17 March 2003
Subject: NAML Financial Report — 2002

The following is a synopsis of the Financial Transactions for 2002:

I. Income		\$14,654.36
NEAMGLL, SAML, WAML Dues, Misc Income	\$14,593.37	
Bank Interest	\$60.99	
II. Debits		\$3,951.27
BoD Meeting (Feb-2001)	\$2295.79	
ISD Computer/Web/Services:	\$540.00	
Postage/Express mail:	\$5.89	
Telephone:	\$3.60	
Travel (Kuzirian):	\$849.25	
General Supplies	\$111.19	
Miscellaneous	\$145.55	
III. Balance Forwarded - 2001		\$30,200.26
MBL Account	\$14,429.13	
NAML Checking Account	\$15,771.13	
IV. Total INCOME - 2002		\$14,654.36
V. Total Spendable Assets - 2002		\$44,854.62
VI. Total Debits - 2002		(-) \$3,951.27
VII. Ending Balance - 31 Dec 2002		\$40,903.35