

**8<sup>th</sup> Biennial Meeting of NAML**  
**F.T. Stone Laboratory, Ohio State University**  
**Gibraltar Island, Put-in-Bay, OH**  
**21-23 September 2005**

**Welcome and Introductions:** Jeff Reutter, NAML President and Host opened the meeting with introductions around the room. Bill Wise was present on the conference phone. Jeff then initiated an introduction to NAML's Government Affairs initiative and added accolades to Tony Michaels, Joel Widder, Lewis-Burke Associates (LBA), and the Public Policy Committee (PPC) on the work accomplished so far.

**Introduction to Governmental Affairs Discussion:** Tony Michaels followed and gave the background of the initiative. Tony stated that 40% of the NAML labs responded positively to the survey directed to its initiation. The PPC and its initiative extended from the decisions made at the March (2005) Board of Directors (BoD) meeting. Its principal goals are to educate the Washington DC community about NAML and to establish NAML's name recognition as a source of expertise and positive player in the marine community organizational structure. Other marine organizations do have a DC presence, but they do not represent marine labs to the level we wish. Tony also extended praise to Joel's work and emphasized the fact that NAML works for the good of the marine community as a whole, and does not have a narrow specialized scope of interest. Tony emphasized that the last 6-months were a gearing up process, and LBA has already extended our message to the Hill. The main question for this meeting is, at what level of activity do we now wish to maintain or expand to, and importantly, how do we pay for it if we decide to continue moving forward. Tony warned that we should only proceed in the 'right way' or not proceed at all.

Tony said the game-plan would be to discuss this extensively during the meeting today, mull over the choices overnight, and then make final decision tomorrow. Tony added that he was a little concerned about the numbers present at the meeting, but said that ultimately, we do need to go forward.

**Review of Lewis-Burke Activities:** Joel Widder was next on the agenda and began by introducing his power-point presentation that had been shared earlier with the PPC and BoD. The Objectives for NAML's PPC were spelled out and included:

- Establishing working relationships with decisions makers (federal agencies, Congressional representatives, etc);
- Organizing the NAML membership to engage public policy-makers (locally or in DC);
- Developing a public policy agenda that would be issue-oriented and organized by priority as determined by the members.

Joel said he needed to know if the issues he has pursued were acceptable. He asked for input to develop the right issues to move forward;

- Creating a strategy for NAML that seeks to implement its public policy agenda and effectively influence decision makers.

Joel went on to review LBA and the PPC's Accomplishments:

- LBA was officially hired/started in May;
- By June, the CPP was created and met via regularly scheduled conference calls
- A Charter for the CPP was drafted;

- Email communications were established with updates and information shared including: hearings, reports, and legislative opportunities for NAML to execute appropriate actions
- Wrote and sent a letter on NAML's behalf in support of the Tsunami Bill following his prediction that the House Science Committee needed this support. The letter helped make and keep friends on the Committee.
- Participated in Oceans Week in June on NAML's behalf.

Joel presented upcoming issues on the PPC Agenda:

- Actively support US Ocean Action Plan and Interagency Ocean Policy Committee - need to develop NAML connections with this group;
- Provide NSF support; FSML (Field Stations & Marine Labs) is an important program for marine labs that needs legislative support.
- Work to revitalize the marine research infrastructure
- Strengthen partnerships between marine labs and relevant federal agencies on the Hill. Joel related that the Agencies drive the funding train as do budgets. NAML needs to be connected to these agencies as a source of expertise and information.

Other Issues addressed:

- NOAA Organic Act;
- Tsunami legislation;
- Support for S-39, Ocean Exploration and NURP programs to House Science and Resources Committees.
- Ocean Observing initiative and priority setting for NSF projects to National Science Board. Margaret Leinen, Assistant Director, Directorate for Geosciences, National Science Foundation advised our support on the issue.
- Developed a letter to House & Senate appropriations in support of NSF and NOAA Science Advisory Board; sent by NAML PCC. The letter pointed out what issues NAML sees as important in science.
- Signed onto a letter concerning Rep. Barton's investigation of climate change researchers and to challenge his role in investigating science research on climate change.
- Nominated NAML President Jeff Reutter to the NOAA Science Advisory Board.

Others Still:

- Assisted with NAML website updates in collaboration with MBL's Chris Dematos;
- LBA has produced a draft set of talking points for NAML to use that provides a consistent NAML message to local, state and federal decision makers; a draft is available on NAML's website.

Next Phase:

- Strengthen partnerships between LBA and NAML - Encourage NAML's use of LBA's facilities and expertise for meetings, and conferences on the Hill.
- Systematically work with NAML to convey NAML's presence in DC.
- Provide advocacy assistance for agency and Congressional initiatives. - October through December is a good time for this activity.
- Work to increase importance of the FSML program. It is not growing and NAML should work to assist this program.

- Schedule meetings with NSF staff and NAML members who have been on review panels and can relate expertise. Increase advocacy for NSF to raise research funding by significant amounts
- Assist NOAA appropriations -- a real beast to tackle. Historically, NOAA falls short on White House and House appropriation bills, while the Senate is very supportive of NOAA. New leadership is occurring in NOAA, and NAML can help their transition.
- Increase opportunities for other programs such as USGS, EPA, USDA, DHS, DOD, etc.

Long-Term Public Policy Goal:

- influence the visibility, and effectiveness of NAML's expertise and role in supporting Public Policy.

**Discussion of NAML's Governmental Affairs Agenda:** Open discussion on the topic proceeded. Brian Melzian mentioned Rick Spinrad, NOAA-National Ocean Service, and his new leadership roles. He knows NAML from the past, and he should be helpful in advocating for marine science programs. Jeff asked Joel if we would be less effective if we kept issues and actions too broad. He asked about how do we explain NAML to the Washington community and make NAML's goals known? This question also applies to the NAML membership in general. Tony said that is exactly what we must do; effective communication. Jeff also asked how do we choose the agency goals to target and then promote program funding. Tony recommended a set of "talking-points" that can be used to introduce us to the different agencies. Jeff asked if NAML represents a membership with interests that are too Broad to effectively express or promote. Joel thought not if NAML keeps its focus points broadly inclusive, clearly defines what it wants, and know how it is to be perceived. NAML's public perception must be developed as a National organization with a national perspective, so that NAML is NOT too narrow. Joel said NAML can be muster an army of support on many types of topics and public funding by regulating and making its support known on the Hill. Tony asked those present if what the PPC has done with support of the Board was acceptable, or do we do something else? NAML as an organization is unique in the marine world, and we can and should have more influence.

Fred Grassle liked the idea of moving things forward especially with topics like the letter to Rep. Barton. Any increase in support of the letter is good even if the full number of required signatures is not obtained. It shows the influence of NAML with its present diversity can be very powerful. NAML represents many voting districts, thus we are uniquely situated for that kind action because of our diversity. George Boehlert also suggested that the same concerns are present with respect to membership participation. Tony agreed and his polling of the members indicated that they are supportive, have concerns about funding opportunities and levels, and have a hard time with the number of emails they have been receiving. Tim Nelson quoted Grant Gross' famous line, "what is a marine lab, and what do they do and need besides money?" Tim said Grant's question of a difficult one because of the inherent diversity of marine labs and the wide-spread degree of that diversity. The Ocean Commission Report may help. Jeff suggested that we list about 5 topics and we push those. They will set the tone for our developing reputation. That kind of strategy can be helpful to our moving forward by not pushing all actions all the time. That way, the agencies will know what NAML is all about.

Proceeding from this discussion came the following list of action items.

*Future Goals of NAML - A list of realistic tasks*

- 1) Target NSF's FSML Program: increase budget from \$2.5M to \$5M
- 2) NOAA: Work to increase Extramural Funding in general. It is important because in the mark-up process, NOAA often suffers budget cuts and then cannot fund awards they wish to make.  
 [Support for using the NIH model: NIH as a funding agency essentially 'own' medical schools by controlling their funding supply; to maintain that funding supply, medical schools then must reciprocate by collectively advocating for NIH issues against the agency's foes.]
- 3) Support the Ocean Action Plan with NAML targeting specific subsets of the Plan that the membership would recommend highly.  
 [This tact would be to support action items that directly support marine labs, that can be easily sold at the local political level and as well as the Federal level. Joel said that small successful accomplishments repeated many times will help accomplish NAML's goals: success breeds success!]
- 4) Education with emphasis at getting people to marine labs.  
 [Jeff suggested the new NOAA Education program and making contact with its new director: fellowships and training grants at marine labs.]
- 5) COSEE (NSF-Center for Ocean Sciences Education Excellence): work for funding increases. At NOAA, and EPA, NAML should work to develop a new reward structure for agency partnerships that will benefit both the agencies and NAML.  
 [The model would emphasize that Community successes would enable continued or increased support from the agencies in the present and into the future. It would be essentially be a human resources initiative with direct assistance in rebuilding man-power programs and future leadership. The European Union puts more money in this area than does the US (work-force enhancement). The aim would be to call for support for K-12 education, general public outreach, and undergraduate education. It would foster increased ocean literacy at high power levels, including colleges.]

Jeff now asked that we become more specific and produce a game plan of deliverables. The plan must show a clear path, and with potential rewards that are realistic and obtainable; e.g., an agency must be able to meet its own set goals and be able to claim success at assisting others. Basically, one can make the claim that each marine lab has a piece of the environment and is its steward. Thus the agency itself can claim a share of this stewardship effort. Bill Wise again stressed that we have to get the NAML membership to buy into the program to a higher degree. He doubted whether these goals would do that. Walt Nelson emphasized that if we tax the members, we then must provide some successes or deliverables for their increased fees. Jon Pennock also supported the view that apathy has to be overcome, and that the goals list needs to include tangible membership rewards. It was noted again, that the diversity of labs may hinder what will make up the priorities list. Jim Sanders said he hears often that NAML doesn't do anything for its members. He asked, "How do we sell it and convince inactive members that this is worthwhile?" Jack Orchard said that all labs get federal funding, so all increases in program

spending will benefit the majority at some point. It was restated again that everyone at all meetings (BoD, WAML, NEAMGLL, SAML) have endorsed the idea of the program. However, the costs for the PPC program are still a concern and whether we can bare them is the primary question. Tony said that he is investigating whether some foundations will fund at least the community-building side of this initiative, if not the lobbying side. Tony stressed that discussions during the meeting should center on the fact that these are ‘transforming decisions’ on the nature of NAML, and that demonstrable positive outcomes of the effort will greatly influence the sustained membership support.

The Meeting then adjourned to accommodate a tour of the Island, including the Stone Lab, its auxiliary facilities, and the famous Jay Cooke Castle; President Lincoln’s Civil War financier. A reception and dinner followed. Further discussion of NAML issues as well as related topics continued after dinner at one of Put-in-Bay’s local establishments.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*

**Thursday, 22 September 2005**

\*\*\*\*\*

The morning session started with acknowledgment of those members who had newly arrived. Jeff gave a brief review of the day’s schedule and expectations. He then offered the floor to Brian Melzian who made an announcement concerning a Federal Advisory Committee Report just completed on NOAA’s Marine Protected Areas. A limited number of copies of the Report were distributed to those who wished them. He described the three types of heritage sites included in defining protected areas.

**NAML Website:** Chris Dematos, Information Technology (IT) Division, Marine Biological laboratory (MBL) – Chris participated via tele-conference. He discussed the changes that had recently been made to the NAML website to include adding the new Public Policy Committee pages and links. The new site was added to promote the activities of the PPC and to make available to the membership all related pertinent documents. The site was updated and made current with all information just prior to the Meeting. The PPC pages had been formatted mainly by Tony Micheals and contain material generated by Tony and Joel Widder, LBA. Chris said that he added website links for the other Ocean Leaders listed (CORE, CSO, AIBS, NASULGC, etc). However, the links are configured so the viewer remains in the NAML site. Jon Pennock suggested adding ERF to the list.

Chris stated that recent material related to the PPC activities are posted in PDF format and there is a free link to Acrobat Reader on the page for any visitor who might need it. All of Joel’s letters are available as well as any of the documents that were publicly released. However, Chris noted that any material still under discussion and consideration is NOT publically available. It can be accessed only under a closed site that is password protected. The site is currently configured the PPC and BoD, who have the name and password (namlppc/1chance2). There is a ‘Comment’ feedback link for anyone visiting the site to respond to. Jeff suggested that the new NAML President-Elect (for 2006) be added to the response link. As configured, the NAML President-Elect will be PPC chair, and the past-president will remain on as a committee member. Chris told everyone that the MBL will be installing new internet software that will allow archiving

emails, and enable members to view and send large files among themselves. It was noted that open sharing of information is important, and it must be open to all NAML members upon request. Alan Kuzirian is the gatekeeper for the \_AML listservers, and will intercept non-members and moderate the distribution. Access to the archives will be available to those who have entry. It was noted that even if hackers might gain entry, nothing is there that really should be of issue including from the standpoint of LBA added Joel. Joel said that LBA's subjective comments added in the 'Status Line/Outlook' category are his current opinions and advise on the topic. Joel emphasized that it is just that, 'opinion and advice' and they are temporally labile and always subject to change. With those circumstances in mind, Joel is comfortable having that information posted. Brian said he finds Joel's opinions very useful, even for his job position at EPA. However, Fred Grassle cautioned that opinions in general are not good to let out. They often are or can be construed as a statement from NAML being published on the Website. Jeff asked that the Website be set up with the following persons being listed; NAML-President, Chair of the PPC, LBA Associate, NAML President-Elect., NAML Recording Sec., and NAML Secretary/Treasurer.

Further discussion went on regarding the appearance of the NAML website itself. Items discussed were the following: status of the Funding and Research thumbnails; and a site map, now developed but not yet activated. It was suggested that the former two be deleted, but Chris noted that he is ready to implement the latter. When asked, Chris related that the member website links are automatically searched and updated twice weekly. Chris suggested replacing one of the empty thumbnails and make it a 'News' button that may also serve as an archival method of items discussed. Tony Michaels brought out that he unilaterally changed the NAML Goals as presented in the NAML Brochure. He did it to aid Joel and the PPC charter development. He said that he had sent out the changes to the Board, and got few responses, so he proceeded with them. Discussion followed on his actions and the question of de-emphasizing marine biotechnology. Everyone was in agreement that the 3-Es, Environment, Education and Economics, were the principal points to accent. It was decided to have people work on the goals during the meeting, and they would be discussed later.

Brian recommended other website changes to include: automatic printer-friendly formatting; autoscaling of the webpage size to fill the screen; enlarge the logo and NAML name banner; and brightening the current color scheme from its now is muted format. Discussion of the suggestions followed and concluded with the consensus for creating of a full banner across the page top that spells out the name NAML while keeping the logo and 'flash' nature of the images. Screen-size scaling can be handled as an auto-formatting feature based upon percentage of area filled said Chris. He also agreed to redo the color schemes and then ask for comments. Ivar Babb suggested that 'marine colors' would be good. It was also noted that having a "Last-updated" date appearing on screen would be good to let people know that the site is active. It was agreed to add the feature to the Page Notice, but not each specific document.

Jeff brought up the discussion about the timeliness of how things get done on our site, and whether NAML sometimes had to be placed in the MBL's priority queue. Chris said delays experienced this summer were a matter of information of flow and the loss of some emails to him due to problems with the new mailserver. Also, it was a matter of uncertainty by him of when final decisions were made and who was to affirm the website changes and printing of the PPC material. Those problems have for the most part been solved. George Boehlert asked Chris about lab images and whether he was soliciting more for the webpage. Chris said he would be

happy to put up any lab's images sent them to him. He also noted that videos are possible and very impressive to view. Everyone was pleased with Chris's responses.

Further discussion ensued about the timeliness issue. It was noted that Chris should have specific people in charge of key aspects related to the webpage and from whom he will receive requests and with whom he can communicate. That process is now being finalized. The Chair of the PPC will be responsible for that aspect of the webpage, job announcements/postings will continue to go to Kuzirian, and all other general website changes should be filtered through the incumbent President.

**AML Mailserver Lists:** The next topic on the Agenda was the new MBL mailserver software and the mailserver lists. Alan led the discussion and began with a brief history of the past summer's events. The MBL added a new server (hardware) system and then added new software that had to be debugged. That has now been done for the most part. Alan said he would send lists to the Board so that we can back-track on potential the loss of email PPC communications from the summer.

**NaGiSA Program (National Geography of Inshore Areas):** Fred Grassle continued the morning's program with a presentation on the National Census of Marine Life and the NaGiSA program (National Geography of Inshore Areas; acronym means 'shore' in Japanese). It has been successfully implemented now in Alaska. Fred stressed that this program is very amenable to NAML labs. He hoped that the program would be embraced someday soon. NaGiSA is a bonafide biodiversity program with several components that include:

History of Marine Populations	Future of Marine Populations
Ocean Realm Field Projects	Census Records and Data Distribution

Fred noted that the deep sea is also part of the census and stressed that the most information is known in only top surface waters (90%); the remaining areas are little known. Data collected world-wide indicate that species populations have declined drastically from the 1950s through 1990. System information for biodiversity are currently hard to retrieve. People trust only their own data and fear others are of unknown quality control. The Census of Marine Live group is now trying to recover and assess data quality for use and inclusion in their studies; especially community data sets for broad trend analysis. Sharing of data has been a problem, but that is now beginning to change and researchers are opening up data sets to share. On-line publication of data is their ultimate goal. Scientific credibility and quality control will be needed to ensure proper species identification and that data quality are high and useable. Fred said all data used would be credited to their sources, and if used, it would be citable as a publication by the researcher. They expect that species guides and new discoveries will be posted on-line too. A standard habitat description format is trying to be formulated. Currently, fishes have the best data sets available, and unfortunately it drops off rapidly with invertebrates. However, data sets for cephalopods and other molluscs (gastropods including nudibranchs, and bivalves) are fortunately high too, close to fish. Corals data are also good. Freshwater fish are included in the database. Metadata handling remains the most effort. Mammal, bird, and reptile data are very biased by geographic location, taxonomic expertise, as well as extensiveness of sampling regions. Planktonic data especially the Crustacea are moderately well sampled. J-GOFF and GLOBEC data are available, but not at the taxonomic levels required for this study (either not identified, or identified above the genus level). Currently, Field Projects are being sampled and the data compiled (inshore reefs, continental shelf, margins, abyssal vents, etc). NaGiSA is an active program. Fish tagging and

physical data sampling allow very useful overlays (i.e., Acoustic code sampling). The groups now meet and share data and methods for agreement. Acoustic modems with a 5-yr lifetime are available and can be sampled remotely. Fish tags now actually record the physical data in which fish live or pass through. Fred noted that the Gulf of Maine and Alaska regions are running very well. The National Ocean Partnership is supporting fish population studies with Sloan Foundation funds. Zooplankton studies are being headed by Ann Bucklin, U-CT. The Cytochrome oxidase genome is large enough to accommodate sorting all known species. Birds will be first as they are best known taxonomically. There will be a general call to determine the next group to sample. Another area slated for sampling is the chemosynthetic ecosystem on isolated ocean oases; seeps and vents. Isolated sea-mounts are also being included, but within their own program. The Mid-Atlantic Ridge ecosystem has a program of high resolution sonar sampling similar to the Antarctic (British mollusc program) and Arctic programs. A new area slated is microbial diversity, but it has many problems and unanswered questions, including problems of lateral gene transfer and high reproduction rates that generate concurrently high mutation rates. There is also no good biogeography data because they are everywhere. Fred suggested that people check NaGISA, on Google for more or future webpage information.

Discussion of the presentation followed. According to Fred NAML is set to fit exceptionally well into NaGISA. Jeff suggested getting the PPC involved in developing other possible funding sources. It is easy to make the case said Fred including stressing education. Currently, there is a US school system that is engaged in bringing participating Japanese kids to the US to help start their program. Certainly all aspects related to environmental change issues can be helped by the program. All Federal agencies are interested in various aspects of this program, including NOAA and NSF. OBIS database is NSF funded, but no Census of Marine Life money is being given yet. The Marine Fisheries regional/seasonal annual census is the closest program for fish sampling. The US National Committee has had a very hard time getting buy-in from other federal agencies. Marine labs could help form a National Program; the coastal tracking program would be the best target. Labs just need to put up a few sensor curtains in local areas. NaGISA is also a natural; plants, fish or other easily sampled taxa would be the starting points. Species ID is usually the biggest problem, but there is a group of Japanese taxonomists who will come and assist.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*

## LUNCH

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*

**Discussion on Email and Communications:** Mechanisms for increasing communications to and from the membership was queried and discussed, but no definitive answers were put forth. Tony expressed his concern that not everyone had gotten the PPC-related emails. Jon Pennock said that communications from NAML must be short, and with key elements clearly listed in the messages because people are getting the sense that everyone is now getting flooded with emails. Tony emphasized that in his mind, “How do we interpret “the silence” is the big question. It was suggested that the best way to maintain the Directory and server lists in proper order is to have the Regional Associations update their current membership lists, and then dedicate time at each winter meeting to review and update the NAML lists again. This should be an annual event and made part of the annual NAML Business Meeting.



Kuzirian agreed that he would straighten out the lists, and work with Chris Dematos to change the webpage listings. A notice will follow to the membership alerting them that they need to update the content of their respective sites and links.

**Return Discussion of PPC issues:** It was announced that Joel Widder would not be present at this session, so that the issues of finance or service could be discussed openly and fully. Everyone was in agreement that the breadth and level of LBA's service so far had been exceptional. Jon Pennock wondered about whether LBA had other clients that were working on the same issues, and therefore there might be overlap or conflicts with NAML issues. Madilyn Fletcher stated that she was looking for benefits in the longer-term responses from the agencies and federal players contacted by LBA. That ultimately will be her and our measure of his success.

Tony led the discussion on the issue further. George Boehlert asked what the relationship of NAML and CORE was/is. Madilyn related some of the history that had occurred between NAML and CORE when Penny Dalton was at CORE. As good as that was however, the point is that she no longer is there. Madilyn expressed concern about the relationship and new status between CORE and JOI. Jim Sanders who is on the CORE Executive Board said that he had not been informed very much on the new status. CORE is concerned that NAML could detract from or compete with their messages to the Hill. It was stressed that the two organizations really don't look at the same issues. Jim related that he would prefer that if we did disagreed with CORE, we could do so cordially, and not work at cross-currents. It was noted that there is a re-opened search for a new CORE public policy director. Joel Widder said that he wouldn't have a problem seeking some form of coalition building with CORE when it would be beneficial to NAML. Madilyn emphasized that NAML really is the only way that the 'little' labs to be represented. Jim Sanders said that NAML represents a larger Congressional constituency than CORE and it is, or can be, an important factor if used to our advantage. Tony said that from his interactions, CORE is still captive of JOI, and that blue-water oceanographic issues principally occupy their concerns. Tony further suggested that the rejoining of CORE with JOI was probably the result of their recent membership survey that revealed that the all important, big-ship philosophy occupied a much lower priority placement by the membership than the leadership had anticipated. It was also clear to Tony that CORE does not want NAML to occupy an official CORE seat if we decided to establish a formal relationship with them. It was his opinion that there is no inclination that CORE and NAML will ever merge in any substantive way. However, Tony suggested that the two organizations can and probably should/will support joint initiatives that commonly favor both. CORE does want to be the sole voice of the marine community said Madilyn, and it does not necessarily want collaborators or close coalition members. Joel stated that the 'want-lists' of each group are not mutually exclusive and overlap is considerable. Joel said that he would recommend using the overlap to advocate for both organizations so that each can survive and prosper. He clarified that the OMB has been the problem when setting funding levels for the agencies. The two organizations working together and bringing the collective expertise to OMB should help to increase funding levels for all marine programs.

Tony gave a rundown of the Priority Lists for CORE: they include; increased funding for NSF, Ocean Observation Systems, the NOAA Organic act, ecosystem-based environmental management, plus research vessels, and mammal sampling programs. In general said Tony, CORE has been a week behind NAML on several current and important issues; Katrina, legislation initiatives, etc. George Boehlert said he needs to have ammunition to get favorable support within his institution for the proposed increase in NAML dues, and that there is sufficient

non-overlap with CORE that justifies the dues spending. Item lists that separate the two organizations will be helpful.

The relationship of NAML and Sea Grant (SG) was then discussed as many labs have SG programs. Jeff advocated for better cooperation, and that we should look and list the benefits for creating a tight association. The Organization of Biological Field Stations (OBSF) was then mentioned, and it was concluded that their dues are so low, that many institutions belong and thus they promote their large membership numbers. Walt Nelson suggested undertaking a recruiting effort to increase NAML's membership.

**PPC Financing:** Tony then suggested that the PPC financing issue be discussed. He noted that 'structured dues' could lead to 'structured benefits'; the more you pay and use NAML services, the more you get as a return. The target amount to maintain LBA services and the usual NAML infrastructure support would be about \$125k/year. Member dues set at \$1000/year, would easily accrue that amount if we can maintain the same membership numbers. However, we might not be able to accomplish it in this fashion, so probably a tiered scale would be better. Tony constructed a scheme that would eliminate Federal labs yet allow some increase to the regions who also might become involved to a greater degree. Several categories were proposed: 1) a 3-tiered system, \$900, \$1200, and \$2000, with \$300 to the region; 2) a 4-tiered scheme with voluntary selection of the participation category; figures of \$500, \$1500, \$2000, \$2500 was suggested that would allow a lower rate for some members with a higher rate for those that could afford it to offset the lower category. Basically, each member institution would choose a tier; and 3) a system comprised of 5 groups of increasingly higher amounts where essentially a small group of labs in the top tier would pay for the majority of the yearly costs of the organization.

Jim Sanders said he would like a scheme set on total lab expenditures. He suggested that this scheme would address the ability to pay question. Tony mentioned that some labs cannot pay for lobbying under whatever label it is given, so the number of participating labs might decrease. However, he noted that many of them are currently CORE members and already pay CORE's high annual dues. It was agreed that there is an issue about the 'label' related to public policy activities. That label needs to be well crafted or fitted with loop-holes that allows the maximum participation. Jon Pennock said he foresees a program where the PPC program would be borne by a set of labs paying a sustaining amount, but that the dues could be increased in general to offset other costs. Jon proposed then that the big-payers have preferential access to Joel's services for specific questions or administrative services like office access in DC, arranged agency or congressional meetings, etc. Madilyn said she would like the funding scheme to be tied to total institutional capital. She said she didn't especially like the differential reward system. Jeff would like the term, 'dues' used on all invoices and not pay additional assessment-fees even if the total rise in annual dues was substantial.

Another scheme was considered: general membership-\$700; full membership-\$1200; Leadership Circle at \$3k. Bill Wise thought there was too large an inter-tier gradient, and that a tiered system introduces an implied class-structure with all the associated baggage. Tony said that it could be modified to eliminate the negative connotations. Bill also questioned the differential reward structure suggested by the names of the tiers. Again, Tony said that the tiered structure can be modified and that coupling it to yearly research funds was most favored by members who responded to the initial questionnaire. He suggested that rigorous setting of the tier levels must be done to insure that members don't arbitrarily opt for a lower level.

Joel reminded everyone that LBA will still accept a two-yr agreement with \$80k for year one, and \$100k the second year; thus extending NAML a 20% discount for the two year

commitment. Madilyn suggested raising the dues to \$2k/yr, but allow smaller labs to ramp up to that amount by requesting a subsidy and initially pay a lower amount. If the yearly amounts received were insufficient to cover the total costs, requests would go out to the membership to cover the short-fall.

On a point of order, Kuzirian consulted the Bylaws (Revised, Sept. 1997) on the quorum count and regulations concerning changing dues structure. The Bylaws state a quorum of third of the members must be present to constitute a formal meeting. The Dues structure is set by the Board of Directors at a duly constituted Board meeting. A majority of the Board present is a quorum.

George Boehlert asked about the source of funds they currently use to pay NAML dues and where the increased moneys would come from to cover the proposed changes. Those present said dues payments come from their regular director's operating budget. Again, the tiered structure for dues was discussed with other criteria mentioned. Several members questioned what the participation level will be by the membership, and if the income proposed income projections would be validated. Using the following metrics, total budget, yearly Federal Funds received, student enrolment, outreach programs, coupled with a 4-tier system of high, medium-high, medium-low, low, where would a member fit into the dues categories suggested? Madilyn suggested using personnel numbers (researchers-faculty-staff) at each marine lab only (not the institution/university total) as the best representation of membership level. Thus, the following metric was proposed based upon the number of FTEs at each laboratory.

<u>Category</u>	<u>FTEs</u>	<u>Dues</u> <u>NAML/ AML</u> <u>= Total Estimated # of Labs</u>
High		<10 \$2400/200 = \$2600
Med-High	10-40	15 \$1700/200 = \$1900
Med-Low	41-70	20 \$1000/200 = \$1200
Low		45 >70 \$300/200 = \$500
		20
Total Projection: \$121,000		

Madilyn said that we have to couple this funding proposal and project with a communications/PR package so that labs will support the effort. She predicted the whole organization of NAML will ultimately increase because NAML will have specific goals and a clearly defined effort, and that will be the measure used by the membership to decide whether to participate.

It was decided to accept this metric and send the scheme to the membership electronically and then assess the returns. A billing protocol can then be developed. However, it would most likely involve direct membership billing by the NAML Treasurer with return of Regional dues to the Regional treasuries. Associate members would only be billed by the Regional Treasurer and thus eliminate any association of their dues with NAML PPC activities.

Tony suggested creating an Individual Donation category to NAML that would be open to anyone. It could be designated “friends of marine science” with email newsletters, invitation to NAML events and congressional receptions, etc. Those present were not too impressed with the idea, and countered with arguments ranging from not being able to communicate directly with directors to noting a perceived lack of structure to accomplish it.

The discussion then centered on what to do to accommodate Federal Labs and those labs with imposed restrictions on using institutional funds to pay for lobbying efforts. It was noted that the NAML Bylaws need not be changed as Associate Membership is set by the regional organizations and only full members can have active voting participation in NAML. Discussion then went back to CORE and their consideration to change their dues structure by increasing or actually eliminating the lower-tier categories. This might help NAML to maintain or increase its membership.

**Action Item:** It was moved and seconded (Madilyn Fletcher, Jim Sanders respectively) to accept the proposed 4-tiered scheme. The vote carried with no negative votes and 2 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned for the planned Regional Meetings.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*

**Friday, 23 September 2005**

\*\*\*\*\*

Due to inclement weather conditions, the Meeting was moved off Gibraltar Island immediately following breakfast and convened in the Offices of Ohio State University in Put-in-Bay. Upon opening the Meeting, Jeff ceremoniously passed the NAML gavel on to Tony Michaels with great pleasure. Jeff affirmed however, that he would continue his presidential duties until the end of the year. It was particularly important in order to maintain correspondence with the membership on the PPC/LBA initiative.

**Board of Directors Meeting, 2006:** The 2006 BoD Meeting was discussed. The Congressional Reception date has been set for Wednesday, 8 March 2006. It was tentatively decided to hold the NAML Meetings on 7-9 March 06. It was recommended that the Board establish an annual Audit process, not biennially as currently done, as well as re-instituting the process of proposing an Annual Budget. The Public Policy Committee will be the main BoD-06 meeting topic. Jeff suggested that although the winter meeting traditionally has been a Board Meeting, he thought it better to change it to a full Annual Membership Meeting. George Boehlert suggested looking at the Board’s composition, particularly with respect to membership; both eligibility and numbers. Potential Bylaw changes were also suggested by Jim Sanders. If the Board so voted, the proposed amendments to the Bylaws can be presented to the Membership for ratification by electronic mail so noted Kuzirian. Joel Widder suggested that speakers for the March Meeting need to be scheduled ASAP so they will be available. Rick Spinrad, Assistant Administrator, NOAA’s

National Ocean Service was suggested. Tony Michaels suggested the possibility of a BoD Retreat for planning purposes to be held in January on Catalina.

**Regional Reports:** Jeff called on the regional representatives to give a brief synopsis of their meeting and planned activities.

**SAML:** Jim Sanders related that they had accepted their Treasurer's Report with 37 labs paid so far and that they expected the final tally to be in low 40s. Katrina relief was discussed. SAML is also considering a retreat and plans to build on the NAML PPC initiative and include scientific topics as well as the usual business agenda. SAML has recommended Jim Sanders as the NAML Pres-Elect. Corpus Christi, TX will be the location of next SAML meeting to be held in the Spring of 2006.

**NEAMGLL:** Brian Melzian reported that those present discussed 4 topics. One of importance is the election of a Pres-Elect needed by 31 Dec. Brian has agreed to stay on another year to keep continuity. Membership recruiting is again the big issue for the region. Those present re-affirmed the vote taken at NEAMGLL's May Meeting to transfer \$12k to NAML for dues (2004-2005). As a follow up to improving communications, NEAMGLL will begin a communications check and updating of their directory and website listings. The group also discussed the use of treasury funds to plan a meeting with a focused topic that highlights science. Jeff Reutter suggested sponsoring a Congressional breakfast in DC for NEAMGLL members around the topic of 'In-shore Areas'. NEAMGLL is planning to develop a NEAMGLL webpage tied into the NAML page with postings of presentations from the May Meeting proceedings to highlight its formation.

**WAML:** Walt Nelson told the group that WAML had decided to transfer \$5k to SAML for hurricane relief as a return gesture for their initial donation of funds that helped form WAML. They discussed Tony's concept of visioning in 06. Upcoming meetings of WAML will be in Hawaii for 06, and then to back to Alaska in 07 to help celebrate a polar meeting and get Alaska people actively back into WAML. They will engage in a recruiting effort for new members also and include targeting smaller labs to join WAML/NAML.

**General Discussion:** Jeff suggested developing a WAML/Sea Grant coalition. It would be especially good at this time with Penny Dalton coming on board at Sea Grant. Walt said WAML had considered that idea, and that WAML was beginning to form academic consortia (Regional Associations; RAs) of IOOSs. He thought it might be good to invite them to join NAML. Some form of Affiliate Membership might allow the consortium to join as they do not fit the current definition for NAML membership. It was also suggested by Madilyn that MACURA would also be in this position. Jon Pennock stressed the connectivity with them would be good for all. In that regard, Tony said he thought they would benefit from our PPC activity. Ivar Babb and Madilyn were both in favor of this integration of policy and good science. However, Jeff suggested caution with these affiliations. He further mentioned that NAML had been contacted by a for-profit corporation who asked about joining NAML. Jeff expressed that he was more in favor of corporate membership and not necessarily RAs.

**Actions Items:** Before the Meeting adjourned, the following Actions Items were approved for inclusion in the Agenda for the Board Meeting in 2006: discuss reducing the size of Board; discuss forming an Executive Committee that would functionally manage NAML's affairs while keeping

the Board as currently configured; actively promote the use of Proxies for meetings to avoid problems with the quorum count.

**Audit Committee Report:** Tony Michaels gave the report of the Audit Committee. He stated that the financial records were in good order. He moved acceptance of the Biennial Audit Committee Report. The motion carried unanimously.

**Accolades:** Everyone present thanked Jeff and his staff for the excellent accommodations and amenities provided during the Meeting. The motion to Adjourn carried as people made plans to return to their respective institutions.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan M. Kuzirian  
NAML Sec/Treas

**Appendix I**  
**Attendee List: 8<sup>th</sup> Biennial NAML Meeting, 21-23 September 2005**

Ivar G. Babb, NURC, U-CT, Avery Point,  
Groton, CT

George W. Boehlert, Hatfield Marine  
Science Center, Oregon State Univ.,  
Newport, OR

Chris Dematos, Marine Biological  
Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA [by  
conference call]

Madilyn Fletcher, Baruch Inst., Marine Biol.,  
U-SC, Columbia, SC

J. Frederick Grassle, Haskin Shellfish Res,  
Lab., Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick,  
NJ

Alan M. Kuzirian, Marine Biol. Lab, Woods  
Hole, MA

Kevan Main, Mote Marine Lab, Sarasota, FL

Brian Melzian, US-EPA - Atlantic Ecology  
Division, Narragansett, RI

Tony Michaels, Wrigley Inst. Environ.  
Studies, USC, Avalon, CA

Walt Nelson, Pacific Coastal Ecology  
Branch, EPA, Hatfield Marine  
Science Center, Newport, OR

Jeffery Reutter, FT Stone Lab., Ohio State  
Univ., Put-in-Bay, OH

Jack Orchard, Great Lakes WATER Institute,  
U-WI, Milwaukee, WI

Jon Pennock, Marine Program, UNH ,  
Durham, NH

Jim Sanders, Skidaway Inst. Oceanography,  
Savannah, GA

Wes Tunnell, Cntr-Coastal Studies, TX-AM  
U., Corpus Christi, TX

Joel Widder, Lewis-Burke, Assoc.

Bill Wise, SUNY-Stony Brook, Stony  
Brook, NY [by conference call]