**NOAA HAB Liaison Project Advisory Committee Meeting Summary – August 5, 3-5 via Zoom**

**Present:**

Rick Stumpf, NCCOS

Veronica Lance, NOAA CW

Elizabeth Rohring, NSGO

***Participating Programs Directors (AC) &/or delegate***

Sherry Larkin, FLSG

Mike Allen, MDSG

LaDon Swan, MASGC

Steve Sempier, MASGC

Kathy Bunting-Howarth, NYSG

Chris Winslow, OHSG

Pamela Plotkin, TXSG

Cindy Lyle, TXSG

Russell Callender, WASG

Tom Johengen, MISG

Barb Kirkpatrick, GCOOS

Ana Sirviente, GLOS

Jan Newton, NANOOS

Clarissa Anderson, SCCOOS

Debra Hernandez, SECOORA

Jennifer Dorton, SECOORA

**Hopes of Advisory Committee** – in response to *“What is one big thing you are hoping for with the AC meeting/project?”* – we may have missed capturing a few.

Have the AC feel confident that these efforts are worthy and benefits will result.

Be able to identify communities that directly benefited from our programming in this space.

Bring data to solve useful problems and address what is needed.

HABs are extremely important, a lot of help is needed; I want to bring satellite data to your world, and the applications that result. Increase the visibility of CW.

Meeting and engaging with new team on this issue.

HABs have fatal consequences, we need to know when it is coming, seafood coordination/information is key.

Help our people be prepared in advance.

There are significant resources available from the state regarding HABS; we do not want to duplicate or replicate. We want to avoid redundancy so see significant benefits from engaging in a broader SG-focused network.

Build to better respond, to be better prepared. Part of that is staff turnover that elevates the need for information to be stored and available in a systematic way so it is not lost. Response planning is key to be better prepared.

Desire to learn more; would be prudent to distinguish between scientific partners/outlets and those focused on outreach and communication (eg. US HABS is scientific).

We have challenges to public health, would like to share BMPs (best management practices), want to avoid redundancies – all speaks to the need for a Sea Grant-led Coalition.

Representing Great Lakes, Lake Erie, forecasting is key, looking forward to benefiting from new technologies, especially interested in toxin work (note: need to distinguish ‘toxicity’).

Ditto Tom and Chris, wants to elevate the value of having a Road Map.

Community differences are extreme and a challenge, all HABS are different and Google Searches will provide misinformation to our stakeholders; would like everyone to embrace the differences and recognize that BMPs are algal species specific.

Interested in long-term relationships; value of “cross-talk” and helping to foster crosstalk within this group.

Self-proclaimed HAB Novice, so we will definitely change that.

**Deliverables – Year 1**

1. Input/Output (Forecasting) Workshops – Rick suggested areas for years one and two, and encouraged discussion. No decision made. But tagging onto other meetings is a possibility. We will follow up thru email conversation.
	1. New York – Kathy - would this be freshwater or marine. Cyano concerns in Lake Ontario. Timing – USHABS 2022 in New York (fall). Rick - Conference typically attracts more agency folks from stake where conference is held.
	2. Washington – the outer coast is well known but inside Puget Sound could benefit. Russell - I want to understand how the inland (Puget Sound) can be factored in as the spatial scale isn’t amenable to satellite imagery…
	3. Maryland – Issues in Chesapeake Bay extend across bay including Virginia.
	4. California – CHARM doing well but maybe opportunities related to SCCOOS products. Want forecasts to be integrated.
	5. Know GOM well in relation to KB, so wouldn’t focus there, but Texas is kind of interesting case in regard to the occasional and unpredictable brown and red tides.
	6. Ohio – well known, like GOM wouldn’t focus there immediately. But Chris would like to keep some emphasis on the need to predict toxicity.
	7. Tom – Joint Aquatics Session in Grand Rapids, MI – May 14-20, 2022. Will attract ~3k participants. Saginaw Bay – no issues with public water but issues with recreation. How far interior – Focus on Great Lakes and Coasts but cyano concerns in FW are the same everywhere. If folks from smaller lakes/rivers attend no problem. From Veronica to Everyone regarding inland systems - As the earth observational satellite sensors and methodology, they "see" water bodies without regard to political boundaries. When we do have appropriate observations (resolution, bands, and/or a "smart way" (e.g., neural networks) to get at those things.
2. NOAA CoastWatch course development & training - Update
	1. Veronica – goals to better understand Sea Grant needs and to expand CW to new audiences (expand visibility and service)
	2. Betty – working with CW Nodes to develop module. They already have in their workplan to develop a water quality module with aquaculture focus beginning in Oct. 2021. We will coordinate. My first step is to develop a needs assessment. Trainings to occur in years 2-4 and we have 1 per year in grant.
3. Session at National Meeting
	1. Grant calls for 1 session a year. We initially thought Sea Grant Week for year 1, but it will not occur until year 2. Also considered SGA but not sure it is the right venue. We like the idea of something associated with SG the first year to raise visibility of project across network.
	2. Brainstorm of other conferences. (list captured in Excel)
	3. Elizabeth – what is the intent? That will help to identify meeting. NSGO maintains a list of meetings and can help.
	4. LaDon - What about presentations as part of industry meetings?
	5. Sherry – we may not meet this deliverable for year 1 given the delay in project announcement – missed window for meetings already scheduled.
4. Key Contacts
	1. Key contacts are based on everyone involved in project and their networks. Most Betty has spoken with (all highlighted yellow). These individuals would include the project team, experts, potential workshop and training participants, and potential CoP participants.
	2. Debra – Will we have access to list – it would be very helpful. – yes, was linked to files no one could open. Will email to group. Please continue to add to spreadsheet.
5. CoP
	1. Chris – looking at Key Contacts – very diverse. Not sure that a CoP would keep interest.
	2. Kathy - Do you need a fresh and a salt?
	3. Steve - Could also organize some elements by primary audience (public health, fisheries, tourism). ID needs by these groups and foster conversations between these groups on lessons learned, etc.
	4. Kathy - Maybe the first CoP should be open to SG and partners and have breakouts to identify themes for professional development?
	5. LaDon – Lots of experts on Zoom – would be helpful if we could answer questions for non-experts.
	6. Sherry – reiterated year 1 deliverables – who & how.

**Milestones - Sherry**

1. MOU – Grant is an MOU and sufficiently details expectations, so a separate one is not necessary and our federal partners would not be able to sign anyway.
2. AC meeting structure - want to be inclusive. Betty & Sherry can put together meeting materials but do we want a chair/co-chair? Resounding no. How often do we want to meet? Quarterly at least for now.
3. POC’s – need to make sure they are identified
4. Communication – Grant calls for developing a website of “experts” hosted by NCCOS. Also, would like to create a project webpage for project team where things like meeting announcements, agendas and meeting materials could be posted. Also, where resources developed would be housed. Some could also be put on other webpages (NCCOS & National HAB Network as example).
	1. Implementation Plan – want everyone to have and be able to share. Look at and make comments, make sure logos are correct.
	2. Tag line – want a tag line to brand project and help retain project focus. Homework to look at word doc and think of tag or acronym.

**Other Note:** SharePoint not a good avenue. In the future meeting materials will be on the website or shared via another format.