



**NAML Biennial Meeting
Skidaway Institute of Oceanography
5-6 October 2009**

Opening and Welcome

Jim Sanders welcomed all who were attending and reminded everyone to be sure to hand in their registration fee. He apologized for the rain. Jim announced that Ivar Babb will not attend the meeting due to his wife's health. People expressed concern for the both of them. Introductions were the next item; people introduced themselves around the table. Jim stated that a couple of members were not here yet and that a representative from OBFS was also expected. Logistics for the meeting were explained including that the Georgia Coastal Center will be the location of the meeting for the second day. It is near the Marriot and thus could easily walk. Jim further explained that he had arranged transportation to the airport. Frank Cushing from DC and Bob Van Dolah also came. Box lunch tomorrow provided too.

The BoD decided there is need for an internal meeting due to major concerns over where NAML needs to go. The loss of LBA was one impetus to that decision. There are two major aspects to the discussion: 1) defining what a marine lab will be in the 21st Century, and 2) deciding on our association with OBFS to go to NSF for a grant to do a survey of what infrastructure are needed in the 21st Century. It is expected that the discussion will enable us to produce a White Paper to use as a Public Policy Statement.

The Founding of Skidaway Institute of Oceanography

Jim gave a brief history of Skidaway Oceanographic Institute. It was founded in 1968, with a generous gift of land by Dorothy Roebelin (Roebelin created the twisted cables for Brookline Bridge) and the Modena property (approximately 800 acres). It was originally a cattle ranch and plantation and was given to the State of Georgia for an environmental center; "Ocean Science Center of the Atlantic (OSCA)." The Skidaway Institute of Oceanography (SkIO) was officially created in January 1968. Its first faculty member, Herbert L. Windom, began work in July 1968. President Richard Nixon and Governor Lester Maddox dedicated the first building of the program in 1970. The OSCA program never fully materialized, and thus President Jimmy Carter dissolved it in 1972, at which point SkIO became an independent research unit in the University System of Georgia.

SkIO has 17 faculty members with diverse interests over and above the oceanographic program. It is a relatively small institution with an \$8M budget, three quarters of which comes from the outside. There is a Campus President who reports to the Chancellor's Office. Transfer of students between campuses is easy and also for faculty. The Univ. of Georgia has 300k students statewide. Locally, new initiatives are capable because of the small budget overall compared to whole system. The Marine Center also has programs for K-12, Elderhostel and teachers. There is a NOAA National Marine Sanctuary 30 miles off the coast. Its base center is on campus also. There is a PBS radio station on campus as well. SkIO operates a UNOLS vessel here which is currently at sea. Jim became director from Herb Windom in 2001, after having received a PhD from SkIO in the 1970s. Many faculty are associated with SkIO, but have adjunct positions within the other institutions for advanced degree students. Jim mentioned that Sapelo Island, which is struggling, has

no official association with them. Unfortunately Sapelo is no longer a SAML/NAML member because of lack of funds.

21st Century Marine Laboratory

Copies were distributed of the White Paper sent out by Ivar. Ivar was to lead this topic, but Jim filled in. Jim apologized for being at a somewhat disadvantage because he hadn't attended the Winter Meeting in DC being ill himself. Alan presented what he thought that is was a challenge presented to us from one of the federal agencies. Jo-Ann mentioned that the Sea Grant association has a program for sustainable energy and for moving labs forward. OBFS is talking to NSF about a workshop for infrastructure needs (Peter McCartney leader). Jan Hodder and Hilary Swain are representing marine labs. Brian was supposed to come to our DC Meeting and discuss it, however it is now moving forward from an August email. The proposal will go to NSF.

The major talking points for the Workshop include: what are the needs and issues that reflect infrastructure support for marine labs. It is proposed to hold two national meetings (1/coast) with 30 people attending each workshop. Surveys will be conducted and the data compiled to present to NSF. It was estimated that about 1/3 of NAML members belong to OBFS. George Crozier said there are big disparities in budget need; field stations require much less than marine labs. Ray Highsmith related that he went to Costa Rica for their meeting and the issue was discussed. Ken Sebens will coordinate the effort to submit information to the Ocean Sciences Board. Of concern is the prominent disconnect between university infrastructure and marine labs as just a university extension or department. Dave Christie mentioned that we need to be able to articulate the roles marine labs play in research and education. It is all a matter of numbers for Congressional funding priorities. NAML members represent 80 different congressional districts so a coherent message is important. Kumar said we have done this exercise before. We need someone to take the message as our Public Policy Program did through LBA. Both pieces need to go together. It was mentioned that meetings with Tim Colien, new USGS head went well to move geosciences forward. However coastal programs still remain behind blue water ones as far as funds go. It was then decided to table the discussion. Brian Melzian said the document he distributed will move forward Ocean Sciences Board. He urged NAML's contribution to the process by participating in public sessions, formulating planning documents, and workshop attendance. Brian will watch this, and will target upcoming meetings that need NAML participation because he cannot as a federal employee. A likely target topic would be Central habit and Coastal protection as a way to bring money into marine labs; biodiversity through the "Census of Marine Life" and working with MARS. The "home" for the CML in the US is unknown. A central location for storage needed. Mexico has its center already, but not the US; presents a big problem. Unfortunately, biodiversity is Not funded anywhere or within any one agency in US. The European Union has them centered in marine labs. It was suggested that we propose that. The use of Marine sanctuaries is being discussed, but nothing is put together. It was strongly suggested that NAML push this issue. Brian related that biological data and biodiversity is being mandated within EPA. EPA is interested in this topic. Could NAML participate??

Business Meeting:

The Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting, 3-4 March 2009 approved following a motion and second by Kumar Mahadevan and David Christie respectively. The subject of NAML

finances was then discussed. Kumar suggested that the Regions might consider rescinding NAML's debt. However the idea was strongly objected to by WAML and others. Jim Sanders stated the repaying the money was his priority, and a motion was made to follow the following time-table.

Action Item: Motion by Bob van Dolah and seconded by Matt Gilligan was passed unanimously to pay Regions for all 2008 dues and NEAMGLL loan forthwith, and 2009 Regional dues would be remitted by the first quarter of 2010. Further, that 2010 Regional dues would be paid by the end of 2010.

The new dues structure was then discussed. Jim is concerned about the response of labs and their ability/willingness to pay. Ken Sebens perhaps letting a lab drop in category or not pay for one year but remain a member. Following further discussion, Wes Tunnell suggested that the Regions discuss this topic. One important point made was the Council on Ocean Leadership paradox in that their dues are considerably higher than NAML's which are paid, but the input to COL is minimal. NAML surely should be able to capitalize on this point.

The topic of the NAML Website was brought up and the inadequacies of the present situation. Alan related that it really needs a chaperone who can oversee it. He has enough to handle with the mailserver lists and treasury duties. Ken Sebens said that he would look into moving the website to Friday Harbor. He had an IT person that he thought would take on the responsibilities. If arrangements are affirmed, he would work with Alan and Chris Dematos to move the website.

Following Bylaw requirements, an independent Audit Committee was formed to conduct the biennial audit of NAML's finances. The committee was composed of Val Klump, George Crozier and Gary Cherr. They would meet with Alan, review the materials and report back before the end of the Meeting.

Governmental Affairs and NAML

The topic was introduced by Jim with the introduction of Frank Cushing from Oldaker, Belair & Wittie. This is the firm that now employs Joel Widder.

Frank Cushing:

Background – Idaho/SF, Golden Gate Park: In 1976 he came to Washington from Idaho, as a fellow on the Land and Energy Appropriations Committee with Senator Mark Hatfield. He has held various committee positions including Energy Committee (1995) on the House, VA-HUD subcommittee, NSF, EPA, NASA budget handling. In 2003 he retired for 22 months and formed his lobbying business. He was recalled to served as Appropriation Committee staff director, Minority Staff Director, and then retired again.

Frank said there is excitement in DC now. The appointment of Jane Lubchenco to NOAA is good, and stimulus money is beginning to flow. NSF and others agencies are improving and it is promising start. The remains whether it will continue and trickle down to academic interests. The OMB still the same people, the NOAA people remain the same, and so is their culture. If nothing changes, then you must go around it. Frank stated that NSF is still on the same path with appropriation committees so their funding appropriations will not change. Change inside the process is needed otherwise conditions will not change dramatically, only marginally. This fact is disappointing to Frank.

On the topic of outside organizations, Frank related: In general, Ocean Research Groups have their interests too narrow; stove-pipe. All agencies are the same, with occasional broadness and overlap. Congress does not know what is going on in these agencies. Specialization within the

Congressional committees makes it necessary to alter the process of the budget formations. Frank suggested the following:

Two pronged approach - NAML handles itself and also Ocean Leadership. FASCEB is a good example of how to proceed. They represent 22 Societies with 95,000 biomedical scientists. Their priority is to increase the NIH Total budget; not sections of NIH. Frank suggested that all three ocean groups speak as ONE group. FASEB has a lobbyist. NGOs are out because they have multiple goals and interests. NAML and others must keep things stove-piped as to what you need to do!!

Representation in DC is questionable due to broadness and regional interests. It is difficult to get message across on the Hill. Targeting as NAML, the organization, is important to affect these programs; stove-piping is necessary. NAML as a group must leave out our own institutional interests, must represent ONLY the single interest. This is hard to do especially if your university is paying. However, you cannot represent both! Frank said we must define what is NAML's personality before we can move forward

Discussion: Bob Vandolah stated that NAML does not have a single target! Our needs are too diffuse for multiple funding sources. George Crozier said that we must target one Agency and its total budget, and not even target a specific program. As an example, there are 27 institutes in NIH, so the money must go to the whole. Frank said that the proper tact is to say, "for the oceans we need, x-\$s. Who the individuals are is not important. Who speaks for ocean research asked John Rummel? Frank answered that a coalition is needed to speak as one voice and to funnel it. All ocean people must come together and it must be built over time. Discipline is needed not to diverge from this course. Will COL run into this problem because they are focusing on programs, not big picture asked John van Dolah? Bob Gogosian is not there yet according to Frank. One main point however, is that COL does not have to lobby for their programs because the programs automatically get funded through the budget process. Dave Christie said that coastal programs as a whole are what we need, but there is no one program that handles them. Frank replied that NAML must become part of the 90-lb gorilla in that 90% of population and money spent by Congress is targeted to the coastal states. We have to coral that money. Amy Hammer said that NGOs are being held up as scientific organizations and are managing to get legislation and bills passed based on that. The Ocean Conservancy is regulating many aquaculture bills. We need to show that WE are the scientists and not the NGOs to whom Congress is referring things. Bob Hobarth said he didn't go through NOAA admin but went directly to Congressional budget appropriation committee. Matt is looking to increase the slice of the pie, and COL is not going to do that. He asked about FASEB's strategy on interagency targeting. Frank says they do little of that except on rare occasions. Frank says we are their own best advocates and that lobbyists are really not needed. Jim Thorp asked about going to local people; how do you reach the important people making money decisions? Focused efforts for NAML must be strategic. NAML can represent itself by its officers, and can make appointments with heads or upper staff members of key people. Jim said that LBA helped formulate the message and to whom it should be addressed. Val Klump asked how do we frame those points to take to the Hill. Val said that Regional Structure is also considered and stressed when he goes to his congressional members; ie, the Great Lakes. It was brought out that Jim and the 3 regional presidents went to USGS head to bring the message. That did increase the impact of the visit with him. JoAnn asked about COL and whether Frank talked about the FASEB model to them. She asked if NAML should join COL as members join FASEB. Frank said all FASEB members pay a single membership and within the group there are committees, etc. However, they always talk one message; forms a super-coalition to speak for the group. COL was heading in that direction, but is now moving away from that. Jim does not think it will work with COL. Frank also said he has had the same conversations with Bob Gogosian. Frank still looks at the bigger picture. John Rummel

says that NAML is not on people's radar screen at the national level, that is what is needed. This moved the discussion to Jim's Points:

- 1) Lobby for highest priority levels only
- 2) NAML: must work for "NAML" level priorities only, not individual labs or topical interests
- 3) There is a void in the promotion of "Coastal Programs" that needs to be filled: proper advocacy and funding increases are needed
- 4) NAML needs to be able to target and approach 'key' individuals in Congress and the Administration to be effective.

*****LUNCH*****

Governmental Affairs & National Policy

The topic opened with the discussion of the Draft White Paper prepared by Jim Sanders. Discussion centered around the 4 objectives from the 2005 Winter and Biennial Meetings:

- Accomplishments of NAML?
- Strengths & Weaknesses?
- Our Silent Membership?
- Outside Services Needed?

Jim has worried about the 'silent' majority. Is it disengagement or is it agreement? This question is of prime importance for the future of NAML. From the 2005 Meeting the following points were recommended:

- Establish working relationship with Agencies/congressional representatives
- Organize membership to engage in public policy
- Develop a Policy Agenda
- Implement that policy

Discussion: It was asked, what is the overarching Goal because the objectives are methods to achieve the Goal? Is raising funding levels it? It was asked if we met any of the goals. Jim said we did well working through it. NAML developed a better relationship and name recognition overall and put together a PPC and distinct policy. The one point we fell short on achieving is the last, implementing policy because time has been too short. LBA distinctly assisted us through this advancement. Kumar said we tried to do it by ourselves in the past, but LBA actually accomplished did it. NAML's PPC has continued to release a list of accomplishments and things accomplished, but it is difficult to say NML has impacted funding by such an amount or that a particular bill got passed. We did play a role in creating an enhanced awareness of marine labs and the Great Lakes. We are now mentioned more often. Infrastructure needs are now being taken seriously and thought about. Jo-Ann emphasized that marine labs provide coastal education and research and that there is a true need for infrastructure support to continue that mission. People agreed it was a good statement.

SWOT Analysis:

Strengths: NAML's strengths are broadly spaced among all the regions. There is high diversity but with common set of goals; unbiased goals but well informed. It was thought that infrastructure is in place to address coastal issues, but marine labs are aging and need to be maintained constantly

Weaknesses: Marine labs are small individually with limited resources. Marine groups are organized around volunteers, with no paid staff and unfortunately few active members. Thus there

are no/limited funds available to promote the goals. In general, communications are lacking and presentation material to the public, federal agencies, etc. is inadequate and not timely.

Dave Christie said the 'silence' is not always apathy, but that peoples times are full and will respond only if disagreeing with an issue. He suggested that deliverables are needed but difficult to quantify. Ray Highsmith asked if you can get more money, it will help with the other three. As an positive response and example, Jim did say that our goals were incorporated into NOAA's Education Program. It was agreed that the Ocean Sciences Program is too large, and that NAML did not necessarily affect it to a large level. Kumar said that the larger labs are missing from NAML; the significant ones. This point we need to change. It was mentioned that Jim Yoder, WHOI was to attend, but that VIMS was lost at this time. Scripps was never an active NAML member. Ken Sebens was directed by WAML to come up with a letter to list NAML's accomplishments, and answer the question, why to become a member. He asked if people would share the burden of writing it and then share the letter with the other regions. Our participation in the 'Friends of NOAA Group' has definitely helped by NAML. Alan Kuzirian stressed that the use of biomedical models should be included again to attract renewed participation of those labs focusing on that area like the MBL, Whitney Lab, etc. would return. MARS has done this successfully in Europe as mentioned by Mike Thorndyke. Jim emphasized that individuals are members of NAML as directors, not necessarily as institutions. Thus, when that director steps down so does the participation. We do not handle director transitions well. The nuts and bolts activities of NML are led by individuals, and we do not mentor their replacements. Brian Melzian reinforced that fact and added that sometimes directors leave and we don't know it for long periods. Because we are individualistic we need to be individually vigilant to watch what is happening at other labs. The relevance and benefits of marine labs to their institutions also needs to be stressed. Following the SAML model, alternate members really are need and should be engaged to participate more to provide a better transition.

Opportunities: Currently only we speak for ourselves in DC. Partnering with others like OBFS or Sea Grant might help. Some of them have overlapping interests that are really very close to NAML's. Ray Highsmith said OBSF and National Sea Grant might hire a paid executive director who would push their interests.

It was suggested that other individual groups might be recruited to post or link their websites under NAML as a means of funneling attention to us and their individual labs. Ray suggested examining those groups that appear to be effective and follow their model. NERRS was used as an example and also MERA, but it got swallowed up. They tried themselves but not successfully so they sent in for RFAs and grant applications for programs. They applied to provide services for NOAA to do specific tasks for them in their education and other offices. Kumar said we still have specific needs that no one else provides and so we do need to figure out how to fund them. He suggested that LBA was effective, so how do we raise the money? We need to explore how to get a constant focal point ways of keeping the organization centered

Threats: Failure to speak with one voice runs the risk of fracturing the message. If we are not there, federal agenda will be set by others. Matt Gilligan was emphatic to say that the relevancy and value of marine labs, and the value of NAML as spokesman must be clearly stated or we are lost. Aswani Violey said if we do nothing, we will loose local state and institutional funding, thus we must stay visible. Mike Thorndyke mentioned the material contained on the website about collaborations and their advantages which are all part of a 21st Century marine labs; sharing the tools we have among ourselves. It is a strength, as well as a weakness if we do not follow the stated approach. The one commonality that exists between labs needs to be promoted as much as the advocacy phases. Matt mentioned that COL focuses only on graduate level education. NAML labs focus on K-12, as well as undergraduates and minorities. NAML has a track record in these programs that no other organizations has. These are definite strengths. Bob Van Dolah said that

NAML has not yet put out a definite White Paper on a specific issue. We can do that without a lobbyist. We have members with connections in high agency administrations and levels that could assist us in this effort. Bill Hogarth mentioned our ability for training of future scientists. It again is a strength, and thus education funding can be targeted. FDA scholarships for 4 students were established at George Croziere's lab. NMFS has similar programs; work-force development is a good tact also. NAML can incorporate infrastructure needs to support all these venues. This will also resonate well with the public. Matt said as coastal marine labs, we have a better assessment as to what types of education are needed and NAML needs should be included with agency participation.

Involvement of Membership: It was clearly agreed that NAML Dues are extremely low for this group, so why won't people join? It was suggested that the presence of NAML at national meetings, perhaps a booth and poster would increase NAML's national presence. Kumar says the NAML President needs help to push and carry programs forward and complete the follow through. Jim said LBA's loss has been difficult because of their success. Joel Widder added a sense of organization we didn't have. It was suggested that NAML could perhaps organize or support a national meeting for people who are usually associate with marine labs, but not working at them; the Society for Comparative Biology was given as an example. Dave Christie said that he can support the dues structure and suggested that membership is important. There should be a way for labs tight on money to stay associated with NAML. He suggested we look for money from foundations that are looking for cooperative groups to support. Sandra Gilchrist suggested that we need to use all members who support the workings of the group

How do we can we accomplish our national agenda?

How do we get it done? How much money can we invest and what can we spend toward that goal; it is a budget issue? The general consensus was that leg work and knowing who to contact is necessary. Jim told the group that is why he started with the budget issue. It looks like realistically, \$50k is available readily. Do we hire an executive secretary to keep things going, or do we need people who can open doors in DC, those are two important questions?. Wes Tunnell suggested an executive director and can open doors, like a retired person who has knowledge and the time, but not perhaps the expense. Val Klump suggested that because we have moved forward politically, it might be better to focus on an executive secretary and website director. Some institutions have a coop organization that can be hired to assist and direct. It was noted however, that in DC, timing is crucial. Things need to move quickly and thus in the case of LBA they were extremely beneficial. It was suggested by George Crozier that a Knause Fellow might be hired. That coupled with good office support at a near-by member's facility might be good solution. Jim suggested from past experience, that NAML needs a DC Advisor more than an executive director. He gave as an example that MERA hired a Knause fellow but still had to train the individual and spend time with that person, who then left for more money. It cost them about \$100k. JoAnn Leong suggested talking seriously with Frank Cushing. He has said that he would charge less than LBA. Dave Christie asked if any feed-back was solicited from the membership on the new dues structure. Jim said that it had, but Alan said there was only one response. Jim was skeptical whether it would come. Basing the dues on lab size was an attempt to make it less vague according to Ken. We know there are still labs that will fall in between. However, there remains the choice of what category a lab would fall into, and now with the suggestion of a hardship category, it would be less onerous overall to the membership. So at this point, we still have no particular knowledge of what the budget will be under the new system. Brian suggested we try again to poll the membership with a letter

explaining the process, and give a specific date for a response. Kumar refocused the issue back on what the money will be spent for; public policy or not. Ray again asked about the COL paradox and what members gain or not from their membership. Jim said that they are there and they do set policy and so his institution needs a seat at the table. Others also questioned the value of COL. John Rummel said that team work is necessary and that should exist between NAML and COL. The overall problem is that too many people have been speaking in too many directions. Cooperativeness is what is needed. COL does not want NAML as a full member. NAML can only join as an industry member.

MARS: Mike Thorndyke, Sweden

Mike came representing the European Network of Marine Research Institutes & Stations, Herman Hummel, director. Mike related that MARS does its own lobbying with the European Commission, the source of their marine money; falling under the category of social engineering. In Europe, national boundaries have gone away within the marine community. MARS members are considered as observatories of the seas. There are currently 60 members with an FTE schedule for dues similar to NAML's. Marine ecosystems and Marine models are two primary focal points. There is an open and flexible membership with a durable integration of members for carrying out programs initially established by the EU. MARS members work on (lobby for) formation about the Research Framework; the sets up the priorities for the next funding rounds.

BIOMARE: The acronym stands for, Marine Biodiversity Research in Europe. It functions by having multiples of 4-5 member states applying, not a single nation. Its first initiative was sponsored by MARS the EU. It recognized 100 sites and 50 member labs as the active network. Spain has never joined MARS. Books are published (x2) online with results. The initiative got marine labs working together and the funding designated.

MARS has worked to establish networks of excellence, to defragment the research and set up long-term integration and equitably spread the activities while removing gender issues from funding. It has received 8.7 M Euros/4yrs. These awards acted to leverage additional funds within member states. These included, Marine Biodiversity and Ecosystem Diversity. There is a Marine Genomics Europe, the 2nd funded program that includes bioinformatics, genomics, ESTs, etc. It has been given 10M Euros over 4 years. Partners are scattered all over Europe, and even Chile. There is a Max-Planck Institute in Berlin for the genomics of early vertebrates (uro-, cephalochordates). There is also "Euro-Oceans" for the blue water people. The consortia made-up of members are sometimes (often) political, but definitely function based upon expertise.

The process proceeds by designating certain challenges; the top-eight were funded in 2007. MARS puts out messages that are disseminated to politicians for funding. Research, Training and Education have been an important part of the programs. These programs then set future networks to build future collaborations.

ASSEMBLE: Association of European Marine Biological Labs. This group has come from the Marine Genomics program. It is now being formed and gaining money. It promotes networking, transnational access, and joint research activities. It now has a new program of 8M Euros to be divided up among members. New users are funded for infrastructure support from fully equipped labs. The program helps gain internal support by showing outside users that their needs being met by that institution.

EMBRC: European Marine Biological Resources Center now formed is coming from ESFRI to establish a roadmap to European infrastructure for all science groups; from biomedical to

astronomy and the environment. All members must approve the program before it gets on the roadmap. EMBRC has already gotten on that roadmap, so they can apply for new money.

WAMS: World Assoc of Marine Stations. This group has been promoted on several occasions including originally Pierre LaSouiére, first MARS director. It has the potential to include NAML and others (JAMBIO, MARS) as members. The IOC and UNESCO has been approached for project funding; they are interested. There will be an October meeting in Naples to celebrate 100th anniversary of Anton Dohrn's death. The IOC is interested in inclusivity; welcome all marine facilities as members. A follow-up meeting in Paris, Spring-2010 is scheduled.

Jo-Ann Leong would like to see if NAML is interested in participating in European programs. There was a MARS Meeting the following day, so there is opportunity for NAML to attend. Ownership of marine organisms is a hot issue. This issue needs to be discussed by both MARS and NAML.

Discussion: MARS prospers from having top-down research directorates as well as bottom-up application and self-regulation. Lobbying comes only for inclusion of specific topics into those general categories where it might fit best. In general, meetings are more informal and directors are called upon and presentations given to see if inclusions are worthy. Jo-Ann Leong asked about their Fee structure. The answer was that it would probably be tiered and based upon an ability to pay and would be nested with division of funds. NAML could/should contact the US-IOC representatives to carry the idea forward and promote its formation. Brian gave methods and possible contact information so this could be done. JoAnn said that she would be the coordinator. It was noted that student interchanges are working well at individual levels (institution and PI levels) between MARS and US labs. However, there is no coordination between these programs.

Jim reminded the group of the remaining items to be accomplished. They included:

- Regional meetings at Roebing House following this meeting
- Audit committee Report

Other items/announcements of importance were:

- The bar will be set up with wondering tour around campus
- Return vans to the hotel will leave at 9:00 PM
- Vans for luggage shuttle to the Coastal Center will depart at 7:30 AM

Meeting adjourned for the Oyster Roast and Low Country Boil.

NAML Biennial Meeting; continued
Skidaway Institute of Oceanography
6 October 2009

Jim opened the meeting, had people check the attendance list, and sign up for airport transportation. He then introduced Brian Capell, President of OBFS who joined us today to talk about their NSF infrastructure proposal.

Frank Cushing:

This discussion was a follow up from the previous day. Frank suggested ideas from the 20k foot level, i.e., what is the big picture and what does it look like. Frank stated clearly that NAML

must take the time to get to its goals slowly. The Congressional process determines who wins by those who play the game correctly. He emphasized that a single message is what moves forward. A limited budget can be made to work depending upon your expectations. Franks cautioned that if your lobbyist does it all, then it is expensive. Lobbying can be done at lower levels with minimal shoe-leather on their firm. However, the level of service as expected will be less. Hiring a lobbyist and getting things done does not require big bucks. Aid given within your won Institutions can also be helpful. Champions on the hill must be identified and your relationship with them must to be developed. Frank reminded everyone to always make connections with your home congressional people. It will be beneficial at some point.

Discussion: Jim Yoder said that COL focuses on ships and blue water oceanographic infrastructure. However, directors are always looking for research funds. Therefore NAML should focus its efforts there. NOAA research is a big effort, but with little extramural return. NAML should focus there also. Frank Cushing offered to assist any and all of us, and not necessarily on account, but pro-bono. Frank said that he works in a law office, but he is not a lawyer, so he doesn't have to bill.

Brian Kloppell, Western Carolina University, and representing the Organization of Biological Field Stations (OBSF):

OBSF president, Jan Hodder was contacted by NSF (Peter McCartney) who related that that NSF were having trouble funding the Field Station & Marine Lab (FSML) infrastructure program. As an outcome of this discussion, Hillary Swain is helping to put together two workshops (one each/coast) and will invite all people who use the program, to have input. San Diego will host the West Coast Meeting. The overall plan is to push to keep the program going as well as increase it. There will NSF observers at the meetings but they will not be official participants. There needs to be a Steering Committee formed of about 7 people including some NAML members. About 25 people are planned for at each workshop. It is conceived that the Steering Committee would write the final report. They might consider using the old data gathered and put together by NAML and OBFS years ago (Jim Clegg and Art Brooks, NAML president). They want users of field stations to send in information, on both the plus and minus sides. They are looking mostly for information that shows how the station could be bettered by upgraded infrastructure. It is anticipated that the two workshops might not be entirely the same. Organizers would build on the first data set, and use the 2nd to augment it. NSF people were surprised that the FSML program was coming under fire, so they are trying to assist to help gather information that would keep the program going.

It was noted that OBFS also does a 'hill' visit each year to promote their situation and gain recognition. They are planning a Feb-March date for San Diego, and a late April-May meeting for the East coast. They are trying to avoid encroaching on the field station season. The East Coast location will be as close to DC as possible.

Each year, OBFS puts together a list of about 12 items to carry forward. *En toto*, they have about 151 paid members including individual members of retired directors. They are looking to hire an executive director, but must raise the money first. They are contemplating a Fund raising campaign for the organization and directors salary. AIBS would consider sharing an executive director for DC. Such an arrangement would put them in DC with access to the Hill. Quarterly BoD meetings are also planned. They are planning on a budget of \$100k/year that would include salaries, office, and expenses. The Services expect would include: a base for the organization, a presence at NSF, links to other organizations, and the presence/recognition to be able to push the initiatives of

the organization not being able to be done by member volunteers. They also would like a 100k discretionary fund to which they could have access.

Retreat Return: SWOT

The discussion included the fact that Brochures are always out-of-date, and that NAML should use its Webpage. This approach is also less expensive than paper. Bob Van Dolah asked Brian about using a lobbyist. Brian replied that the OBSF uses Congressional Visits Day sponsored by AIBS as a lobbying method. He thought it was effective. Jim said that after our experience with LBA, our feeling is that we were rather successful. It was very expensive and we could not sustain the effort at that previous level. However, we can scale back contracted services, or we can merge with another group to help us; OBFS would be one of those considered. Jim invited Brian to participate in discussing his issue. Brian related that in April there would be a new president so it can come up. Currently they only spend between \$30-35k per year for all their expenses including travel for Board members. OBFS is concerned about raising dues. Ken mentioned our categories. OBSF uses "Pay-Pal" to receive their dues. They anticipate moving to using a lobbyist gradually. Ray mentioned that we have already gotten exposure so if we move to an executive secretary, that person can move the issues forward. George mentioned hiring an advisor that would assist us to move on the Hill. It would have to be a shared position. Especially with the new dues structure, we could have an executive director and a Hill advisor. He suggested we build a partnership first and then establish the operating parameters. Ken said the advisor would be less expensive and could be a training period for them. Ken thought that just an advisor would be enough if NAML members did the leg work. Gary Cherr asked about what LBA did. Jim said he helped formulate our agenda and then helped with putting it in action by house meetings, administrative letters supporting legislative bills, transition documents, and he knew the time-table for testimony and when to send letters to committees. LBA assisted greatly by knowing the Hill, the timing, and by getting doors open to us for the right people; LBA helped us put our science into meaningful language for transmission to the right people. LBA also assisted us by putting our BoD Agenda together and with inviting the right people to the meetings. They kept our webpage updated and things posted to it. Jim Yoder related that he feels comfortable keeping an LBA-type, but has reservations about an administrator. He felt that legislative help is what is needed. Another suggestion was the possibility of NAML piggy-backing on our institutional lobbyists to open the proper doors, as well as joining with other organizations to unite behind a single message. Again, it was noted that the training time for an Executive Director takes a long time and thus it may not be the right model. Kumar recommended our three-year model because it worked so well. He strongly recommended we retain it, but look for others firms who charge at a lower price and maybe one that works with like organizations; Sea Grant as an example. It was agreed that partnering is a viable method especially with that like-minded organization, but Kumar still has reservations. Dave Christie still likes our original LBA-model accepted that rescaling the effort and sharing it with another organization is a good alternative. Bob Van Dolah also likes the shared-model. He suggested that with sharing, the output messages might be a little different, but our access to information and services would work well. It would be nice to find one set of experts who works with several groups, but would also help each group individually. LBA did that with NAML and Sea Grant. LTER groups might be one group to consider as a partner recommended Brian.

Action Item: Jim recommended NAML extend the use of its original (LBA) model but at a less expensive level, and also consider talking to other organizations about possible synergies by combining efforts working with one firm. Jim Morse and Jim Yoder put Jim's recommendation into

a motion and added a second. After discussions ensued related to issuing an RFP and setting a fixed monetary allotment, the motion passed unanimously. It was further decided that Ivar and Jim would work with the BoD to solicit firms and settle on a dollar amount to spend.

Action Item: It was moved and seconded (George Crozier and Bill Hogarth respectively) that Ken Sebens take over hosting the Website at a cost of \$3k/year (30 half days). The motion passed. George further recommended \$5k be allotted to the NAML President to offset his expenses while carrying out NAML efforts. Jim Sanders said the funds would not really help much. JoAnn and Jim both recommended that we wait and see what the budget is for 2010. However, member help for his efforts would be of better benefit. In general, most members present were sympathetic to allowing this expense.

Action Item: Jim will re-do the NAML White Paper on Governmental Affairs and National Policy and move it forward over the next 2 months. He will also assist Ivar with the RFP for a new advocacy firm.

Anton Dorn Meeting:

There will be an international meeting to commemorate the 100-year anniversary of the death of Anton Dorn, founder of the Stazione Zoologica, Napoli, the first recognized marine laboratory director. The emphasis of the meeting is to promote and establish a global network of marine laboratories. Gary Borisy, MBL, Jo-Ann Leong, HIMB, and Steve Palumbi, Hopkins will represent the US at the meeting.

Jim stated that a little more attention to the marine world needs to be given besides just the critters. The physical environment also needs to be considered. Kumar wondered how we would tie into their system: funding differences between the US and EU are dramatic. They expect that members will participate through interactions at marine stations. Jim said it was to form a network of labs where people could study organisms. Money for EU funded projects might come from carbon sales. It was noted that our profile for NAML is excellent. The formation of a global umbrella organization is what is driving the initiative and expanding opportunities for research. Kumar asked about OIC funding for NAML or US labs. It was thought that it would be possible. UNESCO Spatial Planning Documents are first rate. Brian Melzian will help move documents through the US representatives to the IOC as his role representing EPA.

Business Meeting, continued:

Regional Reports:

SAML: Wes Tunnell reported that SAML has 56 members, but some (14) have not paid. Three new members were added this year. SAML again funded students to attend scientific meetings. Morgan State University was the host for their last meeting. April 2010 is the next meeting, Steve Gordan, Gulf Breeze will host. Shirley Pomponi was elected the next SAML president.

NEAMGLL: Brian Melzian reported on the 4 topics discussed. The first concerned the repayment of the NEAMGLL Loan and the new dues structure. It is possible that NEAMGLL might be able to return more to NAML. The treasury funds will be used for workshops, meetings, brochures and websites. NEAMGLL needs a President-elect and Alan Kuzirian has offered to serve. Those present considered possible meeting dates for 2010. The problem of lack luster input from the

membership was discussed and thus the Board is looking at ways to revitalize the regional group. Wes said that support of the meetings by charging no registration costs has improved attendance, so the Board will consider that strategy.

WAML: Ken Sebens reported a membership of 30 with a loss of 3. They will push to have them return. The WAML Meeting last weekend in Seattle Washington was a success. It included a visit to the Friday Harbor labs; 17 attended, representing 11 labs. A Governor's compact for state funding of speakers was discussed as was NSF and stimulus funds. Data processing between labs was also a topic as was the rate of dues recovery. Travel grants for students came up and the need to elect an 'At-large' member.

NAML Dues Structure:

Valerie Paul discussed the fact that she would fall in between the proposed new categories, and thus would get bumped up to the next cost unit. That position would be very uncomfortable for her to pay. Bob Van Dolah suggested more word smithing is needed that would allow small labs to better fit the categories. What happens to those that split the categories remains an important question. Such a situation would allow choice. Wes suggested adding the phrase, "and/or" to the upper categories. Kumar asked about dues based upon the percentage of their annual budget. He stated that the AZA uses that model. It was pointed out that budgets fluctuate yearly so there was no consensus could be derived using that model. Gary recommended that there must be a letter to the membership supporting the new dues structure and to make it more palatable. Also agreed to will be a poverty clause as well as adding a statement that a supplemental donation line is available for adding more money. It was noted that any lab can pay at a higher category. Those labs restricted from supporting lobbying efforts can use a check-off box so stating if needed. Federal agencies are billed separately to avoid that situation. Kumar pointed out that our LBA association was not lobbying because NAML did not influence legislation. Jim Yoder suggested adding a box to split amounts between categories. An ensuing discussion centered on whether the Regional Boards should/could assign the categories for the dues. That topic was eventually deemed inappropriate.

Jim related that under the new scheme, dues amounts would rise at the lowest level and the others accordingly. The lowest category is where the majority of the members pay, and thus increases there will produce the most revenue at the lowest percentage of increase. It was pointed out that in actuality, there should be more mid-sized labs, and thus more funds from that range. The discussion then centered on what the smaller labs can actually pay. However, everyone agreed it does come down to priorities and values of what each member thinks they get for their investment. Bob Van Dolah noted that he does not make the decision on paying the dues; its an accounting/admin function. It was restated the Poverty Excuse can be taken for a limited time only, not forever.

Action Item: A motion was made by David Christie and seconded by Wes Tunnell to accept the proposed new dues structure (labs with <5 scientists are considered small labs; >5 to 20 scientists are considered medium labs, and >20 scientists are large labs), and that the Regional Dues will remain at \$200. A Single Bill for both dues will be used. The motion passed.

Election: President-Elect

WAML is to recommend the nominee. Ken related to the group that George Boehlert is the person of choice, with JoAnn Leong as the alternate. George's concern was about his retirement schedule. If he is designated as the institution's representative, then he can hold NAML office. He

is serious about the nomination. The consensus of those present was to delay the nomination vote and do it by email after a firm candidate is presented.

Audit Committee Report:

Val Klump reported that the audit committee simply found a \$13.00 misplacement that was corrected. The Biennial Finance report was signed. Discussion on the requirement for an external audit gave question on the income limits. It will be investigated.

Passing the Gavel Ceremony:

Jim said that he will at some point pass on gavel to Ivar. Jim told everyone that he enjoyed his tenure overall, although at times, frustration did arise over lack of communication from the membership. However, overall it was an interesting experience.

Brian Kloeppe, OBFS, asked for 2 volunteers to assist with the survey for FSML. Jo-Ann Leong said she would consider being one.

Kumar brought up the questions of NGOs and aquaria and possible associations with NAML. Their AZA dues structure is assessed at 0.01% of their annual budget. They are a very progressive group. Jim recommended leaving that decision to the Regions. Wes mentioned that the SAML criteria for membership inclusion was the need to have a research branch. Discussion that followed included past aquaria NAML members like the New England Aquarium, the Shedd, Aquarium, MBARI, and others.

The meeting ended with a motion to Adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan M. Kuzirian,
NAML Secretary/Treasurer



NAML Biennial Meeting - October 5, 2009

NAME

CHERR Gary
CHRISTIE David
CROZIER George
CUSHING Frank
De LUCA Mike
DUTTON Ian
EPIFANIO Chuck

AFFILIATION

U. California Bodega Marine Lab
Kasitsna Bay Lab Alaska
Dauphin Island Sea Lab
Oldaker, Belair & Wittie
Rutgers U.
Alaska Sea Life Center
School of Marine Science & Policy
Delaware

EMAIL

gncherr@ucdavis.edu
david.christie@alaska.edu
gcrozier@disl.org
fcushing@oldakergroup.com
deluca@marine.rutgers.edu
ian_dutton@alaskasealife.org
gave no email

GARDNER Wayne
GILCHRIST Sandra
GILLIGAN, Matt
HAMMER Amy
HANISAK Dennis
HAWKINS Bill
HIGHSMITH Ray

Univ. Texas Marine Science Inst.
Pritzker Lab, Sarasota
Savannah State University
Hubbs-SeaWorld Research Inst.
HBOI @ FAU
Gulf Coast Research Lab U So Miss
Natl Inst. Under Sea Sci. Tech
Univ. Mississippi

wayne.gardner@mail.utexas.edu
gilchrist@ncf.edu
gilliganm@savannahstate.edu
amyhammer@aol.com
dhanisak@hboi.fau.edu
william.hawkins@usm.edu
ray@olemiss.edu

HOGARTH Bill
KLOEPEL Brian
KLUMP Val
KUZIRIAN Alan
LEONG JoAnn
MAHADEVAN Kumar
MELZIAN Brian
MORRIS Jim
PAUL Valerie
RUMMEL John
SANDERS Jim
SEBENS Ken
SHIMMIELD Graham
THORNDYKE Mike
TOLL Ron
TUNNELL Wes
VAN DOLAH Bob
VIOLETY Aswani
WHITE Quint
YODER James

USF College Marine Science
Western Carolina University
Great Lakes WATER Inst.
MBL Woods Hole
Hawaii Inst. Marine Biology
Mote Marine Laboratory
US EPA (Atl. Eco. Division)
Baruch Inst. Univ S. Carolina
Smithsonian Marine Station, FL
Inst. for Coastal Sci & Policy ECU
Skidaway Inst. Of Oceanography
Unv Washington Friday Harbor Labs
Bigelow Lab for Ocean Sciences
Sven Loven Centre of Marine Sci.
FL Gulf Coast Univ.
Harte Res. Institute
Marine Resources Research Inst.
FL Gulf Coast Univ.
JU MSRI, Jax'ville FL
WHOI

billhogarth@marine.usf.edu
bkloeppe@wcu.edu
vklump@uwm.edu
akuzirian@mbi.edu
joannleo@hawaii.edu
kumar@mote.org
melzian.brian@epa.gov
morris@biol.sc.edu
paul@si.edu
rummelj@ecu.edu
jim.sanders@skio.usg.edu
sebens@u.wa.edu
gshimmield@bigelow.org
mike.thorndyke@marecol.gu.se
rtoll@fgcu.edu
wes.tunnell@tamucc.edu
vandolah4@dnr.se.gov
avoletly@fgcu.edu
Qwhite@ju.edu
jyoder@whoi.edu