



**NAML Biennial Meeting
27-28 September 2011
University of Connecticut
Avery Point, CT**

Opening & Welcome

Ivar Babb, NAML President opened the meeting with greetings and welcome to all. Instructions were given to allow people to log into the U-Conn network. Facilities locations were noted. The new University president was scheduled to welcome the group; it was her first visit to the Avery Pt. Campus.

Ivar reviewed the Agenda for major topic points for the meetings. He indicated that a catered Lunch would follow the morning sessions. The Business Meeting would occur in the afternoon. Chris Dematos, MBL webmaster, would teleconference in to the group on Wednesday. A joint OBFS/NAML session was also scheduled on Wednesday; it would be important in light of the upcoming joint workshop. A Campus tour would occur later in the day, and would include Marine Sciences building, seawater facility, the ROV area, and would end at the Brandford mansion; left to the state of Connecticut by the railroad baron, Plant. A group photo was also planned.

Welcoming Remarks: U-Conn President, Susan Herbst, arrived with accompanying provost, marine science director, and campus director. Introductions were made around the room.

We were told that the Department of Marine Science, started only 10 years ago, has granted 40 PhDs, 100 Master's Degrees, plus many baccalaureates. It has 150 staff and faculty with \$20M federal grants.

President Susan Herbst was welcomed by Ivar. She has a Communication's Degree from USC. Ivar asked for her assistance in communicating NAML's message to the broad public. Getting our message across is a big challenge. Susan related that it was nice to come to a group and not to talk about sports at U-Conn. She noted that the message of what science is all about is important, and that the current funding climate for science is worrisome to her and others. Susan emphasized it was her opinion that young people are the strength for environmental issues because they are interested. They are the future for securing funding for environmental studies; much better than their older generation who are set on cutting major programs. Ivar agreed that noted that even the Arabian Spring was generated by the younger generation. He further emphasized that research, infrastructure, education and outreach, plus diversity are the basic premises of NAML: our "Windows to the Sea."

Discussion: Mike Crosby commented about tight budgets and the re-instilling of indirect costs into infrastructure. Susan said U-Conn tries to keep indirect costs related to research and not siphon them off to other programs. The provost agreed with this policy, and over this past year his office has been able to do that. He agreed that there is a ground swell in the number of environmental students, and consequently they created a major in environmental studies. J.P. Walsh injected that inter-disciplinary research is needed back at Avery Point.

National Perspective: Joel Widder, Oldker Group – Joel said he was pleased to be here again with NAML. His "sabbatical" is over. He told us that the FY-12 budget process is in progress. The amount of money was set in August. House Bill, 24B was less than the Senate's amount. Senate CJS Subcommittee cut the budget by \$3B, which was \$7.4B less than President's recommended amount. The House held the NSF budget line at FY-11 levels. However, it increased research by \$43M but at the expense of Education, Human Resources and Research Equipment. The Continuing Resolution (CR) will continue until the end of the year predicted Joel. If so, it would provide NSF with some flexibility. However, the Senate reduced NSF by \$120M below FY-11: OOI at \$83M, but reduced Education and Human Resources. The Senate allowed money transfer authority for OOI or NEON but at a 15% limit. NSF's teaching and fellowship program was eliminated; K-12 education also. That program got moved back into the Education Dpt. Joel said that the Agency's Operating Plan is done after funding levels are set and that gets reviewed by OMB.

NOAA: House 103M is below last year's or \$1B below requested, bringing it to \$4.5B total allocated funds. The House Bill denies funding for climate service and satellite program, with a 30% reduction in ocean and coastal programs. Joel noted that NOAA Satellites are the dollar sink; 33% of the total budget. Extramural programs are going to get cut first as NOAA directors will fund intramural programs first. The Senate restored most of the extramural ocean and coastal programs, so the battle lines have been drawn. Joel said that we should ask OSTP about the satellite program.

NASA Earth Science Program: The proposed budget is \$2B below last year. The James Webb telescope was cut in House version, but the Senate added it back in.

Policy Issues Legislation: Joel emphasized the CRs will continue until after the Super Committee report. That committee report will get an 'up or down' vote (Senate only needs 51 votes, not 60 to pass it). If it is not issued, automatic cuts will come in FY-13, not FY-12. Joel told us that the National Ocean Policy will be discussed later. The Restore Act to capture BP funds and put the money into Gulf restoration legislation is an important item. Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (RI) added a National Endowment for Oceans into the bill to generate a small amount to get program started. Senate Ocean Caucus is now formed (bipartisan) under Whitehouse's initiative. The National Climate Service is trying to be pushed by NOAA. The House defeated it immediately for FY-11, and they are still trying for FY-12. Our Infrastructure initiative with OBFS will be important to help move agencies to support funding infrastructure. They are interested in infrastructure in a general way, but currently without money committed. HABs and coral reef reauthorization are moving between the House and Senate and they are playing the ying/yang game.

In general, Total Discretionary Spending is going to be down from 2012 out to 2021. NIH/NSF and all discretionary spending will be cut to 2007 levels it looks like. The mix on individual spending will be changed, but the total amount spent will be at 2007 levels. It is anticipated that the Super Committee will adjust numbers too, and thus the totals may come down even more. If the Super Committee doesn't act, budgets will come down even more; spending must reach a \$1.5T reduction over 10 years. The Appropriation Committees will have to make the decisions as to where the funds are allocated. After that, Agencies will then get their piece of the pie. For FY-12/13, there is a firewall between defense and non-defense, after that, it goes away and everything is up for grabs. Basically, all funding levels rest with the Super Committee's acceptance or not. Future money will depend on economy. Frank said that

overall, science will be better persevered through this period compared to social programs. However, some science programs will suffer major realignments and priorities

Jerry Miller: NOP/OSTP

Jerry reported that there has been an Executive Order signed for framing a National Ocean Policy. He outlined the nine objectives and the accompanying strategic action plans for each that are being written. It will be at the Cabinet Level. The National Ocean Council (NOC) will be composed of 27 members. Coastal and Marine spatial planning that is not regulatory in nature is planned; this framework is designed to get more efficiency. Overall it is designed to promote prosperity, well-being and security for the future. It does not generate new regulations, doesn't restrict uses or activities, and does not include a zoning plan or map. NOC will have a Steering committee as its action source. There is a government coordinating committee, ocean research & resource advisory board, national economic council, and a national security council. There is a governance coordinating committee that acts as an overseer (state, tribal, local) based upon geographic regions (Northeast, Great Lakes, Pacific, Alaska, Caribbean, Mid-Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic, and West Coast). Ocean Research Advisory Panel will be formed. Joel asked about the time period for applications and was told it was too short to respond to. There will be an annual cycling off of members so there will be new people added at all times. However, there is a long time sequence for screening and approval for all those nominated. Its main Principals will be: ecosystem based management including human impact; strong scientific data base, and collaborative on all regional levels. Nine priorities (see March minutes).

Jerry said emphasized the fact it will be an Ecosystem based management style, but not based upon species as formerly, but now it will have to expand to the ecosystems level. CMZ planning will be comprehensive with a strong education component stretching all levels and includes research. It is designed to improve coordination and integration across all Federal Government agencies. Climate change and ocean acidification will be one of the top objectives, as well as protection and restoration of impacted areas. It will also address, water quality issues, sustainable land practices and possible impacts on the oceans. The Arctic is a dedicated area of concern; erosion, climate change and security issues being included. Observation, mapping, and infrastructure support are also incorporated into the program.

Science input is needed to address ecosystem functions, and social sciences for uses of the oceans, particularly addressing regulation of competing uses; and adaptive management for long-term success. There will be a draft of all the strategic action plan outlines put out for comment, and public input. The first full draft was being written. More information is available at, www.Whitehouse.gov/oceans.

Discussion: Skip Porter asked for a copy of Jerry's the presentation and that it be made available on the NAML website. IOOS is in 9th item said Brian Melzian. JP Walsh asked about overlaps between points including coastal hazards. One can argue as to where coastal hazards might fall, but it is important, although not obvious where it is now placed. Bill Wise asked about where Fisheries lie in the plan as its placement too is not obvious. Jerry said that some points are moveable and temporal, so individual topics might float between the major divisions or even come and go. Jerry emphasized that there are some Senators that have not allowed this bill to even come to the floor, so it had to be done as an Executive Order. JoAnn asked about streaming of agencies to get a particular item through the maze. Will it happen

effectively? Jerry hoped that it would eventually when the whole concept begins functioning. He thinks it will happen more at the local level rather than having to go through higher governmental levels. Mike Crosby said that everything on the policy must go through the budget process and unfortunately that is still the bottom line. He asked how the budget process would proceed. Jerry said that it was planned in the FY-12 for some agencies. The individual action plans will have specified actions assigned to particular agencies. They are then supposed to be budgeted for into the next yearly budget process. Mike stressed that there must be a specified dollar amount next to each chosen item or nothing will happen. Brian reminded us that the Ocean Research Priorities Plan is going along in parallel with this one, and along with it are specific regimes for applying the necessary dollar amounts. At some point, there will be conflict between the two. Funding is still the issue as brought up by Skip Porter and he asked who decides how they are assigned; agency action like EPA verses research funding sources. Jerry said that each Action will be assigned to a particular agency with collaborating agencies assigned. Research programs will be formulated there and discussed between all parties for finalizing the budget process. Once the amount is settled, then it can be decided how it is to be done. OMB did in the past regulate this process and decided where the funds would go, but no longer. NAML should review all of these Action Plans suggested Brian with emphasis. It is important that it be done. There is only a 45 to maybe 60-day review period where this can be done said Jerry. Success stories are needed where OSTP involvement in a particular initiative was beneficial. Jerry asked that any of those examples be forwarded to him so that he can use them to support moving things forwarded. Shirley Pomponi said that negative stories are also important. A good example concerns the situation like the Gulf oil spill: reduced revenue intake severely impacted the local economy can be used to document claims of its total negative impact to the region. Jerry said that they have talked to regional industry folks too, including all ranges of scale from small to large. Skip Porter mentioned industry or foundation input in needed to the process and he thought NAML could assist through local contacts. Jerry asked that NAML package the info first and then forward all the material to him: that would increase impact while decreasing their work load.

NAML Public Policy Agenda 2012

Ivar related that it was the intent to start this discussion early in the meeting and expand upon the topic as necessary in appropriate places throughout the meeting. He reminded everyone that the Agenda was provided in the Meeting Book. Ocean science and science in general as it impacts the economy and education is important for us to address, and should we expand on its role. Ivar opened the meeting for discussion.

Mike Crosby said it is a good template but he advocated that NAML prioritize our focus to agencies and program areas that are under threat and would greatest impact what NAML does. Joel spoke to the advocacy program priorities and reiterated that NAML also designates areas within whatever agency we are addressing. He asked how specific do we wish to get. Currently we are at surface of each agency. Bill Wise seconded the tact of being specific. Jim Sanders suggested we should probably expand the generality to include Science as a whole. JoAnn said she concurred, but at some point, one has to advocate for something specific. Shirley agreed that there needs to be a focus on the agencies to convince them to assign money to a specific program. If we don't, they will have to decide where and how much of the limited money they can allocate. Skip reinforced the fact budget money has to be marked or designated (line-item) in order to assure it will go to the proper program. He suggested that concrete

examples might help get funds directed to a particular program. Another thought discussed centered on whether it might be easier to targeting specific research areas, but not necessarily for infrastructure. In that case, NAML would have to choose the priorities for which to advocate. Major research topics (20) were outlined in the National Ocean Priority Plan which was being rewritten. The 20 topic areas will be essentially the same but have priority changes. Joel recounted that Climate Change legislation was actually done that way: a targeted research area with designated dollars. Shirley suggested Sheldon Whitehouse's Endowment for the Ocean might be a priority for NAML to back as a possible source for future research and policy formulations. Mike DeLuca suggested another approach element to try would relate to societal benefits; specific programs, and job creation, all leveraged to promoting cross-discipline research areas and funding agencies. He suggested NAML needs to assemble this data as a show point. Val Klump put forth that all budget cuts do not affect all members equally. Cuts in federal dollars going to research must be clearly shown to show the vulnerability we are in. Jim said that we tried to do that through Lewis Burke, but it showed that the data was very murky and no clear unit stood out. JP Walsh agreed that a focused policy is a good idea. Mike Crosby used the example of NAML's efforts for infrastructure support (NSF-FSML). Everyone agreed with that one especially in light of the upcoming OBFS workshop and report. Roberta Marinelli suggested we solicit the Agency to fund a particular program, and then let the agency argue with OMB as to where the money should go.

***** **Lunch** *****

NAML's Public Policy Agenda: Discussion continued

Ivar ran through the points discussed before lunch and expressed a desire to continue the dialog. Walt Nelson spoke about EPA and its extramural program. He stressed sustainability as the target program and that EPA is in the process of marking up its budget. Walt asked that we address that issue and to coordinate to the agency's mission and priority as they identified it. Brian reinforced the fact that it is best to identify a person or director that is in charge of the program to be effective. Most of EPA's budget goes to the states because of their permitting programs. Phil Yund made the parallel to FSML and EPA with respect to priority choices. Look to promote areas of commonality, and then both NAML and the agency can benefit. Gary Cherr noted that his administrator in charge of research indicated that infrastructure is low in priority because it is always a target if standing alone. One needs to put infrastructure in the context of research program. It is not advisable just to ask for mortars and bricks for its own sake. Joel reinforced that point, noting that 'building renovations' are not tied directly to structures needed for research, but to support a specific research program/endeavor. It is a fine point, but a serious one.

Returning to the agency discussion, it was brought up that the NOAA workforce development program could be developed for training fellowships and educations. NAML's 100+ marine labs as a national asset partnered with federal research enterprises that do research (not NSF that funds research) would be a good tact recommended Mike Crosby. Sandra Gilchrist recommended that we include undergraduate education and its impact on the economy. John Boreman's report on NMFS warning that it will be losing a majority of its PhD work force through retirement with few available to take their place would be a perfect example. Placed-based research networks must also be a focus. Joel recommended that we need to generate a white paper making the point and documenting the impact what NAML can

give back to federal agencies and their mission. Our arguments must be compelling to the agency affected. It was noted that marine labs are the gangway to ships for public and the monitoring/observations programs; labs and research vessels are an integrated network that share resources efficiently on a multi-tiered level system. Skip Porter talked about a communication network of labs. He cited the Rockefeller Foundation of Sailors of the Sea for fishermen of all types as the example. Jeff Lotz spoke about programs of co-sponsorship on a particular project by an agency. Shirley warned about making sure we have definitive action items in this white paper. Joel said it must be written as one would write a grant asking for specific items (i.e., like a reverse IPA). JoAnn recommended we work with the Oldaker Group to formulate and to put this together. Megan Davis, Mike DeLuca, Mike Crosby, JoAnn and Joel will accomplish this task. Matt stressed that the network is not just communications but people, resources, etc. Bill Wise emphasized the need to create a real synergy so that the whole is truly larger than the sum of its parts. Creating a cyber-infrastructure RFP through NSF that would link NAML labs through stored databases mentioned Ivar. He was told that the same network linking was envisioned long ago with NAML's LabNet. Ivar said he would see if there is a possibility to fit in to that program.

Action Item: Jo-Ann and Joel, with Megan Davis, Mike DeLuca, Mike Crosby work toward generating a 'white-paper' making the point that marine labs are place-based research networks, they are the training ground for the next generation of active scientists, and that the letter document the impact what NAML can give back to federal agencies and their mission.

Audit Committee

A part of the biennial meeting process is the auditing of the NAML accounting. Ivar called for three members to form an Audit Committee: The following individuals were enlisted: Val Klump, chair, Bill Wise, and Megan Davis.

OBFS Workshop Report

Ivar was pleased that the partnership between the two organizations, OBSF and NAML that was discussed first at the Catalina Biennial Meeting (2007) was finally coming to fruition. The Workshop is scheduled (17-18 November 2011, Colorado Springs, CO): a workshop dedicated as part of strategic planning for the future of field stations and marine laboratories, and to identify the infrastructure investments that need to be made to meet the emerging trends in research, education, and resource management. The Final Workshop Report will be generated for distribution next year, 2012: The report will serve as the basis with which to apply to federal agencies and other funding sources for infrastructure moneys.

Work groups; asked to plan for 10-yr priorities

The Workshop will consist of Five Groups that include: Molecular Biology and Genomics, Ecosystem Dynamics, Macrosystems, Organismal and Population Biology, and Environmental Change. Designated cross-cutting areas are research, education, management, and the coupling of human and natural systems. The Timeline of the project begins with the workshop. Ivar related that they found the general weakness of the Program to be inertia! Getting things accomplished in a timely manner was difficult. It was exacerbated by a lack of a dedicated staff to complete necessary administrative paperwork, and an inability to effectively position NSF's FSML directorate within specific scientific research priorities. The Central Questions being addressed are: How important is FSML as a scientific platform for addressing critical emerging needs in research, education, and management. Marine labs are placed among

active/living ecosystems with direct access to species of all kinds. Marine labs are poised also for community engagement and provide instructional access to the sea. Other important topics include; oceans and human health, aquaculture diseases, etc.

Avery Point Campus Tour & NE Lobster Bake

The afternoon meeting session adjourned for guided tours of the Avery Point campus ending at the Brandford mansion NE lobster bake and social evening.

Wednesday, 28 September 2011

Ivar reviewed the Agenda for the day. The opening discussion would center on the topic of 'Like-minded Organizations'; in particular, those that represent the marine coastal institutions. Do we partner with them, and what is potential gain? Specifically, the World Ocean Council is a commercial group and so the question is, what would be the potential collaboration with them on like interests. The Business meeting will be held also and include a teleconference with Chris Dematos, MBL webmaster, and the election of officers. COSEE discussion will follow and NAML's pursuit of educational opportunities.

Like-Minded Organizations:

The topic centers on organizations that represent marine labs and associations that may have potential to work with us. Suggestions for discussion included: CALAMAR, IABOS, WOC, COL, WAMS, Lab21

I2SL- International Institute for Sustainable Laboratories: It is a Marine Laboratory Working Group that consists of and invites experts in marine laboratory design and engineering, consulting, facility management, operations, and ownership. Members are encouraged to contribute their technical expertise, facility information, and experiences. They design and maintenance of marine labs, and initiate using best practices. They also identify the needs of marine labs and facilities, and recommend commercial equipment designed for marine labs including cost-reduction equipment and monitoring. (see meeting book for more information)

The Marine Lab Working Group promotes energy efficient labs etc. An EPA person is head of the group currently. It was noted that Moss Landing Marine Lab was the first LEED-gold lab because of its energy efficient air-handling units, and electricity generating wind turbines. Shirley Pomponi suggested we invite some of these groups to come to the Annual Meeting. George Boehlert also agreed and recounted some of their past meetings; last one held at the Smithsonian. There was an open call to join the group. JoAnn will circulate a presentation from the WAML meeting.

CALAMAR - Cooperation Across the Atlantic for Marine Governance Integration: This is an international group with white papers on marine governance. In January 2010, CALAMAR was initiated by experts on both sides of the Atlantic to foster transatlantic stakeholder dialogue. Final results of the dialogue were shared at the conclusion of the project at a conference in April 2011. Highlights of the key recommendations included the topics, Oceans and Climate Change, High Seas, Integrated Maritime Policies and Tools, and EU/US Transatlantic Cooperation.

Shirley did not see any NAML alignment them. She stated that there is a lot of information posted on the web. They are policy level organization, and follow EU funding practices verses US funding. There are however, potential for cross-Atlantic fellowships, collaborations, and grants submissions.

Internal Association of Biological Oceanography: Headed by Ann Bucklin with the involvement of the Census of Marine Life, the organization promotes the "advancement of knowledge of the biology of the sea". NAML and MARS are listed as a potential collaborators.

World Ocean Council - JoAnn Leong introduced the topic: Its head is in Hawaii; Paul Holthus, Executive director. WOC is an international, cross-sectoral industry leadership alliance on "Corporate Ocean Responsibility". Basically it is an industry leadership alliance for responsible use of oceans encompassing anyone who makes money from ocean uses. It includes the ocean business community; direct users, support industries, and others associated with providing marine economy. Jo-Ann said that impacts on the marine ecosystems are large by ocean industries. Many in the environmental community look at these conflicts and want to limit impacts and restrict access to oceans by industry. Thus, industry representative are now becoming aware of these conflicts and are looking to work with NGOs on resolving the issues. JoAnn thought they would talk with NAML on like issues. Marine Spatial Planning is of interest. Environmental issues include waste water disposals, invasive species, and certainly, marine mammals. The fleet would make excellent sensor platforms for environmental monitoring/observation stations. It is estimate that there are 60,000 ships on the ocean daily, plus oil rigs and other permanent structures (see Meeting Book for more details). Skip Porter recommended that NAML should think about engaging or even joining the group. It is a 501(c)(3) group, and has academic members already listed (Columbia University was a founding member). He suggested inviting them to the Annual meeting. Skip was adamant that his Marine Science Institute would join. WOC might serve as a non-traditional, possible money source.

Consortium for Ocean Leadership: COL has formed a Scoping Group to look at how the ocean community will do business in the new arena of tight budgets. Ivar and Graham Shemmeild are on the committee. The Group recognizes that marine labs are players in the process. They will generate a new message and priority list to be followed by recommendations that will need to be refined and improved. COL has other Task Teams formed to look at additional topics like education, outreach, research, institutional sharing of large-ticket items and equipment with the aim of changing the focus toward accepting the philosophy of the need to share, not own. (see Meeting Book for more details).

World Association of Marine Stations (WAMS) : Established in 2010, it is described as, a Network of Marine Stations and Institutes for the 21st Century. NAML is a member and the organization is moving ahead. WAMS made a presentation to the UN. GEOOS is running and it too is part of it. The organization has interests in global education, biotechnology, integrated research strategies and data acquisition and sharing. Lisbon Portugal is next meeting.

NAML Business Meeting

Minutes: Minutes of the Annual Board of Directors Meeting were presented. It was moved and seconded by Shirley Pomponi and Jo-Ann Leong respectively that the Minutes be accepted. The

motion passed unanimously. JoAnn asked that the Action Items be collated within a week or two, and that the full Minutes be published on the Web the week before the next scheduled meeting.

NAML's 501(c)(3) Status: The issue was review by our Treasurer, Alan Kuzirian. Basically because of the change in our income level, NAML is now required to file IRS forms, 990. However due to their complexity and lack of assistance available even from the IRS, they were not filed in the respective time period. Thus, we need to refile for 501 (c)(3) status. The law firm of Hurwitt Associates has been engaged on our behalf. They specialize in non-profits. Bill Wise moved and Shirley Pomponi seconded a motion put forth by Alan Kuzirian to allow Treasurer to spend up to \$1,000 for accounting services needed to prepare NAML's 990-IRS forms. The motion passed unanimously.

NAML Webpage: WAML and SAML it was reported are moving to establish their own websites with links to NAML. SAML will engage a webmaster with their funds. Shirley suggested that person's time could be shared with NAML. Chris Dematos, MBL IT Webmaster video'd in to the meeting. He related that the MBL will be using WordPress as its new web platform. The new system is dynamic, so anything can be put onto the webpages from virtually anywhere. Any person designated as an Administer can gain access into the system at multiple levels. Thus anyone allowed in can edit or add information to the site. The software has a built in editor with lots of help guides for assistance. Chris told the group that the NAML website is already into the system. It can even be liked to Facebook and Twitter. Oversight of the page can also be established so that items or changes can be approved or disapproved. It is done through designated, editor, author, or contributor levels. All that Chris needs to do is issue usernames and passwords to the assigned people. NAML can also serve as a distribution network of new information to the regions. Chris said that he can set up easy tutorials on how the system works and can be used. He stressed that designs and themes are easily done. Chris said he would transfer the old site to the new WordPress website, and would give out the new URL to the new page.

It was decided to set up a small working group first to test the system. Shirley, JoAnn, Ivar, and Alan would be the test subjects. Gary Cherr noted that his lab had just switched to this system. They hired a web designer to do it and set it up. They were pleased with it (cost of \$8,000 for design and 40 pages of information). Bill Wise cautioned about how many people should be able edit in. He told the group that he has contracted with Academic Webpages at a cost of \$1200/year. They do all the webpages editing for Stony Brook and they are very prompt. George Boehlert related that NAML has been in this webpage situation before. WAML has been displeased with the slowness of the MBL's response. Ivar countered with the fact that with the new system we will be able to do it ourselves. Ivar related that he approves trying the new system. A subcommittee to study the new system was formed: JoAnn Leong, Ivar Babb, Bill Wise, Alan Kuzirian, Shirley Pomponi, Roberta Marinelli, and Gary Cherr were appointed.

Regional Reports

WAML: JoAnn reported on the upcoming Tiburon meeting. WAML also has two sites offered for its next meeting, the Gump Station, Moorea, Polynésie française, and Alaska. Their actions items included the development of a new website. They also discussed Regional Dues Collections and suggested that NAML return to the old method of regional collections with

NAML dues being forwarded to the NAML Treasurer. WAML awarded Travel Grants of \$500 to graduate students to attend and present material at a scientific meeting.

SAML: Shirley Pomponi reported that SAML has a comfortable budget and treasury fund. They formed an ad-hoc committee on spending to reduce the sum of money on hand. A SAML website for better communication was also discussed. Another topic of interest was membership and the rationale for accepting non-traditional members like aquaria, and other NGS or like-minded organizations as an Association Membership. Twenty four members and guests from Mexico attended the last SAML meeting. SAML Elections held. They also acknowledge the contributions of Wes Tunnell, and retiring SAML treasurer, Kumar Mahadevan.

NEAMGLL: Alan Kuzirian reported that those present discussed membership and our need to recruit old and new members. Val Klump will be the incoming NEAMGLL president and thus hold the next meeting on the Great Lakes was definitely a good idea. Initiating a phone campaign to the membership, and a re-invigorated NEAMGLL website was discussed.

Elections of NAML officers: Shirley Pomponi reported that SAML had chosen Nancy Rabolais to be nominated as NAML's president-elect (Wes Tunnel seconded the nomination) The motion passed unanimously.

Emeritus Nomination: It was proposed with the recommendation of SAML, that Matt Gilligan be nominated as an Emeritus Member of NAML based upon his years of service and his strong advocacy for marine education and underrepresented groups. Shirley Pomponi presented Matt's name into nomination. A vote was taken and passed.

Center for Ocean Sciences Education Excellence (COSEE): Liesl Hotaling, Jan Hodder by videoconference

Founded in 2002, COSEE is a network of education centers, at 14 now with the new regional center at U-Conn. All centers whether regional or national all have the same theme and mission. The Centers are now sharing program and content. Liesl noted that Hawaii joined the network yesterday. There is a strong competition with a full proposal review, so it is difficult to form a network and shared information. COSEE also competitively funds beginning scientists as well. Phil Bell, U-Washington, has introduced marine science standards in public education. COSEE has over its history embraced underrepresented students and institutions into marine education. COSEE also has developed partnerships with NOAA Education Programs. An NSF Committee Report on COSEE was released last night that strongly recommended funding for another 10 yrs. The program has a \$4.5M annual budget. It funds programs by rolling 3 and 5 year programs so COSEE's budgets are difficult to predict. COSEE manages a Staff Volunteer Program that assists some of the network groups. These volunteers wish to collaborate with partners of different types, and for auxiliary funding sources.

Ivar gave examples of Best-Practices for COSEE. He mentioned that face to face opportunities are the highest ranking. Their virtual programs were also well received. Scientists liked fact that COSEE help them teach better. Their National networking endeavors are the least efficient at this point; coordination is very difficult. COSEE promotes content generated webpages with a common ground that still allows some personalization. Its Public Outreach document is available in PDF form from the web; it will be made available in hard copy as well.

Their Resources Program includes webinars, professional development seminars, and workshops. They also provide technology and data bases for use in the classroom. COSEE's plan for the future (see Meeting Book) includes a new RFP in 2012 for new centers and Legacy Centers (previously funded centers that maintain associations with COSEE, but are not now funded by them). Included will be an emphasis to involve develop curriculum where teachers give and receive information from working scientists that can be implemented for teaching.

Discussion: Shirley mentioned a Florida COSEE program she knew of that was very successful. It was noted that auxiliary projects are acceptable but have to be self-funded if outside the original COSEE grant. Each center has an assigned regional evaluator that now also evaluates the national network. Program reviews done locally, so some programs do change yearly within limits allowed said Liesl. In the reviews, both program and scientists are evaluated. The practical question really is, how does one scientifically evaluate the impact COSEE has had on increasing science education? That is now being attempted by comparing COSEE scientists versus non-COSEE ones. It has been demonstrated that surveys are not really scientifically sound. Mike Crosby suggested that COSEE and NAML could actually accomplish that task together. Mike Deluca addressed the cost factor for conducting non-mainstream funded projects. He praised NAML labs for being good at finding cost-sharing or alternate funding means. The Hawaiian Program involves ways to give community college faculty more in depth studies to supplement their education. Both Mike Hadfield and George Boehlert endorsed the program that he experienced while participating in this kind of event. Matt Gilligan brought up the possibility of partnering with Jim Hicks (Lewis Stokes) and his program. Mike Crosby asked about quality control for COSEE programs and how the generated data is it evaluated and tested. Liesl said it remains an issue and is sometimes a problem.

Ivar asked the group if and how NAML should be moving ahead to more formally refining the relationship between NAML and COSEE. Dave Christie agreed it should be moved forward. Bill Wise suggested we connect marine lab people directly with COSEE centers both at the local level and in parallel with the national program. Collaborations can happen at the top and at the bottom. Everyone present agreed we should move forward. Mike Crosby suggested that the first issue that we should approach is quality evaluation of COSEE's impact. It was also suggested as another point of collaboration would be the community college-science program.

NAML Public Policy and Oldaker Group: Joel said he needs from NAML a good, clear sense of priorities (3-5) to center on due to the current climate in DC. His anticipates that future phone and PPC calls will fill in the details. Frank Cushing commented that this meeting was one of the best NAML meetings he has attended with regard to NAML's PPC agenda.

***** Lunch *****

Following lunch, Ivar called the meeting back to order in order to complete the necessary items before adjournment.

Audit Committee: Val Klump gave the report of the Audit committee. He said that the books were reviewed and found to reconcile with the bank statements and MBL accounting reports. A motion to accept the Audit Committee's Report was made by Mike Crosby and unanimously approved.

Wrap Up of Unfinished Business:

The PPC and its focused agenda were brought up again by Ivar. What are the PPC's priorities is the main question. Bill Wise asked about how focused NAML wished to be this year, beyond NAML's general statement. JoAnn has the focused action items list (two-pager) and she does not want to redo the general criteria. Success stories need to be added for supporting the policy message that was fulfilled. New focus items can be listed separately on the web. Dave Christie cautioned that we should be reticent about keeping the national policy separate from the regional ones on the Web so there are no conflicts for federal labs.

We need to proceed with NAML's network improvement while seeking possible funding sources to pay for it. Cybernet was recommended for working data and information transfer-sharing. The Latitude and Longitude coordinates were requested for each lab so that the NAML location map can be updated. It was suggested that all unpaid dues members should be called and if necessary, gleaned from the membership list. Also recommended was to send the "Benefits of NAML" one-pager to delinquent members to remind them of NAML's value. George Boehlert suggested that the Webpage needs to include Legislative updates, submitted support letters, important Congressional Committees assignments, etc.

Other actions items will include NAML's Webpage redesign that will be done by committee. It will include Training Sessions for administrators and users for the website. Designated members will be gate-keepers through content management software. Our association with COSEE will move forward through NAML's Education Committee that will work with Liesl. COSEE would have to serve as the coordinator for community college / scientist training programs. The group suggested that NSF needs to formulate a broader impact statement for ROIs.

Passing of the Gavel: The meeting closed with the now traditional, passing of the NAML gavel. Ivar handed it to JoAnn and wished her well. JoAnn thanked Ivar for his dedication and service during his tenure as President.

Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,



Alan M. Kuzirian
Secretary/Treasurer

Participants List – Biennial Meeting, 2011

Ivar G. Babb (NEAMGLL)
NURTEC, Univ. of Connecticut,
Groton, CT

George W. Boehlert (WAML)
Hatfield Marine Science Center
Oregon State University
Newport, OR

Gary Cherr, (WAML)
Bodega Marine Lab, UC-Davis
Bodega Bay, CA

David Christie (WAML)
Kasitsna Bay Marine Laboratory
School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences
Univ of Alaska-Fairbanks; Fairbanks, AK

Michael Crosby (SAML)
Mote Marine Laboratory
Sarasota, FL

Megan Davis (SAML)
Harbor Branch Oceanographic Inst./FAU
Ft.Pierce, FL

Michael P. De Luca (NEAMGLL)
Inst. of Marine & Coastal Sciences
Rutgers University;
New Brunswick, NJ

Sandra L. Gilchrist (SAML)
Pritzker Marine Laboratory
New College of Florida
Sarasota, FL

Matthew R. Gilligan (SAML)
Marine Sciences Program
Savannah State University;
Savannah, GA

Raymond Highsmith (SAML)
Nat Inst Undersea Sci-Tech,
Univ. of Mississippi,
Abbeville, MS

Val Klump (NEAMGLL)
Great Lakes WATER Institute
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI

Alan M. Kuzirian (NAML- Sec/Treas.)
Marine Biological Laboratory
Woods Hole, MA

Jo-Ann C. Leong (WAML)
Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology
Kaneohe, HI

Jeff Lotz (SAML)
Gulf Coast Research Lab
Ocean Springs, MS

Roberta Marinelli (WAML)
Wrigley Institute for Environmental Studies
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA

Brian Melzian (NEAMGLL)
US-EPA Atlantic Ecology Division
Narragansett, RI

Walter Nelson (NEAMGLL)
US-EPA Western Ecology Division
Newport, OR

Shirley Pomponi (SAML)
Harbor Branch Oceanographic Inst., Inc.
Fort Pierce, FL

Skip Porter (SAML)
Marine Science Institute
U-Texas, Port Aransas, TX

James Sanders (SAML)
Skidaway Inst. of Oceanography
University System of Georgia
Savannah, GA

Wes Tunnell (SAML)
Harte Research Institute
Texas A&M University,
Corpus Christi, TX

Graham Shimmield (NEAMGLL)
Bigelow Lab. for Ocean Sci.
West Boothbay Harbor, ME

J.P. Walsh, (SAML)
Institute for Coastal Science & Policy
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC

Bill Wise (NEAMGLL)
School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences
Stony Brook University
Stony Brook NY

James Yoder (NEAMGLL)
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Woods Hole, MA

Phil Yund (NEAMGLL)
Marine Science Education and Research
Center
University of New England
Biddeford, ME

Guests:

Frank Cushing, Oldaker Group,
Washington, DC

Chris Dematos, MBL, Woods Hole, MA

Susan Herbst, President, U-Conn, Avery
Point, CT

Jan Hodder, COSEE Partnership Panel, NSF

Liesl Hotling, COSEE Partnership Panel,
NSF

Jerry Miller, Assist Dir. Ocean Science,
OSTP, Washington, DC

Joel Widder, Oldaker Group, Washington,
DC