

**NOAA Science Advisory Board
Teleconference Meeting
May 16, 2011
3:00-5:00 PM**

Presentations for this meeting have been posted on the Science Advisory Board (SAB) website at <http://www.sab.noaa.gov/Meetings/meetings.html>

Attendees

SAB members in attendance: Mr. Raymond Ban, Chair and Consultant, Weather Industry and Government Partnerships, The Weather Channel; Dr. Eric Barron, President, Florida State University; Dr. Frank Kudrna, CEO, Kudrna and Associates; Dr. Eve Gruntfest, Director, Social Science Woven into Meteorology, University of Oklahoma; Dr. James Sanchirico, Associate Professor, University of California at Davis; Jerry Schubel, President and CEO, Aquarium of the Pacific; Mr. William Townsend, President and CEO, Townsend Aerospace Consulting; and Dr. Thomas Zacharia, Associate Laboratory Director, Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

NOAA senior management and Line Office representatives in attendance: Dr. Larry Robinson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Conservation and Management; Ms. Mary Glackin, Deputy Under Secretary of Oceans and Atmosphere for Operations; Dr. Paula Davidson, Chief Scientist, Office of Science and Technology, National Weather Service (NWS); Dr. David Kennedy, Assistant Administrator, National Ocean Service (NOS), Dr. Paul Doremus, Acting Assistant Administrator, Program Planning and Integration (PPI); Dr. Gary Matlock, Director, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR); Ms. Beth Lumsden, Chief of Staff for Science, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)); Dr. Stan Wilson, Senior Scientist and Dr. David Hermreck, Senior Programs Advisor, National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service (NESDIS); and Ms. Jennifer Lukens, Acting Director, NOAA Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Program.

Ecosystem Sciences and Management Working Group: Dr. Jeremy Collie, Dr. Jackie Grebmeier, Dr. Jo-Ann Leong, and Dr. Jake Rice

Staff for the Science Advisory Board in attendance: Dr. Cynthia J. Decker, Executive Director; Mary Anne Whitcomb

Ray Ban called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. There were two topics on the agenda for the meeting: discussion of recommendations on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP) from the Ecosystem Sciences and Management Working Group (ESMWG); and discussion of the revised Concept of Operations document for SAB Working Groups and Task Forces.

Before discussion of the agenda, Ray Ban congratulated Board member Peter Kareiva on his election as a member of the National Academy of Sciences.

Recommendations on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning

Jeremy Collie, University of Rhode Island and member, ESMWG

Dr. Jeremy Collie presented recommendations from the ESMWG on its white paper on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP).

Overall Report

The ESMWG had already presented two interim reports to the SAB that provided background and preliminary findings. The ESMWG noted this input on the national effort on CMSP, a topic highlighted in the President's National Ocean Policy, could be helpful to NOAA. The audience for the report is the people who are working in CMSP in NOAA and ultimately other government agencies involved in CMSP. Dr. Collie presented both the report and findings. He started out by noting that there are already a number of expert reports on focused topics relating to CMSP; the ESMWG instead worked to review as many marine spatial plans as possible, asking specific questions during the review. The members hoped to find new results that might have been missed and wanted to challenge people's expectations of these plans. The group compared existing attributes of marine spatial plans; success can't yet be measured because most of these plans are too new. The group has compiled a data base of attributes that people can draw from; Jeremy provided highlights of the report.

Europe, Asia and Australia and the US are places where marine spatial plans have been developed. Plans that are mature are 10-20 years old and are on their second or third iteration. These plans have been developed at considerable expense, often through public-private partnerships. The group looked at the spatial scales of the marine spatial plans and the scope of challenge in US is equal in area of everything done so far in marine spatial plans.

One finding is that a government mandate is a necessary but not sufficient condition for marine spatial plans. There may be no legislative changes needed to make the plans because the agencies already had this authority but the challenge was to get government agencies to work together. Another finding was that data collection is demanding in terms of time and investment. The report showed the different types of data used with strong dependence on qualitative data and expert opinion to fill in where quantitative data is missing.

Stakeholder involvement is critical but one of the most demanding steps. The European approach to stakeholder involvement is different from the Australian and American approach. Europe had stakeholders acting in a review function rather being involved at the beginning of the process. Plans with more stakeholder participation took longer to develop and approve but it is not clear if those with more involvement were more successful.

Decision support tools are available but not used extensively yet in marine spatial planning.

The product of plans is either a process for decision-making or a map designating uses. The proximate indicator of what is considered success is to get the plan adopted but the ultimate goal is to use plan to allocate space and meet plan objectives.

Finally, most of the plans incorporate some level of monitoring. Adaptive management is a guiding principle but has only been made operational in one or two cases. The full feedback cycle has not been fully implemented in marine spatial planning anywhere.

Discussion of Overall Report

Jerry Schubel asked whether, before a formal process was launched, there was any informal process and did it help or hinder any formal process launch? Dr. Collie responded the group did not look specifically at this question but his observation was that having a history certainly helped in some cases to either speed process or do a mid-course correction.

Larry Robinson asked Dr. Collie to distinguish stakeholder role in development of plan versus implementation of plan. Dr. Collie replied it depended on the part of the process where stakeholders were involved. Dr. Robinson asked if the successful plans engaged in one or the other. Dr. Collie said there was no conclusion yet on whether engagement early in the process can make a difference in the outcome. One proximate measurement of success is if stakeholders are not involved in plan development, they can oppose the plans later on.

Dr. Robinson asked if an executive order is considered a legislative mandate. Dr. Collie replied that government mandate was defined broadly in this exercise.

Frank Kudrna asked if any of examples of government mandate were authorities of waters that were the properties of subdivisions of federal government or if they were all federal waters. Dr. Collie was not sure in every country; there may have been mixes of federal and state authority. Dr. Kudrna said the Great Lakes governors are parochial so it would be good in a Great Lakes plan to distinguish between federal, state and binational waters.

Jennifer Lukens asked about measures of success and performance measures, for example, regulatory streamlining, reduction of cumulative impacts. Dr. Collie said regulatory efficiencies were not highlighted in the plans they reviewed; going forward, NOAA should indicate that these should be measured.

Report Primary Recommendations

Dr. Collie presented the specific parts of the report recommendations for the members to consider.

Objectives - NOAA and the National Ocean Council (NOC) should support the development of operational objectives and they should be stated as specifically as possible early in process with regional science and stakeholder teams having a role.

Scope - NOAA should be supportive of sub-regional planning efforts and should support plan development on a variety of levels with public and private partners.

Data - timelines should be set for data-gathering and compilation to allow sufficient time in the planning effort for analysis and decision-making because the time for analysis and decision-making often gets reduced in the end.

Participants - NOAA should provide guidance to regions on stakeholder roles and responsibilities early in the process.

Decision support tools - NOAA should provide guidance using best practices available from recent efforts. NOAA should also support development of tools, particularly tradeoff analysis tools.

Social and Economic Outcomes - NOAA should support formal metric measures for social and economic outcomes, identify permitting time and costs as useful metrics, and should gather information now on some current permitting times and costs of regional CMSP efforts

Jake Rice, ESWMG member, noted that, across the range of cases, there is a mix of federal and state jurisdictions.

Discussion of Recommendations

Ray Ban thanked Dr. Collie for the presentation. Mr. Ban said the SAB needs to be thinking of all the recommendations listed in the report in addition to ones in the executive summary.

Jerry Schubel said this is an excellent report and asked about if the role of experts could be explained in more detail. While stakeholder involvement is critical, they need expert guidance once goals are identified. Dr. Collie said the use of science advisory teams was important in the process.

Larry Robinson asked whether there was information on costs of plans being developed. Dr. Collie said there were some estimates on the cost of getting people together, holding meetings, buying time of experts that do the work, cost of the data collection, synthesis, and new data collection efforts. They did not consider data on what it would cost to implement the plans. Jake Rice said the degree to which existing data had already been pulled together and were georeferenced for other reasons resulted in cost savings.

Jerry Schubel noted that there will be a meeting of 50 people on CMSP in the Southern California Bight; this effort is an informal way to get together to discuss what CMSP would look like in southern California. He asked if the group could provide advice to make this more useful. Dr. Collie replied that having a scoping meeting is good in a way and allows people to get elements on the table to understand users to be included, interests, etc. Jeremy noted that to progress beyond that point, the objectives progressed from conceptual to operational and that tradeoffs occurred. In scoping, people may be less prone to stake out positions. There is a need to be clear that there is no outcome from the meeting so that people can be free to comment. As the process proceeds then tradeoffs need to be made. To make those tradeoffs, there is a need to

have a mandated outcome before you start. Jake Rice said if you know there will be people or sectors that will be problematic; they should be included in the first meeting. If those individuals are ignored, there may be problems later in the process. Dr. Collie said it is helpful to define the roles and responsibilities early in the process. In a warm-up or scoping meeting people are cooperative, but when decisions being made, people may feel they have been burned.

Larry Robinson asked about the point at which stakeholders are involved. They are often involved in planning but not often in implementation processes. At NOAA there have been discussions across the country on national ocean policy; it may be worth touching base with Jennifer Lukens on what NOAA has done. There will be a national CMSP workshop held in June 2011.

Ray Ban asked if there were any parts of the recommendations that are a problem with any board members. Ray asked if under item B1 if there were any points that ESMWG wanted to emphasize. Dr. Collie said some plans with limited scope were able to be implemented more quickly, but the tradeoff is if you ignore a sector, it may backfire. There is no prescription; there is a need to look at all sectors. NOAA wants to show early success and roll out some plans that will be considered useful and successful; to do this NOAA may want to start with less complex plans to gain some success.

Ray Ban asked if the cost is financial or is it time costs in considering engagement. Dr. Collie replied that it is both.

Larry Robinson asked it would be useful to have a marine spatial planning process with a manageable scope to get early success and look where to target the early success. Dr. Collie agreed targeting is necessary; going from the scope of a vast area there is a need to decide where to invest resources.

Ray Ban asked Dr. Collie to add a sentence under item B1 to add points made in this discussion on targeting for early success. Dr. Collie asked if they should provide examples of what are the tradeoffs. Mr. Ban agreed that it would be helpful to add some clarifying points.

Ray Ban asked if with the minor editing of recommendation B1 is there a motion to accept and transmit the report. The motion was made, seconded and approved unanimously

Jim Sanchirico asked if the SAB wanted to request that the response on CMSP recommendations from NOAA should be on a faster timeline than the normal one year response. Ray Ban said this request could be made in the transmittal letter if the SAB agreed. Paul Doremus said that NOAA could propose a timeframe back once the report is reviewed. Ray Ban said the transmittal letter can say that the timeline for response could be less than a year with a suggestion of the fall meeting. Jerry Schubel commented that this is a request so it seems the right way to go.

Paul Doremus noted that while the recommendations are directed to NOAA many have complexities that involve the National Ocean Council so the agency will need to think about what can be done by NOAA and what requires involvement with other federal agencies. Ray Ban agreed and said perhaps NOAA can split its response to the report and perhaps come back in the fall with a response to some recommendations and come back with a full response later.

Dr. Collie thanked the SAB members for their attention and recognized some of the recommendations will be parsed between NOAA and the NOC. The ESMWG hoped the recommendations can be useful to NOAA.

Ray Ban thanked Dr. Collie and the ESMWG for a comprehensive and thorough report and the preliminary reports received earlier make this report much easier to understand.

Action 1: The Science Advisory Board Working Group Subcommittee will accept the report from the Ecosystem Sciences and Management Working Group on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning, after requested revisions by the ESMWG

Action 2: The SAB Office transmit the ESMWG report on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning to NOAA with a transmittal letter that requests a response from NOAA sooner than one year from the time of transmittal.

Action 3: NOAA will provide a response to the SAB ESMWG report on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning in an appropriate timeframe.

Concept of Operations (ConOps) for SAB Working Groups and Task Forces

Ray Ban, The Weather Channel and Chair, SAB

Ray Ban introduced this topic. The SAB concept of Operation for SAB Working Groups and Task Forces (ConOps) is a document that the Board has been working on for some time. He asked members for their thoughts, comments and suggested edits on the new version of the ConOps provided before the teleconference.

Frank Kudrna said a good job was done on this version of the document. In naming members to working groups, the document states that members must be appointed at in-person meetings of the SAB. Could appointments also be made during teleconference calls as well as at in person meetings? The response was yes, it could be done at either. The language will be revised to reflect this. Dr. Kudrna further noted that the liaison role was not clear and whether that SAB member is a member of the group. Cynthia agreed we don't say whether it is preferred that they be a member or liaison. Ray Ban said the language used for Chair of the working group and can be incorporated in the working group member paragraph.

Frank Kudrna liked the work product language; is this language generic enough to allow the working groups to be aligned with goals? Cynthia Decker said this language is meant to be generic enough to allow the groups to be operated no matter what the topic area is that they will address. Ray Ban said the concept of operations would be valid no matter where the SAB is in the process of alignment with goals.

Eric Barron said he thought this document was consistent with earlier discussions; there is wording saying that if additional expertise is needed that could go through existing working groups.

Jerry Schubel said the ConOps is a comprehensive document that is not inconsistent with the proposed realignment according to the goals.

Cynthia Decker suggested that the ConOps be sent to the working groups for comments and then a decision on whether to adopt the document could be made at the July meeting.

Bill Townsend asked about the last sentence of the document and its meaning and whether it implies that the SAB and its working groups work as consensus groups as that was not his experience with NASA advisory groups. Mary Glackin said NASA puts together advisory groups that are not commissioned under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and in those cases the NASA advisory groups issue consensus reports. Mary Glackin said that SAB working groups seek to work by consensus but on occasion NOAA has received minority reports from working groups. Cynthia Decker said language was added that when NOAA wants quick advice that can't wait for full SAB consideration; individuals can provide non-consensus advice.

Ray Ban asked if anyone opposed passing this to Working Groups for feedback. Members agreed that the document should be provided to Working Groups for comment.

Action 5: SAB Working Groups will provide comments on the SAB Working Group Concept of Operations in time for consideration by the SAB at its July 2011 meeting.

On another topic, Bill Townsend referred to the March SAB meeting discussion with Dr. Lubchenco on working with the Hill on the importance of the weather satellite program. Dr. Townsend noted that there was an op-ed article on this and the string of tornadoes that ripped through the southeast U.S. and the weather satellites saw evidence of this event five days ahead and 12 hours out were able to alert regions. Cynthia Decker asked Bill Townsend to send the article to the SAB office to distribute to the SAB members.

Ray Ban said the summer meeting is in Ann Arbor Michigan July 20-21; ~~the~~ the first day of the meeting is at the Michigan League and the second day at the GLERL. The morning of the 21st will focus on regional issues.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Actions

Action 1: The Science Advisory Board Working Group Subcommittee will accept the report from the Ecosystem Sciences and Management Working Group on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning, after requested revisions by the ESMWG

Action 2: The SAB Office transmit the ESMWG report on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning to NOAA with a transmittal letter that requests a response from NOAA sooner than one year from the time of transmittal.

Action 3: NOAA will provide a response to the SAB ESMWG report on Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning in an appropriate timeframe.

Action 4: The Science Advisory Board Office will revise the SAB Working Group Concept of Operations as per SAB member comments and will send out to the SAB working groups for comments.

Action 5: SAB Working Groups will provide comments on the SAB Working Group Concept of Operations in time for consideration by the SAB at its July 2011 meeting.