

. 1

ORIGINAL

IN THE MATTER OF:

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

The above-entitled matter came on for a

public meeting on Thursday, May 25, 2006,

commencing at 8:10 a.m., at The Consortium For

Oceanographic Research and Education, 1201 New York

Avenue, Suite 420, Washington, D.C. 20005, J. Scott

Rainey, Chairman, presiding.

Reported by: Richard D. Baker, Jr.

		2
· 1	INDEX	PAGE
2	Welcome and Administrative Comments	3
	Mr. Scott Rainey, HSRP Chair	
3	Rear Admiral Richard West, USN (Ret.),	
	President and CEO, CORE	
4	Captain Steve Barnum, NOAA, DFO	
5	Introduction of Keynote Speaker	5
	Captain Barnum	
6		
	Keynote Speaker - NOS Navigation Services and	
7	HSRP Collaborative Efforts: Panels and Q&A	
	John H. Dunnigan, Asst. Administrator,	
8	NOS	
9	HSRP Deliberations and Discussions on NOAA	7
	Navigation Services Role in Responding to	
10	Incidents of National Significance and NOAA	
	Issues for CMTS Consideration	
11	Mr. Rainey	
12	HSRP Deliberations and Discussions on the	96
	Hydrographic Services Improvement Act	
13	Mr. Rainey	
	Ms. Helen Brohl, NSRP Deputy Chair	
14		
	CORE: Current Ocean Initiatives and Pending	149
15	Issues	
	Core External Affairs	
16		
	NOAA's Navigational Services Priorities	238
17	Relative to the Integrated Ocean Observing	
	System Overview	
18	Mr. David Zilkoski, Director,	
	National Geodetic Survey, NOAA	
19		
	Old Business/New Business	312
20		
21		1.0

PROCEEDINGS

. 1

MR. RAINEY: Good morning. I'm Scott
Rainey, chair of the Hydrographic Services Review
Panel. I'd like to welcome all the members and
public attendees. We did have a signup outside for
the public, if they could sign it and indicate also
if they had any comments or would like to address
the panel. We're going to try to find a time
around our lunch break to move in any opportunity
for the public to address the panel. So please
indicate if you have some remarks.

Just had a couple of quick things. I wanted to say thank you very much to Admiral West for hosting us today at his offices here at CORE.

It's a beautiful facility and office and I really appreciate that. And I think any of you who had the opportunity to attend Captain Parsons' retirement ceremony, and we had a small part in that and I wanted to thank all the members that were able to attend and Helen and Lou also particularly for their help in our piece of that

1 with the declaration that we had for Captain

2 Parsons and putting, for the NOAA/CORE commendation

3 medal for his work with us. I think that was a

4 | fitting tribute and I appreciate everybody's help

5 and support on that. I was glad we could be a part

6 of that.

7 I'll go ahead and turn it over, unless,

8 Admiral, do you have any required egress briefings

9 or anything we need to do?

10 RADM WEST: Glad I could be here. My

11 deputy director for external affairs is going to

12 spend some time this afternoon to tell you a little

13 bit about CORE, who we are and the major ocean

14 issues we're working on in town. There's a lot of

15 stuff going on. So she's on top of that. She'll

16 be giving you all that this afternoon.

MR. RAINEY: Thanks. And I wanted to

18 also acknowledge that Mr. Richard Baker here is

19 recording this for us. We had the service at our

20 previous meeting so I know everybody's familiar. I

21 promised him we'll try to keep most of it in

English, a little bit of Greek, and we'll see where we go from there, but we'll try to talk one at a time and he's going to try to pull our names off the name tags, so if you have anything particularly controversial, switch out your name tag first.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

He'll interject when we're going a little too fast.

Let me turn it over to Captain Steve Barnum, who as you know is our new designated federal officer. Good morning and welcome to the Hydrographic Services Review Panel. I am the new designated federal official. As the new director of Office of Coast Survey it's my pleasure to be here to serve as DFO. HSRP is a panel that advises NOAA on its navigational service and I'm very pleased to have this austere group here today to advise NOAA on the direction on its navigation services programs. I do not have any lengthy opening comments. I know we have a short meeting today, just one day and a packed agenda, so with that I'm going to introduce our keynote speaker, and that is NOAA's assistant administrator for

National Ocean Services, John Dunnigan. Dunnigan is the assistant administrator for NOAA's Ocean Services. He has broad experience in marine science and policy in the service of marine resource conservation. Mr. Dunnigan has been associated with NOAA throughout his career beginning as a NOAA congressional affairs intern in 1972. Since 2002 he has overseen NOAA's efforts promoting fishery conservation and management programs aimed at achieving the optimum sustainable yield for U.S. fisheries on an annual basis. has played a key role in guiding NOAA's policy under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. While serving as director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Dunnigan also 16 served as the director of the NOAA Ecosystem Goal Team, one of the four mission goals in the agency. He has led efforts to develop long-term multi-year 19 policy direction as NOAA works to implement an 20 ecosystem approach to its management of the nation's marine resources. He joined NOS as the 21

. 1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

1 assistant administrator in January of 2006.

Mr. Dunnigan received his law degree from the University of Washington, where he focused on environmental and marine law and legislation.

He holds an undergraduate degree in communications from California State University and is an active member of the Columbia Bar Association and a member of the Washington State Bar Association, and with that it's my pleasure to introduce Jack Dunnigan.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Thank you. Good morning.

I'll use this because I'm so hard to hear and maybe

if I could just for this purpose move over this way

so I can see everybody. Hi, Andy, hey, hi. So I

can see everybody and say hello.

What I would like to do this morning is tell you a little bit about me and a little bit about what I see are the challenges and opportunities for all of us and perhaps a little bit about what I think our future as a committee and as an agency working together can be if we try to make it happen.

Just a little bit about me. Steve went through the major highlights of my career. I like to tell people that I'm the guy who's quit NOAA three times and I am either the testament to the existence of the well-oiled revolving door or I am the proverbial bad penny that just can't keep going The nice thing about being able to say that, though, is to note that I've been able to join NOAA four times and it's always been a privilege on my part to be able to do that. NOAA has been a terrific home for me and for my family. They've given us the opportunity to move all over the country. Our children have this great sense of wanderlust from having had the opportunity to live on the west coast and in the south and in New England and then in Washington, D.C. So much so that as adults they've all gone up and moved away so we don't get to see them very often. daughter flew in from California last night, so. But NOAA's been a great place, it's been a great place to have a career, it's been a terrific agency

. 1

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

opportunity to really get involved in things that are important to the country and to have this strong sense that you're able to do something that's contributing to what our people really need.

. 1

Now, most of my experience in the last 30 years or so has been related to fisheries. I'm a lawyer as was said. Scott and I both come from the same law school, but most of what I've done, and the biggest thing that I've done outside of the agency that the people would know me for is having been the executive director of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

what my fisheries background really showed me was the power of collaboration. You know, in 1976 Congress had this great idea that we didn't have to have a commanding control regulatory system for this country's fisheries, that we could do it collaboratively through stakeholder-oriented groups called Regional Fishery Management Councils. Certainly over the 30 years of the

Magnuson-Stevens Act the council system has had its share of the good, the bad and the ugly, but over the long term, you know, the sense that we have a mutual future that we need to share and that we need to work together to try to move towards that I think has been a basic part of what's been good certainly about the federal fisheries management system.

. 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The other thing is those eleven years that I spent at the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission are really significant because here you have an organization that was formed in 1942, totally voluntary, among 15 different fractious and contentious states, and yet they have found the opportunity, especially over the last fifteen years, of sitting down and recognizing their mutual future and a way for them to work together to go forward. And remember, in our country it's the states who are sovereign and for them to come to an organization like an interstate fish commission and say we're willing to put our

1 sovereignty second on any individual issue because

2 we know that the future that we can arrive at

together is more important I think, is a very

4 | significant thing and the Atlantic States

5 Commission has been a leader and done a great job.

6 So I come into this version of my career in NOAA

with a strong orientation towards partnering and

8 towards collaboration.

Let me also say that in my career in fisheries, we have a major federal advisory committee similar to this one. It's called the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee, and I have worn so many hats at that committee you couldn't shake a stick at. I was their lawyer, I was their chief of staff, I finally became a nonvoting member when I was at the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, and then when I came back to NOAA four years ago I was among the office directors who were principal in bringing issues to the committee, leading a well-rounded and fully fleshed out discussion. We thought -- we did a pretty good job

I think in arriving at an administration position right now under Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and our ability to work with our advisory committee was absolutely fundamental over a period of about two and a half years to getting the administration to the point where it could come forward with a bill, with all of the contention that's associated with Magnuson-Stevens, come forward with a bill that really dealt with the substantive significant policy issues of the day. Unlike a lot of administration efforts which are usually technical in nature, which avoid any controversy, you know, the administration's Magnuson bill deals with economic regulation, it deals with IQs, it deals with ecosystems, it deals with registration of 17 recreational fishermen. All of the major important issues that are there, the government, the administration, has a position on. And I think that's a testament to our ability and the commitment frankly of the members of our advisory

. 1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

committee to sit down and talk to us.

. 1

So as we move forward together I am looking for an opportunity to work with you, and I'll talk a little bit more about this when I wrap up my initial comments, but a good opportunity to work with you to talk about what our future is, what the issues are there, what's important to our country and how NOAA can best respond to making those things happen.

I've been at NOS now for four months, four months and three days. And a couple of things happened to me when I came over here from fisheries. First of all, as a person who has been in NOAA for 20 years and in this business for 30, I really was shocked at how surprised I was with the diversity of the portfolio at the National Ocean Service. I have been as the Ecosystem Goal Team lead generally familiar with a number of the programs that are executed in NOS, but it really struck me that there was so much diversity in what we had to do from estuary research reserves and

sanctuaries and marine protected areas to oil spill response and restoration to corals, to a wide range of scientific assessment monitoring and research, and all of that I was somewhat familiar with and what I was not familiar with really at all except for my co-gold team lead here, Steve, who helped me begin to understand what was going on in the commerce transportation side of our agency. generally consider that to be the Office of Coast Survey and CO-OPS and the National Geodetic Survey. So all of those issues were sort of new to me and I was immediately impressed because I'd always thought of NOAA as an environmental stewardship agency and what I really began to learn quickly was this was an agency whose mission is vital to the commerce and economic security of our country. so I've really been I think privileged to be able to have that sort of opened up to me.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And what we began to learn really last year and, you know, shame on us for not figuring this out sooner, as a result of the devastating

. 1 storms that occurred in the Gulf of Mexico and in 2 the south generally, was how much these two sides of our house are really tied together, because it's 3 really all about the water and not just what 5 happens in coastal areas but what happens in upland areas and the absolute necessity for NOAA, if it's 6 7 going to fulfill its mission, to be able to 8 integrate across what we do and also to be able to 9 reach out and integrate with partners, other 10 federal agencies, EPA, USGS, Corps of Engineers, 11 Coast Guard, National Geospatial Intelligence 12 Agency, and also with state partners, and I, having 13 had this background with the states, please understand that I really am committed to 14 15 recognizing the fact that states are governing 16 bodies too. They're also public trust 17 responsibility agencies and we need to be working 18 together with them to be really effective. So I do 19 come in with this sense of collaboration and the 20 sense that we need to move ahead.

it took us a couple weeks beyond that to put out a report, and frankly I don't know if you've seen this but there's no reason why you shouldn't, and we would be glad to make it available to you, I came up with a transition report that sort of summarized my initial impressions and initial set of things that I thought we could do within the National Ocean Service to help NOAA to move forward with its strategic objectives.

. 1

Ocean Service is an organization that's pretty well aligned. It is an organization of tremendous people. How often do we say that people are our most important asset? It almost becomes routine to say it, but I really have been impressed. I like to tell the story that we had a number of our class fellows come up to the front office when I'd been in there a couple weeks, when they'd been there, the new class had been there for a couple weeks.

As they were leaving I said well, tell me what has struck you most about being at the National Ocean

. 1 Service and they talked about it and they agreed on 2 two things. They said first of all, we can't 3 believe how nice everybody is. Here we are a bunch 4 of kids coming from all over the country, some of 5 us being away from home for the first time and we are all being made to feel welcome and a part of 7 the family. The second thing they said was we 8 can't believe how committed and passionate 9 everybody is about their work. To me these are, in our profession these are some of the most 10 11 optimistic and dedicated young people in the whole 12 country and they're telling us they think we're 13 passionate. That was a statement to me and I think 14 it was a good statement about what I found at NOS. 15 I'm not a reorganizer. I'm not coming 16 in to make a whole lot of changes. I would like to 17 reinforce the things that are there to provide some alignment. I've got a couple of major issues that 18 19 we'll talk about in a minute that I'd like to try 20 to focus on. But NOAA and NOS to me are

organizations that are going in the right

direction. They have a lot of capacity and capability and have very strong foundations to move forward on. Change, however, happens and the slide that's ahead of you, and I think this handout has been delivered to everybody, I'm just going to talk generally about some of the concepts that are in here.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Change happens, paradigms shift. might look at the two boats that are represented on this slide. The top one is the first boat that my wife and I owned and it was terrific boat. It's a Maxim 27, a light weekend cruiser for the Chesapeake Bay, it got us interested in boating, it got us really to love the water, got us just great stuff. There were a couple of things about it. noticed that the best time on our boat was when the engine went off, and that really began -- and, you know, the noise and the vibration. The other thing about that boat was a lot of our boating friends were really people who used their boats to get from one place to another, usually a place associated

with consumption of large amounts of alcohol, and that wasn't really the kind of boating experience that we were interested in. So when we decided to go for a sailboat my wife said the words that every man wants to hear from his woman; honey, I want you to buy a boat big enough to keep you happy. So we We shifted to a boat that is -- and shifted. again, there's nothing wrong with the way we've been doing things for a long time. But we shifted to a boat that is certainly quiet. The fuel bill on the upper boat last year I had it was \$1300, the fuel bill on the lower boat the first year I had it was \$17.87. There are just lots of different things. The upper boat went 25 miles an hour. The lower boat can do six knots on a good day. So you have to look at these things and say what is it we're trying to optimize, what is important to you and what are you trying to get out of the system. They're both valid experiences, but this kind of change is going to happen and we need to be ready to be able to respond to that and to use the assets

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

that you have.

. 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We had some, if we can go to the next slide, we had some discussions in the National Ocean Service about what our -- you know, in NOS we have a lot of very, sometimes too disparate sets of programs that can operate filly independent from each other. This is not new to me. For a long time the NOS leadership has been talking about what is it really that sustains us, that really is a part of, the essential part of the mission that we have. And for the moment I've been able to get it down to 13 words. I'd like to get it down to fewer, something like we bring good things to life. Somebody else already has that one. But to me part of what it's really all about is this idea or vision, what is it we'd like to see.

We'd really like to see people because it all starts with people. Sometimes when you're in an environmental agency people think you're talking just about the environment for its own sake, but really at NOAA we understand it's all

about the people. And people need to both enjoy and sustain. Government cannot do these things alone. The people have to understand that they are the stewards of the resource as well. And we have to help bring them to that understanding and we need oceans and coasts that are productive. that word rather than the word healthy because the word healthy can also connote questions of harmful algablooms for example or oceans and human health or seafood that is not healthy to eat. And that's not really what I'm talking about. I'm talking about resources that are productive and can be sustaining. And why do we do that? We do it because we're grounded in ecology, you know, the values of the resources and the services they In heritage. We have been a maritime provide. country for hundreds of years and parts of our agency are going to be 200 years old as of next year. And for economy. 98 percent or 95, I've heard a couple of numbers of what comes in and out of this country in trade goes by sea. So the

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

economic value of the resources that we're responsible for are critical and it's something that we have to absolutely remember at all times.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

If we can move ahead there. This is an interesting slide that was put together by some folks at Tenant Space Center. It was derived, the idea was derived from a different slide that we prepared for the Gulf of Alaska that came out of the Exxon Valdez program, and what we're trying to do is capture what ecosystems are all about and all of the different values and services that are associated with this here. And as we think about this, to me there are these four major areas that are important for NOAA and the National Ocean Service to focus on in the relatively near term, next 12 to 18 months.

First of all I think we have to have broader engagements at a regional and ecosystem level. We tend to compartmentalize problems and that's not a very effective way or efficient way of coming up with long-term solutions that give us the

kinds of results that we really want. Nothing . 1 2 frustrates me more than to do something that you 3 look back at it eight months later and you say well, there's a nice report sitting up on the table 5 but it really hasn't made a change. We should want change for America. And I think that you can get 7 there by bringing lots of issues, stakeholders and people together. Think of LNG for example, which 9 is a very current difficult issue. Is LNG an 10 ecosystems issue? Absolutely, as far as I'm 11 concerned. Better that we find ways of bringing 12 stakeholders and decision-makers together to talk 13 about transportation, exploration, fisheries, 14 commerce, tourism, you know, why should we make all 15 of these decisions in bins that are not related to each other and they're uncoordinated? We ought to 16 17 be finding ways to try to bring these things 18 together. And I think NOAA's in a position to be 19 able to help lead that, I think NOS is in a 20 position to be able to help lead NOAA. 21 experience we had in the Gulf of Mexico with the

Gulf of Mexico Alliance I think is a good start and we need to try to do that in more areas. But when I think of this, understand that when I talk about ecosystems I'm not just talking about water, fish, habitat, I'm talking about the interactions that people have with these resources, and that includes commerce, transportation, resource utilization, exploration. So to do it right you've got to bring a lot of things together.

. 1

A second major item I think important to us is this concept of integrating across the breadth of NOS, and this was the point I was raising a little bit earlier where we do so many things, we're just beginning to find the benefits of having our Geodesy Program working closely with our CO-OPS program and all of them working closely with our Habitat Restoration Program and in dealing with the climatological issues that are associated with our corals programs. There's a lot of integration across what we do that we can accomplish that's going to make what we do better.

A third major area is really community resiliency and this is national priority that was brought home to us last year as a result of the hurricanes. We really need to find a way across our government, working with states, working with people broadly to be able to build into the way we live in our ocean and coastal areas a resiliency to be able to deal with the environment that we have. And there's a question here of just being smart about the way that you plan, about the way that you commit and about the way that you use resources.

. 1

And then a fourth area is managing our integrated ocean and coastal observation, which there's been a lot of focus in the last couple of years on IOOS. David Zilkoski, who's sitting with us now, is NOAA's IOOS project manager, and what I have found talking on the hill and talking with groups around the country is that this is an idea that's getting some traction. People are interested in knowing what we're doing on IOOS and what we really see for the future and the vision of

it and the good thing about it is that word integrated because we recognize -- another one of those areas where NOAA recognizes it can't do it alone. We've got to be building partnerships with states, with the academic communities, with stakeholders to be able to get those observations and get it moving. So as I look at the sorts of things I'd like to be focusing myself on over the next year or so, these are the four major areas I've identified.

. 1

The next slide talks about a number of more specific things. I'm not going to take the time to walk you through what all of these are.

Clearly for anybody in government these days focusing on the President's Ocean Action Plan is a priority. And that's an area where we need to spend a lot of time within the National Ocean Service. Securing the future of America's maritime commerce is absolutely essential. NOAA is committed and I will be committed to the successful implementation and operations of the CMTS. We've

made a selection for a NOAA staff person who's going to be working over there full time with the new executive secretary once that is done, and I'm going to be engaged in that. So this is an area I think where NOAA recognizes the important role that we can play and the importance of this issue to the American people. So we'll definitely be strongly engaged there.

. 1

The issues related to the Hydrographic Services Review Panel, these are all issues that have come up that I know are on your agenda. What I'm looking forward to is the opportunity to talk to you to get your best advice, to get a good understanding of where you think NOAA can be going and the Department of Commerce can be going to help make these things successful in the way that they're resolved for the people of our country.

Let me close with just a comment, and then I really hope we'll have some time to have some good discussion, with my view of the federal

. 1 advisory committee. I hope you've gotten the sense that I believe that the government can work best 3 when we have open and transparent dialogue with lots of partners and stakeholders and I've always 4 5 been strongly in favor of doing that. To me we ought to be -- we at NOAA need to be sitting back 7 and saying we got a problem here and we need some 8 real experts who really know what's going on to help us solve that problem. We need to open it up 10 and have a constructive transparent engagement. me that's what a federal advisory committee can do 11 12 and that's the kind of relationship that I hope 13 we'll be able to develop, that we'll be able to sit 14 down and talk about these critical issues for, really for the future of our country and figure out 15 16 where are the pluses, where are the minuses, where 17 are the diverse interests, and diversity is 18 inherent in the nature of what we do. What are the 19 diverse interests that we all have to try to 20 respond to and have good open discussions, get good 21 solid recommendations, because when I go to Capitol

. 1 Hill or when I go to the Department of OMB I want 2 to be able to say these aren't just my ideas. 3 We've sat down with the best minds in the country 4 and talked about this and gotten the advice. 5 you will find from me, I hope, and it's my 6 commitment, a strong commitment to engagement, to 7 sitting down and having open discussions. We will not always agree, that's good. If we always agreed 9 with each other we really wouldn't have any reason 10 to meet. But sometimes we just need to sit down 11 and talk to each other honestly about what's 12 important for America and that's where I see the 13 real value of this group. 14 So I was really glad to find out when I 15 got here that we had the HSRP. If we didn't I 16 would have tried to invent one. I'm looking 17 forward to being able to sit down, coming back to a 18 meeting with you on a regular basis.

meetings will be on my schedule and so I'm hoping
to get to know all of you better, I've gotten to
meet some of you over the past couple of months,

and have a good opportunity to work together to talk about and find some answers to really difficult issues and problems that we're faced with.

. 1

It's a privilege to be here. Thank you very much and I think right now I'd just like to have an opportunity to answer questions that you all may have that I didn't get into or maybe go into a little more detail on any of these things and just basically begin our engagement working together, Scott, if that's okay. Thank you very much.

MR. RAINEY: Mr. Dunnigan, thanks very much --

MR. DUNNIGAN: It's Jack.

MR. RAINEY: -- for a very encouraging outlook and we very much appreciate that, and I know personally I've been very anxious or excited about this meeting because I think it's a wonderful opportunity to open up the dialogue and some new opportunities with you and Steve coming in to work

with us.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Just a quick note. On your agenda, we had invited Ms. Emily Woglom from OMB, she's not going to be able to be here, which is good and bad news, but that allows us a full time to have a great discussion here with Jack and Steve about their views and some of our experiences and concerns with the workings of the HSRP. I don't think I want to make any particular comments. I did have chance to brief Jack, and Mike Szabados was able to attend that meeting with me in the transition period that they talked about on some of our previous recommendations and where we're going and so I think at this time I'll just open it to the members and we'll just try to have a good dialogue and put Jack on and get a position fix on where we are and maybe some ideas and share some These microphones are kind of push down thoughts. to talk and then go ahead and release it.

You mentioned in the four teams that you were

MR. McBRIDE:

Jack, I have a question.

interested in advancing, one of them of course is, managing the Integrated Observing Systems and you listed NOS priorities, you referred as well to securing maritime commerce for the nation. Along the lines of converging those two thoughts, we've spent a lot of time in this community talking about the ports system as being backbone of a federal IOOS and form a fundamental element and being vitally important to the maritime commerce for the nation but unfortunately not receiving much attention or priority, certainly not at the hill, and the open question in my mind to NOAA generally, and I wonder what your thoughts are about how we can strengthen the delivery of a meaningful monitoring system within our major ports around the nation as a means of supporting both IOOS and maritime commerce.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: Yeah, I was real surprised, among the surprises, when I found out about the port system and our CO-OPS office that Mike Szabados had. And it's pretty impressive. I

never knew what Texas chicken was, so I got to learn a little bit about that and I really hoped to get down to Houston and see --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. McBRIDE: Come to Louisiana, we have that there too.

I think you're MR. DUNNIGAN: Fine. right, I think our port system needs to be an integral part of IOOS and it needs to be able to move forward. I think it's a wonderful tool. you think of what's happening, think of the future of maritime commerce on the globe, where more and more commercial vessels are being built that are larger and larger and we have to ask ourselves the question as a country where is the infrastructure going to come to be able to support those. seen pictures of large derricks and cranes coming under, the famous one coming under the Golden Gate Bridge. You know, you worry about how much water you have below you and how much air you have above you. Otherwise commerce just isn't going to work. And I think this is one of those areas where if

NOAA wasn't doing its job well, we would know it tomorrow morning. It's one of these things where every day we're providing a service that's absolutely essential. But I think I would make this observation back to you and I hope you'll have some resonance with it.

. 1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

NOAA doesn't always tell its story very well, and we've not always told our story very well on Capitol Hill. And I think that we have to put more energy into doing that. We owe it to the folks in the community, we owe it to the folks on the hill, we owe it to the people of the country to make sure that we're getting the word out. You know, not just us, working collaboratively with the commercial transportation community about how essential these services are and what's at stake if things don't go well. You know, when you're in government you begin to realize after a while it's really all about risk management. That's what fisheries regulation is all about. It's risk management, and the question is what's the risk if

we don't do this right 20 years from now, and it's that kind of vision that we have to have.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I guess to respond to your question I would say I recognize and I've come to learn that the close relationship and the importance of it, I think the country would be well served by a much stronger port system. I could make a good case that it's in our benefit to be able to provide that data, but we do have a problem in the country right now and it's above all of our pay grades. Well, maybe not Admiral West. And that is we're living in a country that wants to fight two wars, have tax relief, fix Social Security and provide economic relief when major parts of our country are hurt in storms. And, you know, you can't do all of that. I've got three grandchildren who are going to be paying for this. And so the country has got some real difficult priority issues to focus on and to sort out. Now, our job I think is to make sure that as the country, as the body politic goes through that, they clearly understand the risks and what's at the stake and what's important about the marine transportation system and how to make that work and how to make that effective. In the long run I'm a good and loyal public servant, I'm going to do what the President wants me to do. What I need to be able to and you need to be able to help me is make sure we're getting the story up the line so that when people make difficult choices they make them with their eyes wide open and with lots of good information. Bill.

. 1

MR. GRAY: Thank you very much, Jack.

Thank you very much. That was a, I think, very optimistic and wide ranging outlook that you put forward this morning for us and I think that's very, very positive. I also will say I'm going to be repetitive because I had the opportunity and it was very pleasant yesterday at lunch to talk with you about some of the interests that I have and some of the reasons why I wanted to be a part of this group. At the risk of taking a little bit of time, Scott, if I can go through this.

MR. RAINEY: Certainly.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. GRAY: When we talked on Monday about what kind of meeting we were going to have this week, we said well, let's all put out some of the questions or issues we'd like to bring up with Jack Dunnigan, and I said I'll try to do that in one piece of paper and I copied these, I think there's enough to go around for the committee. I'll just go through this and I'll say NOAA/NOS has developed some very excellent new hydrographic data gathering and distribution techniques, but their use has been severely limited due to totally inadequate funding for at least the last ten to fifteen years, specifically and has just been said, the ports realtime data acquisition system capability designed for use in over a hundred U.S. ports to provide mariners with realtime tide, current and weather data only exists in about ten ports, maybe twelve, I don't know, and all of the funding has to come from each local port. You know, they have to pass the begging bowl that?

each year in New York, Delaware, wherever it is, Houston, to even make these things operable.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Broad beam, I guess multi-beam is the right term, sonar scanning for full bottom sounding coverage has been commonly available for perhaps a dozen years but in this time less than half of the navigationally sensitive 61,000 square miles identified by NOAA/NOS have been surveyed about this technique and almost none of the federally maintained channels which the Army engineers dredged and maintained have been surveyed by these modern techniques. The final report the Coast Guard now has out on the ATHOS 1 tanker spill in the fall of 2000 in the Delaware River makes it clear that the ship's crew and the pilots bear none of the blame for this accident caused by large metal debris in this government-maintained channel and anchorage because the engineers don't have broad beam sonar or multi-beam sonar and NOAA wasn't called in until after the accident. found the stuff. Thus causing the ship owner's

insurer a cost of over \$165 million and still counting. They doubled the liability for the owners of single hull tankers through no fault of their own. Why is this?

. 1

These deficiencies are virtually because of totally inadequate funding, not lack of knowledge or diligence by NOAA/NOS staff. The people I've been associated with in the last eleven or twelve years in NOAA, they're good people, they know what to do, they know how to do it. All of this has been known and pointed out. The National Academy of Sciences had a 1994 report called Charting A Course to the Digital Future.

Intertanko's 1996 Port and Terminal
Safety Study, I did most of this for them, we
echoed some of those points again and urged that
the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, which has
accumulated several billions of dollars -- marine
really gets nothing back from those things, why is
that? And then there was also this report, the
Intertanko Port and Terminal Safety Report was

really the reason that we have an MTS system now or

2 | what's called an MTS system because it produced the

3 MTS report in 1999 which created the MTS Advisory

4 | Committee and the integrated committee and now it's

5 a cabinet level post. What it's doing I don't

6 know, but to members here of NOAA, I think they

7 | should bring these things up.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And I'm curious, Jack, whether you've seen any of these studies. If you haven't I think your staff should get them for you and you should take a look. They're ten years old or more. They really laid it out and we're still where we were ten years ago.

The net result of these deficiencies in accurate hydrographic data is that the United States, despite being the worlds largest trading nation, receiving and shipping well over 90 percent, well over 95 percent I guess, with all these exports and imports through our harbors, also has many substandard harbors which are not nearly as safe as they could be with the technology that's

available today. I ask the question how can anyone responsible for safe and environmentally sensitive waterways tolerate this disgraceful situation? And it is a disgraceful, actually a tragic situation.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Intertanko asked me to do this report in 1994 because of the concern they had for the liability, the dual liability that ship owners face coming into this country, both federal and state liability. And I told them when they asked me to do this, I know that in 29 years with Exxon we had over half our groundings and collisions in just two places and that was in the lower Mississippi and Houston Ship Channel, and that's over half of them, with less than 5 percent of our traffic in those areas. So the frequency was terrible by comparison to other areas and so forth like that. Sadly I think this country still has ports and harbors and waterways that are not as well maintained or known, as do a lot of the rest of the world, both the undeveloped world and the developed world, where they've paid more attention to it. And I don't

think this is really NOAA/NOS's fault. I think it's quite right, you said they don't necessarily tell their story very well. I think that's true.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

One of the words I don't think I heard in your very good presentation is safety. And to me navigational commercial safety for the commerce of this country is absolutely vital. People on behalf of container ships afterwards this Dubai fiasco, I talked with their main lobbyist yesterday afternoon, Chris Cook, and he made the point that if some of the things that the politicians want to do happened, the commerce of this country would absolutely stop. The secretary general of IMO has taken to saying if we stop shipping commerce around the world, within two weeks half of the world would have frozen and the other half would have starved. That's how important these things are. So I hope that there can be some -- these are all points that people on the HSRP know. We've made these points in various ways, we've forwarded them through discussion and so forth. But I don't feel we've

really ever gotten anything going to improve this . 1 2 situation, because as Steve Barnum told me 3 yesterday, the commerce goal and so forth gets about 3 percent I think of NOS's total budget. 4 5 the time the charting the course to the future came 6 out it was one and a quarter percent or something 7 like that. I know hurricanes and typhoons and tornados, they're important, but so are safe 8 9 harbors. So that's the message I wanted to get

MR. DUNNIGAN: Thanks, Bill. I think very well put, frankly. I wish I could have articulated some of these things as well in my opening comments as you did.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

across.

You know, a lot of what I would react to to these questions is to say hear hear. A lot of it I can resonate with and would like to do something about. Where I'm a little bit unsure is, you know, where the right direction is to go here. We need to talk about what the problems are, but frankly we need to also be talking about what the

realistic solutions are that we can move forward with.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

One of the things that's been good for me in going up to Capitol Hill and talking about the President's budget, typically agencies are in a position where the President's budget never has funding that you need to really do your job and, or that you think you need, excuse me, I want to be politically correct here, to do your job. certainly there are lots of places in the NOAA and NOS budget where that's true, but there are many areas of the President's budget right now where I'm able to go up to Capitol Hill and say this is money that we need and the President has asked for it. There's a little bit of money in there for expansion of ports. If you look at the hurricane supplemental, which I heard yesterday is now being delayed by another month to two months, I don't know what constitutes an emergency anymore, but the hurricane supplemental has funding in there for expanding port systems in the Gulf of Mexico, so

. 1 that's a good move. It's obviously not being done 2 in a strategic sense, its being done because that's 3 an important part of the country right now and 4 that's good. We'll certainly work with that and 5 take it, but the President's budget has money in 6 there for moving forward, not as fast as I'd like 7 to, but moving forward on ENCs. There are a number 8 of areas where I think the news that's in there is 9 good and it's really up to Congress now to be able 10 to respond to what the President's done and try to 11 get the things going. This is one of those 12 situations where I can go up to the hill and argue 13 for that and I have been. And I can also, without 14 violating any laws, encourage you to do the same 15 thing. Because, you know, in the long run people 16 on Capitol Hill listen to so much from bureaucrats 17 like me and they listen a lot to people like you. 18 So I would encourage you to support the President's 19 budget in those areas where we have some resources. 20 Now, are they enough? I couldn't as a professional 21 sit here and say to you with a straight face that I

think so, but then we get back to this other
question of the big priorities that the country has
to deal with. So we do need to figure out a way to
tell that story and be able to move forward. I
have seen the academy report, all right? I haven't
seen the others yet and it's a good suggestion,
I'll certainly do that. But beyond that, I think

that the questions really raise issues about what

our future is and how can we work together.

The other thing I would say is I'm really, really hopeful and committed to the Committee on Marine Transportation Systems and NOAA is going to be committed and certainly our deputy secretary at the department level went to the cabinet level meeting and it's now on his radar screen. He understands that NOAA isn't just about weather and fish, that we are a vital, have a vital role to play in what the Commerce Department usually thinks of as its core mission, and that's the importance of commerce in our country.

your last comment, I meant to slight to marine

safety. I think it's obviously a critical and

important issue. If anything, being a boater,

being out on the Chesapeake Bay and keeping a good

weather eye for ships coming up and down the Craig

Hill Channel, because they're all a lot bigger than

me, I think I have an orientation for thinking that

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

way. So I think those are good comments.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Tom.

MR. SKINNER: I just wanted to start by reechoing some of the things that you mentioned during your introduction on NOS. Both in my past life as a CZM director and currently as a consultant on an offshore L&D project and member of the GoMOOS, and on this panel there are a lot of great people and great programs of NOS and your real task before you I think is your second major theme of integrating them all together to realize their full potential.

Specifically on the IOOS and ports, I

want to reecho what Adam had said about funding for . 1 2 the ports, but in addition going beyond that I 3 think it's hard to be against integrating, coordination and all the other things that are 5 associated with the IOOS movement, but I think it's very important to also develop pilot projects that 6 7 demonstrate to people what IOOS can do for specific 8 markets. That was one of the big things that we 9 always raised as CZM directors is it sounds great 10 but what has it done for us lately, and I think the same is true for the maritime community. I know 11 12 that Janet Campbell at UNH is doing a pilot project 13 to see what types of products can be developed if you take the information from a port system and an 14 15 offshore buoy system. And I don't know, Andy, or 16 Mike, if you guys know where that is or have heard 17 anything about that. But that's the type of thing 18 that I think needs to be developed as the IOOS 19 program matures.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Thanks, Tom. And I think good comments, appreciate it.

20

21

I want to emphasize one thing. Another thing I've learned about NOS is we have a lot of capacity around the country to look at problems and deal with them and I think that the investments we've made up in Durham have really come home to me, and of course Andy is here, but have really come here to me in a broad sense, not only the commerce and transportation side but also on the stewardship side of what we do really begun to give this idea of how these various pieces of what we do can work together. I'm real proud of what Andy and the others have been able to put together up there. And I see that as sort of a, maybe a model for how we can help in doing some of these other things around the country. Rick.

.1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aboard to you and Steve, glad to have you kind of explain about a new start here. I hope you appreciate the expertise and knowledge that's sitting around this table and use it. That's really why we're all here. So you've been here

. 1 four months. The honeymoon's over. Let's talk about -- yeah, it is. I want to take, go on from 3 what Tom said about IOOS. In fact, Nina Young, who will talk to you this afternoon, is actually leading this coalition for IOOS. She works on the 5 hill, she's coordinating it all, so she's the 7 expert outside of the federal government, which is important because that's what we've been doing to ourselves over the last few years, is fighting with 9 each other and it's convenient for the hill to say 10 okay, you guys figure this all out. And I think 11 ports is one of the fundamental ones we've been 12 dealing with. I can tell you after almost three 13 years now, this board here said do something with 14 ports. That should say something. But bigger than 15 16 that is IOOS. And I think NOAA has to step up to the plate and do an Integrated Ocean Observing. 17 I saw in your chart, I'm glad to see it, 18

I saw in your chart, I'm glad to see it, you keep saying managing and integrating and all this stuff from NOAA, you haven't done that yet; NOAA, you have not done that yet. Connie went over

19

20

21

. 1 last year and said we're spending \$740 million in 2 Ocean Observing now, but it's not integrated, and 3 you can't manage something until it's integrated. What I think this group is telling you, you start 5 with the fundamentals of it, the GIS capability, the charts and all this stuff to go with it, the 7 ports capability, and you start building this all 8 together and selling it as an IOOS integrated 9 system, but you haven't started to do that yet. 10 for NOAA to say we're doing IOOS and managing IOOS 11 is wrong. It's sending the wrong signal. It's not 12 even been approached at that level yet. Maybe Dave 13 will talk a little bit more about it this 14 afternoon, but that's crucial. The O, the ocean 15 part of NOAA is going down. We lost a half a 16 billion dollars last year, so we're not in good 17 shape. And a lot of the reason for that is you 18 have a million little lines that are so easy to 19 pick off, and most of them are ocean stuff and 20 we're part of it that's earmarked. But you got to 21 roll all this stuff up as being important to an

- 1 Integrated Ocean Observing System for the following
- 2 reasons, that it's good for the country and all
- 3 that stuff. Now, I put that on you and Spinrad.
- 4 You're going to be our saviors, you've got to do
- 5 this for us, and I think what you've got around the
- 6 table will tell you where you start with IOOS. So
- 7 anyways, the GIS is obviously in PORTS and we've
- 8 told you that for two years in PORTS. Enough said
- 9 on lectures, so I'll stop.
- 10 You mentioned the canals Fellows, a
- 11 totally different story. That's a wonderful,
- 12 wonderful program. We only have about 40 of them.
- 13 How many do you have at NOS?
- MR. DUNNIGAN: Ten.
- 15 RADM WEST: I would get one or two of
- 16 them involved with some of this hydro services
- 17 stuff. There's very, very few people in the
- 18 federal government to understand this piece of it,
- 19 the GIS, the hydro part of it, and I don't know how
- 20 you deal with it, but I'd encourage one of them to
- 21 maybe get involved. I don't know how you deal with

1 them. And quite honestly, we're trying to get

2 another 40, we're trying to double Sea Grant

3 canals. It's peanuts, it's 39K to come to town and

learn the ropes. Well, some of them are free, but

5 if you're on the hill you have to pay for them.

6 They're a wonderful asset because they're the folks

7 that are going to be sitting here in a few years,

8 so the more of those we have the better off we're

9 going to be.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: Thanks. None of them are free. You could take any one of my three children and sit them down in this room and ask them what's the one rule in life and they will tell you there ain't no free lunch. The ones on the hill the Sea Grant program pays for; the ones that work for us we pay for. And I have always felt the Sea Grant Fellows are a terrific investment, basically just for what they do, but they're also an investment in our future. Many of them end in coming back to work for us or they go to work in the states or they go to work on Capitol Hill. It's a way of

bringing professionals into our business for the
long term. So yeah, I've been a big supporter of
the program. I don't know, Steve and I were
looking at each other, I don't know if we have any
the current group of Fellows that are working in
this area, but I think we have in the past. It's
certainly something we ought to be looking at.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

On IOOS, I think you're hitting the right message there. Rick Spinrad and I are committed to working together. The way this has happened, when Rick had my job he engaged a lot in global observing issues, both at the IOOS level and GIS level. In moving over to the Office of Oceans and Atmospheric Research, Rick has carried most of that portfolio with him and I think that's good, I think that's good for NOAA, it's good for the country, because Rick's a scientist, I'm not. Rick has been doing this in NOAA and in the Navy for more than a decade. He's got credibility and contacts that I certainly would never be able to develop. So Rick is continuing as the IOOS

executive and my commitment to him and to the admiral is to make sure that NOS is standing up, the support that he needs to be able to make that program work.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And, you know, David Zilkoski is certainly one of the very best people we have and one of the things that I've gone to Dave and told him is I really want him to focus on IOOS and what we've done is we've moved one of our office deputies from Coastal Resource Management into NGS to help carry the load in the Geodesy Program, management of the Geodesy Program so that Dave will have more time to focus on making IOOS work. briefed the admiral last week, Dave and Rick and I talk about every other week 7:30 in the morning to make sure that we're aligned and we know what's going on, that we're able to move forward, so I think there's a good commitment that's there.

The other thing I would say is that as we think about what IOOS is I think we have to talk about integration and getting things to work

together. I think we also have to be thinking too . 1 about what we want this thing to look like in the 3 One of the impressions that I've had about the IOOS program is that we had this \$750 million 4 5 worth of activities that we can identify as being 6 ocean and coastal observing, and we said well, 7 okay, we looked at all the trees and we need to figure out to get the trees to work together, but I 8 9 don't think we yet have a good picture of the 10 forest. I don't think we yet have a good idea of what the end game is here for IOOS, what we want 11 12 IOOS to be when we get done. We've been focusing a 13 lot on what are all the pieces and how we want them with each other, but I think we also have to put 14 15 some energy into thinking about the why, the bigger 16 question about what this thing is going to be all 17 about at the end, and Dave and I have been talking about this with Rick and that's another area where 18 19 I think we have to put some energy into. 20 RADM WEST: Two things, one is the RFQ

that's out in industry as far as defining the

21

architecture and why it's important, when that . 1 2 comes out this August you need to take that and do something with it. The second thing is, I'm sorry 3 Emily wasn't here today, Emily was a NOAA examiner 4 of OMP several years ago. She is very, very 5 knowledgeable about NOAA and their efforts and also 6 7 on detail to you I think for 90 days to put out a paper about ocean coastal management I think. It's 9 crucial, she needs to talk to this group soon. 10 mean as she's doing this paper I think somehow the front table needs to make that all happen. 11 would be nice to get back to everybody or maybe get 12 Emily at the next meeting to talk to us, so I think 13 that's crucial input we ought to hear. 14

welcome you aboard. Steve and I are old friends, no need for that. But I'm just interested in hearing basically your admitted ignorance of what goes on in the commerce and transportation side of NOAA and it's something I've been telling NOAA people for 20 years, like remember the Department

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

.1 of Commerce, and it just doesn't seem to get there. You were talking about Congress, making sure we get 3 the message to Congress. We have to get the message to NOAA. Basically we're the forgotten child of NOAA. The funding for us is so small because it never gets out of NOAA. I learned when 7 I got on this committee, we always thought well, we've got to fight Congress and then found out that the fight, it's not getting out of NOAA, it's not 9 10 getting out of Commerce to the fight in Congress. 11 We can't fight it there if it's not in the budget, 12 like ports and things like that, and charting and 13 things. We had a big harbor safety conference a couple of weeks ago and Admiral Bowen, the new 14 15 assistant commandant for prevention, said remember 16 I'm a prevention guy, I don't want to be a response 17 guy. This is what Bill said, you know. This is about those big ships, they're coming, like it or 18 not they're going to build them bigger and bigger. 19 20 My thing is we're putting ten pounds of ship into a 21 five-pound channel. And that's going to keep

. 1 happening. We've got to get better systems in place to do this safely. That's my job; my job is 3 safety. I've got to move those ships as safely as possible. I can't do it without the technology that's out there, and the problem is we're not getting the funding to get this thing going. We're 7 not getting the charting, not getting the observation systems, and it's because it's not 8 9 coming out of NOAA. As you thought, you and I 10 think most of the people in NOAA and NOS think 11 you're an environmental agency. Well, you know 12 what, we want to protect the environment too, but 13 again, we want to be that prevention guy, not the response quy. We don't want you to have to clean 14 15 anything up. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We want the ounce of prevention 16 17 instead of the pound of cure, and we're not getting that, we haven't gotten that. Unfortunately this 18 19 town is a reaction town, they wait for the big hit 20 and then they'll throw money at it. We're trying 21 to do it beforehand. And it's just, I think the

. 1 education has to be within the department and 2 within the agency, how important this is, because we're getting that 1 percent or 3 percent, you 3 know, you spend \$750 million on ocean observing, 5 we'd like \$7 million that we can't get. I mean 6 come on, I mean really, it's ridiculous. Somebody 7 who has been fighting the port thing since 1991, it's ridiculous, it really is. But to find out 8 9 only last year that it's never gotten out of the 10 house basically, which is why we've never gotten it, it's not the fight in Congress, it's gotta get 11 12 out of here first. So it's got to come out of NOS 13 and then to NOAA and then to Commerce and those are the people that we have to -- if it's in the 14 15 President's budget we have a much better chance. If it's not in the President's budget, let's face 16 17 it, what chance do we have? Then we get into earmarks and everything else, which is just a pain 18 19 in the butt. But in order to get it, we've got to 20 get it through you and the next step and the next step. That's the bottom line, we have to get it 21

out of here.

. 1

MR. DUNNIGAN: Thanks. I'm going to have a comment but I think Mike wants to help comment on this one too.

MR. SZABADOS: Yes. One of the first

things during Jack's honeymoon was debriefing from all the directors in the programs and I did have that opportunity to brief Jack and we had a discussion on the programs and I do want to give something to his credit, during the discussion he gave me the green light to work with the Congressional Affairs to support the President's request to restore the funding for the PORTS program, to work with Congressional Affairs to get it on the hill; he recognized that and gave me the green light to do that. Thank you, Jack.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Yeah, and I think Steve and I have obviously made a commitment to each other to work very closely not just in his capacity as the director of Coast Survey but also in his capacity as the Goal Team lead for commerce and

transportation. Maybe we ought to have an . 1 opportunity at some point for me to try to simplify 3 for you how we do business in NOAA these days. seem to really have wanted to make it very 5 complicated through Goal Team structures and program structures and PPBES and whatever. 7 talking and working and trying to get that story up 8 and having better luck at it. I think I can just say that NOAA's got four strategic goals, one 10 dealing with ecosystems, weather and water, climate 11 and commerce and transportation, and if you look at the NOAA strategic plan sequentially, that's the 12 13 way they come out to you. Commerce and 14 transportation just happens to be the last one 15 that's there. So in talking in meetings like this 16 around NOAA, ecosystems got labeled as goal one, 17 weather and water goal two, climate goal three and C&T goal four, and what I'm fighting against and 18 19 what Steve's going to fight against is to let that 20 concept of goal four get so ingrained in people's 21 minds that they don't think this is any less of a

priority for our strategic future for the country than the other things that NOAA has to do. You're right we've got to find a better way of carrying the story forward. Please don't think that we're not. And you can help us. You know, let's find chances for Vice Admiral Lautenbacher to come in and meet with this group, General Kelly to come in and we can have these discussions with him, and get the deputy secretary to come in here and talk to you. These are political people, they understand how business gets done and how priorities get developed. I think we have a shared opportunity and responsibility to make sure that these issues are getting out in front of everyone.

. 1

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: I was just going to jump in with a one-liner. What I very much appreciated in your opening remarks was the recognition or your comment about how the missions and programs that we support here primarily are so interdependent with your other goals, and I think that many of us, I know many of us have testified on NOAA's behalf in

front of Congress and others to try to get that

message across that, you know, what happens in goal

four if you will, if we can't do better there we're

really running a risk of ruining goal one. And

commerce and transportation is, an adverse incident

there can wipe out a whole lot of money going into

the ecosystem management. Really just recognizing

that I think is, like Andy McGovern is saying,

where we're trying to --

. 1

MR. DUNNIGAN: Let me just say one other thing. I think you're right, I think the sense of how we go up to Capitol Hill and tell our story, we're getting a better sense of how these things have to be related to each other. I would really congratulate the community at large and CORE and Admiral West for taking the leadership right now. You know, the people who do NASA appropriations will tell you when they're dealing with NASA appropriations the community comes in and says we support NASA. When the oceans community comes in it's we support my grant, we support my piece of

. 1 the action. And really this year there's been -can't endorse the number they came up with 3 obviously and keep my job, but the idea that the ocean community could come together in a unified 4 5 voice and support the ideas of a strong NOAA 6 working for the country in all of its strategic 7 areas I think is critical. It's a good development 8 and to the extent any of you are involved in that 9 effort I say congratulations and thank you. 10 MS. BROHL: I'd like to follow up a 11 little bit putting my maritime interests hat on. 12 don't know if this question is better answered by 13 you, Steve, or you, Jack. It has to do with, 14 Steve, that you wear a number of hats when you come 15 to the table here, one of which is to be the 16 commerce and transportation lead. Could you 17 elaborate on what that really means to be the lead, what it means when it comes to strategic planning 18 19 in a meaningful way to NOAA, and how we can perhaps assist in that, because if we feel as if -- I mean 20 21 see this as a good thing, that those programs which 1 we see support safe navigation are also the message

2 you can take from your role under NOS as a

3 transportation lead higher up for commerce and

4 transportation, but what does that mean on a

5 day-to-day basis, what is your role as that lead,

6 how does it affect strategic planning?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: How much time do you have? I was the Goal Team lead for ecosystems and Steve has recently taken over as the Goal Team lead for commerce and transportation. I'm not being facetious or cutesy in making that comment, and I'll let Steve comment from his standpoint in a second. What Admiral Lautenbacher did, we've been talking about immigration, I will say this for him, and I've known all the NOAA administrators since Bob White, he's the one since Bob White who has I think taken the greatest interest in what NOAA really is at its core and how it does its business.

and he said isn't there some way to sort of build a

strong, unified effort across all these stovepipes,

When he came in he saw lots of things that we did

. 1 and he's been pushing for us six years now to think about who we are in a bit of a different way. 3 instead of five line offices that execute a lot of programs, he's taken a crosscut look of what NOAA 5 does and said there are 45, we call them programs, but they're basically thematic areas, and those 7 thematic areas each support one of our strategic goals. So it's been a very sort of strategic way of thinking about how we do it. So right now NOAA 10 is matrix managed. We have a couple of sort of 11 parallel organizations and the challenge for people 12 like Steve and for me as a line office director is 13 figuring out how to keep these things aligned with 14 each other so they're mutually supportive. 15 four Goal Team leads principally have a 16 responsibility to do long-term visioning and 17 outyear planning. They're getting ready right now to start their '09 to '13 five-year plan. 18 19 plan was wrapped up in December and the '07 plan is basically on the hill right now, it ultimately 20 21 arrives in a budget for the coming year.

day-to-day basis what the Goal Team leads are really doing in concept is to be thinking about the future of NOAA and how we serve the country and what strategically the best way for us to do, given that we live in a world of limited resources, the best way to help define our future and where these things go.

. 1

The role of the line offices on the other hand is to execute, so I put on my NOS hat, my job is to take the resources that Congress has given us, take NOS's strategic direction and say I've got a 12- to 18-month horizon all the time to carry things out and make things happen. That's what I do. The Goal Teams and the program managers are really involved with sort of thinking ahead and envisioning the future. That's sort of the basic structure. Steve can comment specifically on how that plays out in commerce and transportation. I think you have another question.

MS. BROHL: I guess I just wanted to have you elaborate a little bit. One, is there a

. 1 team that helps the team leader or is it just literally more Steve and the other three leaders 3 sitting around thinking about it, or is there a team to help the team? And when you do that 5 outyear or five-year planning, can you think outside the box or are you given up front, okay, 7 you can think about what a five-year plan is but don't think beyond these certain levels of funding, 9 don't think beyond what we do, don't do anything 10 out there that's big, and the ideal scenario, the 11 perfect world scenario, make sure you stay within a 12 box? And that of course is not meant to be a 13 loaded question, but it kind of ends up being. 14 MR. DUNNIGAN: There's a yes and no to that. The Goal Teams leads are encouraged to think 15 16 outside the box, to envision the future of what 17 NOAA really needs to carry out its job, we call it the hundred percent requirement, and really to 18 19 think big thoughts. 20

Then the problem -- and that's really done by the 44 program managers. The real problem

21

comes for the Goal Team leads when they have to get down to really doing some programming, because you're given a ceiling at that point, you're given a fiscal ceiling where you have to take all these big thoughts and say in '09 to '13 these are the resources that you can program for, and there are limits, there are lots of limits and that's what make the Goal Team leads' plight difficult. That's sort of bridging. And then what happens after you get done with programming, the vice admiral decides this is where I want to put emphasis in the '09 budget and he'll make that decision not until next 13 January, and then it will turn from programming into budgeting and the budget shop, which is what 15 they're doing right now for the '08 process, putting the budget documents together that are 17 really more specific.

. 1

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

14

16

18

19

20

21

Do you want to talk about C&T? there is a staff. NOS is told that we're responsible for standing up whatever resources Steve needs, and fisheries is responsible for the ecosystem Goal Team and OAR is responsible for the climate Goal Team. But whatever he needs I'm supposed to give him.

. 1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CAPT. BARNUM: A little more detail on what Jack outlined, certainly the commerce and transportation Gold Team is one of four and within that portfolio is a number of services that are viewed by NOAA that facilitate commerce, so it includes things we're familiar with, marine transportation system, MTS, Geodesy, aviation weather, surface weather, marine weather, emergency response, and commercial remote sensing licensing. And all these play together in my mind and how I'm pushing my vision toward is preparing our country for the MTS, the 2020, the doubling of trade and how these services fit together to facilitate trade. Yes, we're going to have to get the ships in safely to the port, but how we're going to get those goods out of the ports, the interval connections, the aviation and surface weather play into that. Certainly emergency response of how, if it were to happen, we can't control all natural disasters and hopefully that's all we have to deal with, how do we get the ports back open and get commerce flowing again.

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So in a nutshell, that's my message, I'm wrapping those services together which may appear unlike in how do we facilitate the commerce coming and going out of this country. Our bumper sticker that we developed within our group working together -- and it's about 40 total, it's a matrix program, so none of them really report to me directly, but it is, has strong support from all the leadership of NOAA, including Jack. moniker is Information That Moves America. information, that critical information that the pilots need, that truckers need, that the aviation community needs to be able to deal with what's again an increase in the amount of trade, number of ships, number of trucks, number of airplanes in the air space. So with my hat on, my other hat, it gives us the opportunity to tell the message within

1 NOAA and the importance of how that fits into

2 NOAA's plans and also now that fits into commerce.

Did I answer the question, Helen?

MS. BROHL: I think so. I think it was helpful to understand that we're fortunate in the fact that the team lead is also going to be on an everyday relationship with us, and I think we hope you will also, even though we're strictly on the hydrographic services aspect, that where it goes outside of that because of the expertise of the table that you call upon.

that up. Where this panel can certainly be very useful is part of the process is to seek public comment and in weighing what the vision is, you have to look at congressional intent, where the administration is going and also our customer input and all that gets weighed together in putting together the portfolio of how the money is balanced between those various programs, and it's certainly a challenge before me now and what Jack mentioned

earlier in the climate that we have in two wars, major hurricane disaster costing billions of dollars, how do we weigh that within the government and balance that portfolio.

. 1

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. GRAY: I'll probably just confuse the discussion because I really don't understand the way you guys work, but I'd just like to introduce some things. Two thoughts that have very much to do with money and how it's allocated, and you're right, Jack, there is no free lunch. One of the things that we did talk about previously in the HSRP is that getting the MTS concept up to cabinet level, which it never was before, maybe now will be able to do something, because before it couldn't do anything because it had no control of any money and each of the people sitting around had their own little piece of it and that was that. The thought I have is this, and that is that in all the money spent for commerce and transportation or safe commerce and transportation, if you want to rebalance this, given the way we can find the

1 position on your vessels or on mega-vessels or

2 anything else like that, I boat Long Island Sound,

3 and I don't know how many buoys we have in Long

Island Sound but it's a hell of a lot, and I also

5 know that this country has over half of the

6 legitimate navigational aids in the entire world.

Do we need those? The answer is we do not. We

8 don't need all these buoy-to-buoy things and

9 everything else like that. I would hope that in

10 the MTS, Coast Guard with aids to navigation should

11 give up some money for some of the things that I

12 think should be done by NOS or something like that,

13 or others.

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The other one that comes to mind, with the ATHOS 1 in mind, is the fact that here we've got the Army Engineers, who've got a hell of a lot more money than anybody sitting in this room gets, they dredge these channels but then they don't know how to measure what they've done. That was shown by ATHOS 1, and I think, Andrew, you said in one of

the discussions we had that on occasion when you

had it up in New York/New Jersey you asked NOS to . 1 come in and give a good modern survey right within 3 the federally maintained channels and you found a lot of debris in those areas and so forth. So what 5 would it take if instead of Army Engineers when they finish their job in a given channel for, the 7 engineers finish it, why not have Steve come along and give a good broad beam survey of it so we really know what is in those channels? Now, that's 9 again changing the funding allocation between 10 commerce, between Homeland Security, the Army 11 12 Engineers and so forth, but these are the things I 13 think we'd like to get into because I think some of 14 the other things, rebalancing within the four goals 15 of NOAA is like playing to the right of the decimal 16 point. I'd like to get out there where the big 17 number is and I think that's what the expertise is we have, the HSRP should be able to get those 18 19 messages across and figure out how do we get those messages, if you agree with them, to wherever the 20 21 decisions are going to be made so that we can

rebalance but rebalance not just within NOAA, not just within commerce, but within the federal government. Thank you.

. 1

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: Great comment, Bill. think that was why I came back to the point I think in response to what Helen was saying about what I see as the critical role that the C&T has to play and why it's essential from our standpoint that we be there. In a world of collaboration where NOAA will never be able to do all the things that we need to to recognize that MARAD, that the Coast Guard and Corps of Engineers -- and we're only the four sort of lead agencies, there's plenty more agencies that are there and that need to be engaged and be a part of that. That's why I think it's so important that we maintain our commitment to making that process work because that's a place where we can come together and try to be one government. think we owe that to the people.

MR. RAINEY: What I would like to do, I know Elaine and John had some comments, I want to

let them jump in here, I'd like to save a couple minutes, what I want to do is just ask a couple things at the end about some of our ways we can go ahead and pull this together and work forward. So for folks who haven't put in, maybe Elaine and John.

. 1

MS. DICKINSON: Thank you, Scott. I'll try to be brief. Welcome aboard and it's great to have a fellow sailor among us, somebody who really appreciates the importance of recreation in our society and I hope you'll come to understand that boating is an industry, it is part of the commerce, very much so.

This is kind of a big picture question.

At one of our earliest meetings that Admiral

Lautenbacher stood before us and he basically

described NOAA as a collection of something like a

thousand mom and pop businesses under one roof.

And at one of our first meetings we saw PowerPoint

after PowerPoint, it was almost an overwhelming

display of projects and programs and programs and

projects and there was more stuff than I think any . 1 of us could absorb at that time. It's made me wonder, with the competition for resources, when 3 are your programs too many programs, when does a 5 program, when it starts or a project when it starts, does it go on forever or does it have a 7 beginning and an end. This recently occurred with 8 the Coast Guard, an agency we follow closely, where 9 it was kind of a watershed moment where the 10 commandant actually went up to Congress and said, 11 and I think it was for the first time ever, we 12 can't do everything you want us to do, we can't do 13 it, not with what we have to work with. And it was 14 important that he said that because that's not 15 something that in the military culture anybody ever admits, they cannot perform a mission. But it 16 17 seems like your programs are almost fragmented, 18 there are just so many of them. Have you ever or 19 are you going to take a look and say do we really 20 need to do this one, do we really need to do that 21 one, can we prioritize our core missions back to

what we think they should be? Does every project . 1 have to be funded? I know nobody wants to give up their pet project, but I think you're spread way too thin and the budget situation has been dismal and it just doesn't look like it's going to get any 6 better.

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: I think you're absolutely correct. The process that Steve and I have strong roles to play is supposed to get us to that point of being able to do a serious question of priorities. If you're going to recognize you can't do it all, then you have to be able to say well, you know, what are the criteria that you're going to use in deciding between all of these mom and pop business operations that we have, where do you start, and we haven't really developed on an across NOAA basis how to evaluate that. We've started, I've started talking to the NOS leadership about having this sort of discussion, what is it that's really important and how do you balance the value of a national estuary research reserve against a

national marine sanctuary against responding to an . 1 oil spoil against providing electronic navigational 3 charts, what's at the core of those and what's most important to you. I think we're beginning to 5 recognize exactly what you said, Elaine, that we can't do it all and we shouldn't pretend. What 7 we're doing right now is suffering death by a thousand cuts, and we'd be a lot better off trying to be more strategic and saying okay, this is 10 something we can do, let's focus on that. So I 11 think you're right on. John.

MR. DASLER: Welcome aboard. I think along what Elaine was saying too, the actual comment at the time we heard it was the Coast Guard was commenting on all of the added tasks they have now with Homeland Security and his comment was that's fine, we'll take on the added tasks, but don't cut our cutter budget. There just really needs to be that stand up where is the core mission and the stand behind that and that those things aren't cut.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Also I guess just to comment a little bit about what Bill was saying, the Corps has some multi-beam technology and they do some of that work, but their main mission is really dredging management. They aren't out there for object detention and that's a big gap in inland waterways. I think that's part of the reason we're seeing things like ATHOS 1.

. 1

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Also I just wanted to comment, I guess getting back to some of the stuff Andrew was saying, you sail on the Chesapeake and there's these great models now and a lot of information that's out there and you can see the tide moving in and out. Part of that problem is a lot of that is pretty inaccurate. If you've ever looked at observed tide versus actual tide in the Chesapeake where you have a two-foot range, they can be off by two feet. Just a real need for Height Modernization and getting accurate levels when we're out there doing surveys. We can run multibeam and all the latest equipment, but if we don't

- 1 have good height data it's not doing a lot of good.
- 2 I think with all these models, the perception of
- 3 the public is there's a lot of accuracy there when
- 4 there isn't. They see the accurate models with the
- 5 flows coming in and out and things look good but
- 6 when you get down to the nuts and bolts there's
- 7 some problems, trying to go back and address those
- 8 issues.
- 9 MR. DUNNIGAN: Certainly Height
- 10 Modernization issues are important and are going to
- 11 get a lot of attention in the next couple of weeks,
- 12 and we've got to be able to move forward on that.
- 13 Please don't tell me when I'm sailing around in the
- 14 shallow waters of Chesapeake Bay that my instrument
- 15 is off by a hundred percent or could be.
- MS. DICKINSON: Just use a depth finder
- 17 and you'll be okay.
- 18 MR. DUNNIGAN: Then there's the question
- 19 of what the accuracy of my depth finder is.
- One of the things I've tried to focus on
- 21 and I'm just really getting started on this with

NOS is to think about science and information. . 1 you're talking about questioning the accuracy of what you do, we really do have a responsibility as 3 a science agency to make sure that the error bounds 5 around our information are well understood. a critical part of what you do. When you say the tide is at X, what you're really saying is that, 7 you know, our calculated estimates of what the tide in within certain error bounds is X. That doesn't 10 come through to a lot of people. How hard is it for people to understand what it means to say 11 there's a 30 percent chance of it raining this 12 afternoon? Which I think is what they're saying 13 today as a matter of fact. You know, most people 14 15 don't really know that's basically a statistical statement and figuring out how to understand and 16 17 communicate that is important. In NOS we have a part of our agency that consists of about five 18 separate laboratories, mostly dealing with coastal 19 science and living resources. We do have NOCS, we 20 also have a scientific laboratory, but we actually 21

do science all over our agency. We do research in marine sanctuaries, we have national estuarine research reserves. Our corals prompt is heavily into science and research issues. So one of the things that I've been focusing on here is a way of understanding better what the NOS science enterprise is and how to get that information structured in a way that it's helpful and useful and helps us to move forward.

. 1

MR. DASLER: That's nice that the science end is really coming to line in a lot of the charting efforts. Now they're doing a lot of automated processing where they're using total propagated errors. But right now we're seeing tides as a major contributor to that total propagated error, that's one area that could be vastly improved on. There's been a lot of other advancements and it just needs to follow up suit, the use of rtGPS or other methods just to bring that total propagated error — just the need for reducing the total propagated error of the tides

component for charting.

. 1

21

2 MS. BROHL: I'd like to ask Dave a 3 practical question. Because you have experience with the Fisheries Advisory Committee, that's 5 excellent, because I think we're looking for some 6 more guidance on how to be a more effective panel 7 and advisory committee, and it has seemed as if --8 I guess to look at the downside of Steve wearing so 9 many hats is that on a day-to-day basis, while I 10 think you will be a good administrator and Barbara 11 and her team have always been extremely good about the mechanics of putting meetings together, they're 12 13 always efficient, you always feel there's follow-up, but we really need some practical help 14 15 in the generation of paper where we need some 16 perspective on that. My understanding is that if 17 there's some, we need some staff assistance, it 18 kind of gets detailed out amongst the different 19 offices, but it would be great to have somebody who 20 is a program person.

To give you an example, we had a really

. 1 good public meeting in Houston to hear some statements on NOAA's recovery efforts post hurricane and we heard some excellent information, 3 which certainly we can generate in meeting, minutes 5 of the meeting. But it's more than that. Wouldn't it be great if we then generated a summary report 7 that had our heading on it, that was from the 8 committee, it's a quotable piece, not just minutes 9 of the meeting, but whose responsibility is it to 10 do that? Is it us, is it the panel? Certainly you're there for expertise and to help, but it 11 12 would be great if there were a person who was a 13 program person who you work with, who the 14 chairperson consistently works with, where you 15 consistently can then go out and draw resources of 16 information from within NOAA, rather than well, 17 who's helping us. It's not really -- you can't ask Steve to sit and generate that paper. There's just 18 19 no way Steve is going to be able to do it in his --20 or Dave is going to be able to do it. 21 IOOS coordinator. It's just not going to happen,

productive as possible, as constructive as
possible, not feel that we have great ideas but
then leave and frankly go back to where we have our
own jobs as well, not that we want to shirk our
responsibilities, but I think your assistance and
support in other ways, recognizing that, you know,
it's just one more thing, if there's an area where
we could actually get real support in a program
way, that would be terrific.

MR. DUNNIGAN: I agree. I'm not going to direct Steve's reorganization of the staff here this morning. What I have seen for example, the Fisheries Advisory Committee worked well, that's what's happened. I view HSRP as an asset that I have that's going to help me to do my job, and if it's going to be able to do that effectively I have to be able to make an investment in your capacity, not your capability. You've got all the capability in the world, but I need to make an investment in your capacity to be able to provide me with that

.1 assistance. Without giving a specific decision 2 this morning, I certainly agree, and the other thing that I would say is that I think we have --3 if you're basically here to give us advice, we have 5 a responsibility to prep you to be able to do that. That is a basic staff support role. You shouldn't 6 7 be walking into these meetings looking at the 8 agenda and thinking my goodness, what are we going to do. By the same token, I don't want to come 10 here with a bunch of show and tell. I've seen that 11 happen, where you come in and listen to a lot of 12 stuff and walk away and you haven't done anything 13 except listen to some nice presentations and look at some good PowerPoints. I hope we can develop a 14 15 model where we keep you focused on what the policies issues are and help us understand the pros 16 and cons of those and what the alternatives are and 17 18 where we ought to be trying to go. I think there is a staffing responsibility that we ought to be 19 20 able to bring to this if it's going to be 21 effective.

I want it to be effective. I'm not here
to serve you. I don't want that to sound too

crass. I view you as a resource to help us figure

out how best to move forward and we need to be

willing to make the investment in the committee to

make that happen.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BROHL: If I can just take that one step further, we have made recommendations to the administrator and never actually gotten any response. Some things may not actually need a response, but it would be great to somehow feel that they were received other than having our chairman, who has always been diligent, he actually handed things over, and then he comes back and he says I handed them over. Even if we acknowledge that he himself says this has to do with NOS, we'll pass it back to Jack Dunnigan to make the response for me, doesn't matter. It would -- I guess we just want to say hey, thanks, heard you, gotta put it aside now or thank you, it's right in front of me, it's important, something. We recognize we

advise, we don't order. However, a response once in a while would be great.

. 1

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: Well, that is a commitment I can make this morning, and we certainly do owe you that. I don't want this to get to a situation where you all think you're not using your time usefully because you're not getting any feedback, so from here on you will be getting a very specific response from me about our reactions to the recommendations we've heard. You also are going to hear reaction sitting around the table. I'm not just going to sit here and be a sponge, I'm going to help probe and help make our discussions productive as we go through. So I think you're absolutely right and we'll start doing that.

MR. RAINEY: I'd like to jump in with Helen on the line that she started. We had that opportunity for that briefing and I very much appreciated the time that you were able to give and the commitment that you've reinforced today. I wanted to let the panel members have a lot of time

. 1 to put some issues out, but I know as we kind of wrap up before the break, as chair and trying to help coordinate this, I very much appreciate that. 3 We talked about in our briefing about looking at 5 ways to find or to come up with a more longer range 6 work plan and things of that nature to kind of help 7 guide us and as I looked through major themes that you presented I think we have the information that we can provide that goes to all of those. 10 concerns have been all along to knowing full well 11 how busy your calender is, basically the leadership 12 is in one meeting to the next and often it's off 13 campus and extremely busy, as are many of the folks 14 here. It's been an ongoing challenge for us to 15 sort of develop our agendas, execute them and 16 coordinate them on many of the issues we were 17 talking about. So to the extent we could take a 18 longer vision and look for strategic things we 19 could do that the HSRP can be in step with all of 20 your many policies and decision-making processes, I 21 think that would be a tremendous benefit.

. 1 One example where particularly I 2 mentioned when we talked earlier and a couple of 3 times, I had just two possible thoughts. One was 4 mentioned by Steve as well. In addition to the 5 excellent representation we've had from the program offices and your commitment from the line office 7 directors, our New Hampshire meeting was 8 particularly useful, going up to that, to me to 9 help pull some ideas together, working with Glenn 10 Boledovich of the policy charting end of NOS, who's 11 had a long run with many of the Ocean Action Plans 12 and these programs and the evolution of NOS policy, 13 and that was particularly helpful and that might be a suggestion to at least engage the policy folks. 14 15 Admiral West pointed out and we talked a 16 little bit about, I think emphasized today, and 17 Admiral Lautenbacher talked to us about in our New York meeting, I think it's of consequence that 18 19 Congress chartered this panel, and that's an act up 20 for reauthorization soon and we have had a little

bit of difficulty in getting NOAA -- we're all very

21

familiar and aware of our FACA limitations and what . 1 2 we can and can't do and I think we've come a long 3 way since our initial meeting to pull together as a group and sit as a FAC and recognize as we sit here 5 we have a special set of circumstances, but I think it's been for whatever reasons a little overly 7 difficult or a little overly conservative in our ability to engage in any sort of informational 9 sharing with the hill, and we obviously have an 10 interest in doing this, they stood this up, and if we can work together to facilitate kind of once and 11 12 for all our ability or your interest in our ability 13 to understand congressional intent and to help you 14 make recommendations up through NOS and to the NOAA 15 administrator that can be useful in telling a story 16 as you say, I think those two areas at least from 17 our experience, that would really go a long way as well. 18

MR. DUNNIGAN: I agree.

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: Are there any other -- I very much appreciate, I think this was a helpful

chance for us to talk with Jack and Steve and with . 1 2 panel members and issue our views. This afternoon 3 we do have some specific recommendations on NOAA's emergency response and recovery capabilities, some proposed ideas for NOAA to be thinking about in the 5 Marine Transportation System and a few other 7 issues, Dave Zilkoski has a report on IOOS and others, so we have some substantive issues to take up this afternoon, but we're at our break time and unless there are any other comments here I would 10 like to go ahead and adjourn for our break. Okay. 11 12

MR. DUNNIGAN: Let me just again thank you for the discussion, I think it's good. It's our first discussion, we're going to have lots more and I'm looking forward to it and I appreciate it. Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

(Recess from 10:00 to 10:25 a.m.)

MR. RAINEY: Let me make a couple of quick administrative comments. Kind of picking up on our joke about the no free lunch, for those of us who attended Roger's function yesterday, we do

owe Barbara for that if we haven't paid already, so please honor the no free lunch rule. And additionally, to pay for the no free lunch you need to sign your attendance sheets and get those in to Barbara, Steve or Monica, in to our staff, so they're in the folder there. And so those two things you can kind of take care of as you have time administratively here.

(Discussion held off the record.)

MR. RAINEY: Okay. What I was saying was a little confusing. The lunch payment is \$15 to Barbara or our staff and that's separate from signing that for our attendance for the special government employee remuneration.

Let me kind of introduce what I'm hoping to do here in this next segment. We had our meeting in Houston and we had a few topics before us. One of the primary issues there was to take a look at and highlight the programs that we work with, NOAA's overall capabilities or roles, responsibilities, capabilities in emergency

response and recovery efforts. And we had a . 1 presentation by Steve on the integrated NOAA 3 response, we had some one-pager information from the various program offices, NGS, CO-OPS, Coast 5 Survey, and we had discussions from the federal partners, Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers, and got a pretty good flavor from the federal response and 7 recovery efforts that have been undertaken and in 8 fact was still ongoing. We also heard an excellent 10 presentation from Adam McBride firsthand of going through that Port of Lake Charles and also a 11 representative of the American Petroleum Institute 12 on the critical importance of these navigation 13 services response capabilities to getting these 14 15 channels, ports and harbors reopened and the ramifications of that. 16

Subsequent to that Houston meeting what

I tried to do, and I know I circulated on the

Internet to each of you and we posted, either

Barbara or myself put up on our members only

website these as well, as well as some reference

17

18

19

20

21

. 1 documents I've pulled from. NOAA, our staff also put quite a bit of time into circulating some summaries of the presentations and made those 3 available. So what I'd like to do in this session 5 is to walk through the proposals or the thoughts that I had circulated just as a point of departure 7 for us for some discussion and see if the panel 8 agrees with any of these proposals, starting with 9 the NOAA's emergency response capabilities and then 10 going to some possible suggestions for NOAA to 11 consider in their work as they look forward to the 12 Inland Marine Transportation System. That's sort 13 of my plan here in this next segment.

Taking up -- what you have handed out is a hard copy of what I kind of informally monitored Scott's thoughts on the topics. That is kind of by way of a white paper, just sort of the work I had done since the Houston meeting and sort of an explanation or rationale for the proposed recommendations that I kind of scribed out. Now, the proposed recommendations have been pulled out

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and they were sort of embedded in those white

papers and I pulled them out and that's what's

displayed on the overhead. So I'd like to just

walk through some of my thinking, and I don't know

the extent you've had a chance to read what I had

sent around, so I'll try to quickly go over that

and we can maybe discuss it and my hope is that

that will give us a substantive framework to have

some discussions.

So taking up the emergency response capabilities, I did want to pick up on some things that we know I think and comment about it. This is a big deal and as we heard in Houston and before we went to Houston, NOAA has some unique capabilities in the federal government for recovery and response. One of the things that occurred to me is that we do hear an awful lot about sort of the front end, the National Weather Service and Hurricane Center, we hear about the hurricane tracking things, but in large -- my sense is that NOAA has an equally important role in the response

1 and recovery efforts and that's where these

2 services play. It's interesting to me, I want

3 everybody to understand there's ongoing work here.

We learned at Roger's function yesterday that

5 Admiral Lautenbacher couldn't be there because he

6 was at the White House in a briefing on

7 preparedness, hurricane preparedness and emergency

8 response. So at the top level of NOAA, this is an

issue as we stare at the next hurricane season.

10 You know, it's upon us.

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I also know that Howard Danley, as many of you know, works for Steve as the chief of the navigational response division, is down up the gulf region right now working on hurricane response and recovery, and I know in my research I've learned about NOAA's staff and I'll talk about it here in a minute, about standing up their responsibilities on the national response plan, which includes implementing the national incident management system or incident command system, and NOAA has an operating manual for their incident command center,

and I talked with some people regarding that and I've got some comments here, I've reviewed some plans.

. 1

There's also, I believe again Steve and Howard are working on, it's in draft form, and I'll talk about what I learned on that, you'll see in my writing as shorthand is all con ops, which is all hazards concept of operations. I went through that and I'll have some comments.

So the opening salvo I wanted to say is that these are tremendously important programs and I think NOAA's stepping out on these responsibilities and really starting to pull this together. It's an ongoing effort, but I thought that perhaps we could make some recommendations as initial thoughts that we have from our meeting in Houston and some of these comments hopefully will be acceptable to you today and maybe we can keep the door open.

The one last thing I wanted to say is

Barbara was able to attend the most recent meeting

of the MTSNAC, which is a sister federal advisory committee on the transportation system, they have an informal effort and I subsequently talked with Richard Lolich, who's the executive director of MTSNAC, they are working on and they have hopefully a July time frame to pull together some thoughts on, you know, hurricane response as well. So there may be an opportunity for us to coordinate and have some joint recommendations with MTSNAC and HSRP regarding some of these federal capabilities.

I'd like to do is, what you have passed out, I
believe you'll have four documents, one of them -well, there will be two on this first topic. The
first one is the complete hard copy of sort of the
white paper we'll call it that I sent around,
Scott's thoughts on these. That's sort of all the
context. I'll just sort of paraphrase through my
thinking there, and then the other is, I believe
will be the enumerated proposed recommendations of
things that I would suggest we could perhaps

. 1 receive motions on and vote if we're in agreement 2 with those recommendations. What I'd like to do is 3 walk through that because it's something that I put in writing and then open the floor up to members if 5 they have other, you know, comment or motions or 6 recommendations that they would be prepared to add. 7 And again I think we can say this is sort of an initial thought in that this isn't the last chance 8 9 we may be able to comment on this, and as Helen 10 said before the break, threw out an idea of 11 possibly pulling some of these things together and have a more formal presentation of the results of 12 13 the Houston meeting. So let me go ahead and start. One of the things that when I went and 14 15

One of the things that when I went and researched these various plans, and I'm somewhat familiar with them so I kind of knew a little bit where to look, we did request and there is and I did get a chance just before the meeting to talk to Tim Goodspeed, who is one of the NOAA folks that is putting together the hot wash that we talked about off and on and that's still very much an internal

16

17

18

19

20

21

. 1 document, but it's being moved through the channels and it does have some internal recommendations from 3 NOAA's experience in Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. So in looking at all of this, one of the things I 5 looked at was there's a table in the national response plan that talks about, there's a lot of 6 7 jargon here, a lot of acronyms, but the emergency support functions. And one of the things that came out of Houston was how important is this? Well, 10 NOAA has responsibility in 10 of the 15 enumerated 11 ESFs, Emergency Support Functions. NOAA's role is 12 considerable. One of the suggestions as I reviewed 13 those -- and these things are posted, some of these 14 documents are, they're not classified but they're 15 designated as official use only. So it's not something we could widely or publicly disseminate 16 17 necessarily, so they're up on our members site. 18 One of the things that occurred to me is that, again, I think that there's a clear understanding 19 of NOAA's forecasting role and prevention role 20 21 perhaps, but it seemed to me that some of the

. 1 capabilities and responsibilities that these programs have may not be fully understood or reflected in some of those emergency support functions, and one of the thoughts I had is NOAA 5 might want to take a look at the line office and program levels at everything that they're doing in 7 response and recovery effort is adequately 8 reflected and they're getting credit for that and 9 that there's an understanding across the federal response agencies of these unique capabilities that 10 are contained in NOAA. So I put in my white paper 11 12 that NOAA should fully identify all hazard response and recovery capabilities, and again sort of 13 14 listing them out, but boiling down to the number 15 one proposed recommendation was that the HSRP 16 recommends that NOAA review the emergency support 17 function table and its Homeland Security capability matrix, which is a separate document NOAA prepared 18 19 to take a look across its programs and functions of what it brings to the table from a Homeland 20 21 Security perspective. And again, the reason to

take maybe another look at those for completeness regarding NOAA's all hazard response and recovery capabilities. In other words, is everything these programs are doing represented there and just to take a double-check on that.

. 1

3

5

6 Then I was suggesting that -- let me go 7 through these because there's only five. 8 run through them, then we'll open up for 9 discussion. Again, you can kind of refer to the 10 language. The other thing, there are some plans and like I said, some of them are in draft form, 11 and I talked to some people and I know they're 12 13 implementing them, but just a recommendation, and some of this is obvious, that HSRP recommends that 14 15 NOAA assess the readiness of its response and 16 recovery capabilities, and clearly that's going on 17 with all these meetings we just described, for all 18 of its mandated emergency support functions. 19 assessment should include a review of NOAA's capabilities to execute each of the five incident 20 21 command system functional areas, and they're listed there. That's pretty basic out of the national response family of plans.

. 1

3 The HSRP recommends that NOAA fully train its incident command center and response and 4 5 recovery personnel in all aspects of the ICS and that NOAA fully participate with its other federal 6 7 emergency partners to ensure NOAA's unique emergency response and recovery roles and 8 capabilities are fully utilized in any federal 10 response. The whys and wherefores behind my thinking there is that the incident center is stood 11 12 up at NOAA corporate level and it stood up by members of the line offices and program offices 13 with subject matter and operational expertise in 14 their areas of responsibility. And it's an 15 exercise to unify and it's a layered response to 16 17 any sort of incident, so there are many things day to day that are handled at the program level. As 18 19 the severity of an incident and its national significance increases, there's a resultant 20 increase in the coordination and it moves up the 21

1 food chain as far as the command control system.

2 So there needs to be a fair amount of training I

3 think still yet to be done to stand this ICC up and

4 also I think that NOAA needs to be appreciated

5 across the players and the federal government to

6 coordinate that response and continue work there.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

All right. Now, number four is perhaps I think maybe my most, the thing that occurs to me most. I reviewed these plans just from our general experience with what we saw out of Katrina and the responses. My point I'm trying to make with number four is there's a tremendous first step already underway and that's in the coordinating across NOAA programs, assets and resources. My sense of these plans tends to be that they do a tremendous focus on the federal government itself; in other words, you have the coordination issues within and across agencies, and then you have an extreme focus on the continuing operation plans. We have something bad happen, we gotta get the federal government back together and operating, but I think that's a

. 1 necessary and proper first step, but I worry that -- what I think is sometimes shortchanged is 3 not only, yes, the government has to get up and running, but the government has to really have and 5 I think do some additional work to help coordinate with the local stakeholders that control an awful 7 lot of infrastructure and other things, so what I'm trying to get at and the biggest chunk of my little 8 white paper soapbox there is that I really think, I 10 think this was borne out in Houston, we know from 11 our community we have a few NAB managers spread around, Alan Glenn was there and others, those are 12 the folks, the maritime and what I'm characterizing 13 as the local coastal zone stakeholders. 14 15 cases if you got a significant incident, are those people looped into the ICS command structure? 16 17 other words, do the people that the maritime industry and local stakeholders know represent 18 19 NOAA, are they going to be there or when this thing 20 stands up and they page the duty watch officer and they stand up the incident command center at NOAA 21

headquarters, there can't be a loss of . 1 communication between the people on the ground. 3 And the plans are very clear about how they stand up an on-scene commander and this and that, but 5 what I'm trying to get at here is I think additional work should be done to expand and 7 clarify guidance on the agency's interaction with maritime industry and other local coastal 8 stakeholders. Who are those people that you need 10 to get ahold of in a significant incident, and 11 these are the folks that are involved with NOAA's 12 primary initial assessment functions and do develop 13 procedures for the stakeholders and the appropriate 14 NOAA representatives to coordinate emergency 15 response and recovery efforts. I think that's a real critical piece. I think we saw in Katrina 16 17 that that was the difficult area, the vertical coordination and linkages, way more difficult to 18 manage than the horizontal within the federal 19 20 government, even though those were challenged as well. So I think that goes back to the training 21

. 1 piece and how do those people fit into the plan, because those are the folks that our communities 3 will know and they will not necessarily know how to interact with the ICC and such and vice versa. 5 NOAA provides scientific, I forget the name, but there is a system where they have scientific 7 advisors that respond, but that's not necessarily 8 your NAB, how are your NAB managers and the other people that are used to interfacing with these people locally tied in. And I talk a little bit in 10 my discussion, it may be understandable to folks 11 12 inside NOAA, but as you pull through these plan documents I think that there can be some confusion 13 14 maybe even within NOAA to my looking at them, 15 because the ICC, as something becomes more 16 significant, takes on a larger command and control 17 responsibility, but yet in certain appendices it delegates it to the line office and there's many 18 19 different working pieces. So I think a real look at how this is all is going to play out and the 20 21 linkages that can be put in place with the local

folks is real important.

. 1

2 Let me just read the last one and I'll 3 completely back out. The last thought was borne 4 out in Houston, something we said quite a number of 5 times, we asked about this in the hot wash and kind of got blank stares back, but it occurred I think 7 to many of us. HSRP recommends that NOAA identify 8 and whenever possible recover significant 9 unbudgeted expenses incurred by NOAA's navigation 10 services program in responding to natural and manmade diasters. The HSRP notes that NOAA must 11 12 recoup significant unbudgeted expenses incurred in 13 the provision of emergency response and recovery 14 operations or the agency will not be able to 15 sufficiently execute its primary mission and 16 essential functions for navigation services. 17 I've got a little bit of discussion in my white paper about that. It is incorporated in the ICC 18 19 standard operating procedure, you can see the exact 20 language, I put it there for you saying that yes, 21 in fact we are going to do that and that the line

offices need to be aware before they obligate their vessel, even though we're going to try to do the accounting and should do the accounting, you know, supplemental funding may not come forward. So it appears that perhaps this has been covered, but my sense in Houston was, and I haven't heard anything to the contrary subsequent to our Houston meeting, I'm not certain it was done. There may be ways of setting up special procurement authorities or special government credit cards for field teams and people on scene to use that would come under a special budget. I don't know the mechanisms that 13 it could be done but I do think our sense is that these programs are so underfunded as it is that 15 these events are completely foreseeable and NOAA always responds and has a big, big deal to do with 16 17 response and recovery and somehow we have to identify these costs and get that money back to these programs.

. 1

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

18

19

20

21

That's a very quick kind of rehash of my thinking and then a reading of some proposed

recommendations. Let me open the floor. Bill, you had some comment?

. 1

3 MR. GRAY: Thank you, Scott. I was unable to be at the Houston meeting, which was a very enlightening event, to take advantage of learning what really happened where the action was. I haven't really gone through these papers in Scott's thoughts number three that -- but in number 8 9 four there it says that we, that's us sitting here, 10 recommend they undertake additional work to expand and clarify guidance on the agency's interaction 11 with the maritime industry, and that phrase just 12 13 struck me. I'm curious whether at Houston you got 14 a definition of what that really would entail and who it would entail, or whether any recommendation 15 made by the HSRP now shouldn't cover that, because 16 17 what that means to me, when you're talking about responding to emergency situations, I think there's 18 19 an organization, the International Oil Spill 20 Cooperative Organization, I get their newsletter once a month, but it's people I knew when I was 21

. 1 active on qualified individuals, response capabilities and things like that. Salvage is plugged in and I think there's a group as I see it, 3 even though I'm not actively involved, are doing a very good job in saying what is the state of readiness in various parts of the world to handle 7 unpleasant events, either caused by weather, accident or whatever it may be. And I think also 8 of the Harbor Safety Committees, which it was 10 Andrew McGovern's idea that we really have the annual Harbor Safety Committees and you assemble 11 12 representatives from Harbor Safety Committees 13 around many parts of the nation, and I would think 14 that this also would be something where the harbor 15 safety, whether it's in Houston, whatever it may 16 be, in Mississippi, was that ever defined at the 17 meeting in Houston or if we're making a recommendation we ought to give them advise how to 18 do this, get ahold of the salvage, get hold of the 19 20 spill cleanup people, the Coast Guard has a role in 21 these things, and certainly if you just sat back

and read the newspapers during Katrina and Rita,
things were in a state of disarray until Fat Alan
got down there and kind of straightened them out.

So naming some of these, when you talk about the
maritime industry, and I absolutely agree with the
concept of it, but wouldn't it help NOAA to be a
little more specific, at least make sure you've got
your relationships well cemented with these parts
of the maritime community.

MR. RAINEY: The short answer is no, in my view anyway, and that's precisely the point I'm trying to make here, is that I absolutely agree that the follow-on, this begs the question well, how do we do that and I think HSRP could be a body that NOAA could draw on, among others, to sort of start to identify that and perhaps take a more robust look. In the plans as they exist, and I say, I put it in my paper, but there is an annex or appendix four on, I'm not going to look it up here, but basically it's detailed operational framework is the title, or something along those lines. It

. 1 is one page long, four subparagraphs, and the only thing in the appendix for detailed operational 3 framework is that the administrator delegates the authority to make it happen to Jack as a line 5 office. So I mean that's -- all I'm saying is I think that's a very critical and necessary step to 7 try to get a handle on that going into next season 8 and beyond and perhaps, I'm suggesting I guess 9 perhaps we could help maybe develop that. We have 10 a lot of experience with the industry and some 11 things we could bring to bear and help identify. Anyway, I completely agree and that's what I'm 12 13 trying to suggest. 14 MR. GRAY: Should we identify at least 15 these are the organizations that should be on the 16 list to be contacted? Who do we call if we've got 17 a problem? Do we plug them in, we want to be 18 contacted or something like that, just like Andy

armstronged me at the break, he'd like some advice on organizations or individuals he can contact in redesigning the way they issue electronic charts.

19

20

21

I can get some people to do that, but we've got to be asked. I think rather than having a lot of words to say the maritime industry or this industry or that industry, we ought to at least identify some of the other organizations who are going to be very important in these circumstances.

. 1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: I don't know whether, Bill, you would agree with me or the panel would, but my thinking would be is perhaps go through sort of these recommendations as a first step and then we can come up and follow up on it and say okay, we like that and we want to take it a step further and work with our NOAA representatives and then itemize or enumerate or list some of these things that would support work. I mean perhaps we can take this on as a future continuing task under that recommendation and talk about how we could play a My sense is if we try to do the list right now sort of extemporaneously we're going to eat our entire time kind of listing things out, but maybe we can go through these and find areas we want to

definitely follow up on and do that.

. 1

MR. GRAY: I'll ask one more question and then go away gracefully. In the three days at Houston did anybody else put up the kind of suggestions I'm making in all the chaos there was in the gulf coast? What organizations did NOAA interface with that were really crucial to doing what they were supposed to do to help these people in this circumstance? Because if they didn't, you haven't learned anything. You haven't learned who was valuable to help with this or that or whatever the hell it may be.

MR. RAINEY: Maybe I'll let Adam jump
in. But yes, part of the Houston thing was in some
ways almost a first step I think because we did
have a number of presentations from the different
players I guess you'd say and we tried to have a
representative population of the different
stakeholders, federal, private, and the Port of
Lake Charles did a phenomenally good presentation
with excellent concrete recommendations and kind of

on the ground how it happened. But there was an attempt I think in Houston to get that sort of information on the table. Now at this meeting we're trying to distill that down and move forward and I think this meeting, again I suggest I don't think will have to be the end of it, but there's other things in play. Adam, do you want to comment on how you felt that went?

. 1

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. McBRIDE: Our experience was very good with NOAA and of course we were down -- at the point we were dealing with Tim Osborne and the NRT groups. They were in daily, more than daily contact with us, with the pilots, Coast Guard, Navy, and those were the critical agencies in terms of getting the initial channel surveys and NRT work done. They dealt with other groups. Certainly we found them to be in very good communication. I'm not sure what kind they had inside the organization but they touched everyone they needed to and on a pretty regular basis, at least in our area, so I thought the response to the community and other

groups was very good in our event.

. 1

20

21

2 MS. BROHL: I want to make sure I 3 understand where this is going, because I came out of Houston -- I went into Houston with the understanding that the very successful part of hurricane recovery was the maritime components, 7 opening the ports. There was incredible dynamic interaction between agencies. In New Orleans I heard outside of Houston from vessel agents, from 10 pilots, that they had daily conversations that Coast Guard organized where NOAA was actively 11 12 engaged, and I know Coast Survey was actively 13 engaged in trying to open those ports. I came out 14 of the Houston thinking there was a NOAA success 15 story here. So I want to be sure I understand, the 16 question is not was there good response; there was, 17 especially on the maritime side. It's where the 18 success story lay. 19

What we're trying do is, because of,

Scott, your exceptional background in these type of
things and your understanding of the post emergency

. 1 response documentation and things, that you found 2 that there were areas where perhaps NOAA needs to 3 be a little more clear and engaged, whether it's the national recovery response plan, things like 5 that, and that's what we're trying to detail here. My understanding, other than to say I would want to 7 front a recommendation with an overall statement that the testimony we received in Houston indicated that NOAA did an exceptional job, and it's really 10 making sure that there are I's that need to be dotted and T's that's need to be crossed in terms 11 12 of having an overall role on the Hydrographic 13 Services portion, whether it's a national response 14 plan or a specific emergency response. 15 hearing that correctly? 16 MR. RAINEY: Helen, thanks for that. 17 Let me just respond real quick. I absolutely 18 I think that and my point here is just 19 exactly that, that NOAA response and recoverable 20 capabilities are critically important and they

were, did a fantastic job there. The difficulty

21

1 I'm having here is trying to walk through this.

2 I've stripped out just these recommendations, but

3 | what we would do, we would go back to the extent we

4 approve these, in putting some of the supporting

5 and lead-in introductory comments, and certainly we

6 want to highlight that. We also heard, though, and

7 I think it's worth pointing out, how incredibly

8 helpful the navigation response teams were and the

9 remote sensing capabilities were universally used,

10 the photogrammetry work at all levels from

11 individuals to the federal response to state and

12 local first responders. Without NOAA's

13 participation here it just doesn't happen. And

14 they were still, as we heard from the Coast Guard,

15 a person who was running the salvage operation, how

16 still today they're using those capabilities out of

17 NGS to prosecute the salvage.

But for example, take the NRTs. During

19 that effort we had half of the existing capability

20 in the country down there and it was still more

21 work than they could do. We heard the NAB manager,

Alan Bunn, drove his personal motor home over there . 1 so that one of the NRTs had a place to crash. 2 3 got to tour those boats down in Houston. essentially an open boat and you've got a little 5 cabin on there, but the habitability is not intended to sustain a crew working those kind of hours. So the difficulty they had in getting gasoline and fuel for those teams and, you know, this, a big piece of the success was the initiative 10 and the ingenuity and the highly motivated NOAA field units that pulled this off. They just found 11 12 a way. And same thing with the port directors that 13 were down there. And so what I'd like to suggest 14 is sort of just exactly what Helen said. It was a 15 terrific job but this is important and it shouldn't 16 be done on a shoestring on the back of some poor 17 soul on a trailable boat. We're talking about 18 supporting and getting back -- the API 19 representative talked about the importance of these 20 refineries and things. How thin a thread do we 21 have when we talk about these resilient

communities? I mean look at what's at stake here, and we heard testimony about if we don't get these ports up in 48 hours, tremendous consequences. And to say that okay, for a natural or manmade it's all hazardous response, we're going to rely on three trailable boats, and I'm oversimplifying, but I think we need to take a look at these capabilities and say this mission is more important than the resources we have available currently to throw at it, and that's the message we should try to tell and that's what I'm trying to do, but by no means trying to shortchange the effort that was mounted.

. 1

MR. ARMSTRONG: I guess I'd like to make one comment on your sort of list of proposals in a general sense before we start getting into picking at each one.

The first is that it strikes me that these maybe almost overshoot the mark and that we're telling NOAA go back and look at your table and look at your list and look at your command center training. They're going to say well, we

just did that. The point is I think that in light . 1 of what this panel learned in Houston, we've looked at the documents and we don't see some very 3 important specific issues covered in there. example, in transportation, we don't see anything about the ability to navigate the waterways. 7 think rather than saying NOAA should review the ESF table and Homeland Security, we should say that in 8 Katrina and Rita we had some very good experience 10 with NOAA's response teams but there's a risk that it won't be there the next time because in the 11 12 government reorganization or review of this those 13 capabilities were completely overlooked or essentially overlooked or substantially overlooked. 14 What we should recommend is that, specifically for 15 16 the navigation and hydrographic services, that NOAA 17 look at those tables and incorporate that, and in particular number five, because if they're not in 18 the tables in the first place they won't pick up 19 20 number five, the funding. So I think that we need 21 to be more specific in our set of recommendations

or we're going to get a reaction that says we have

2 looked at them. So in general I think we need

3 maybe to preface these with some remarks that says

4 | it worked well last time, we're concerned it won't

5 next time because we don't see these things in the

6 table, and please, NOAA, go back and incorporate

7 these specific issues in your table.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Katrina?

RADM WEST: I agree with Andy. But going back to Houston, we heard some impressive things you all did and we were told there was an after action report being written. I don't know where it is. And there should have been some dollar figures put to that. Two questions. One is there's a supplemental on the hill. Is there any

NOAA money in the supplemental as a result of

MR. DUNNIGAN: Yes. The original presidential request did not have much for NOAA in there but the Senate mark had a billion dollars for NOAA and the House is a lot less.

RADM WEST: Is it geared towards what

you do, hydro services?

. 1

MR. DUNNIGAN: Some of it.

RADM WEST: Was it a result of that after action report? Because I don't know where it ever went to, nobody ever saw it. Here's --

MR. DUNNIGAN: The Katrina-Rita assessment report is not final, it's still very much in a draft stage.

RADM WEST: A little bit of frustration we have here, we could have helped I think by supporting, that we saw firsthand how important it was and how underfunded it was, and for this group to say look, we can help you there, I don't think that ever got in front of the hill when they were working the supplementals, is my point I think. And for the long haul it's just what Andy just said.

MS. BROHL: I know the National Weather
Service has gotten a lot of attention on the
supplemental. How much, though, really is coming
back to NOS to make up for whether it's a water

1 level gauge or whether it's to put some money back

2 into the NRTs getting back to where they're

3 actually based or finishing up the bathymetry

4 reviews or things like that? I know the first time

5 around it was zero.

that we care about.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: I actually have some numbers in here. What you've seen in the Senate report relating to marine debris and identifying and clearing marine debris from commercial navigation areas is money that we would get within NOS and within our commerce and transportation functions. There is money in there for expanding, reinforcing and hardening ENRON stations, there is money in there for ports and for implementing the port system in four of the ports in the Gulf of

MR. DASLER: I've got one other comment from Houston and some of the things that were issues there. One of them was the water level

Mexico, so there are a number of areas where there

is funding specifically set aside for the things

. 1 observations going offline and the lack of water level information, and it just seems like it would 3 be critical for the NRTs to have that capability for putting in temporary gauges in support of 5 hydrographic surveys and trying to get as fast as they can water level stations online with portable 7 gauges or RTK systems, but some way where those, 8 they're completely self-contained, some are what NOAA might be doing in Alaska and some are putting 10 in temporary gauges and that kind of thing, but 11 they need that full support for a fully functional system to get in and do adequate response. 12

MR. RAINEY: Jon, just picking up on that, I heard anyway that that's something they are taking a really good look at, a need for hardening the tide gauges and things, so that's one of the things that has been identified in the internal assessment, the ability to do that and need for. They are taking a hard look at that.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DASLER: I've heard of the hardening of the gauges but I think there's still going to be

cases where infrastructures are out, things are
going to go out, and just having a fully equipped

NRT that can respond, you know, if they're going to
do soundings, anybody out doing surveys would be
fully equipped with that and should be equipped to
handle that.

MR. RAINEY: Adam.

CAPT. McGOVERN: I think maybe we do have to get a little specific. I was looking at, like number one, transportation, looking at the NOAA responsibilities, there's nothing on there about survey.

MR. RAINEY: That's my point.

CAPT. McGOVERN: Here's one, I've never seen you carry a gun, Steve, but according to number 13 you're going to provide law enforcement and security capabilities. I've never in all my years --

MR. RAINEY: Fish cops. That's my point, let's take a look at these things and make sure we're really fully addressing NOAA

capabilities and response.

. 1

MS. BROHL: Scott, as you said, getting
into wordsmithing doesn't make any sense. Is it
your goal just to get a few more comments in
preparation for a follow-up conference call, now
that we've had a chance to kind of ask those
questions on what it means and how it means and
give it a second look in the near future maybe in
conjunction with developing a post meeting summary
report?

MR. RAINEY: That's exactly the question. And the answer is I don't know. We've been trying, this is where every meeting comes to sort of a screeching okay, jump ball. Maybe we could ask Jack to help us a little bit here. It's been our experience, I think everybody would agree, that we have very high interest in these programs. We care and we bring a lot of effort to it at the meeting, but it's been very difficult for many, many good and valid reasons to conduct a lot of work between the meetings. And so we tried to --

. 1 again, this effort here on my part was to provide 2 some discussion points and this is always the 3 difficult part at the meetings I think, everybody sees it a little bit differently, and frankly we don't or haven't had in my opinion a real sense from NOAA, although we have tried to ask what --7 can you take these rough ideas, just to give this working relationship, in other words in the FACA 8 paradigm here, what's the most helpful and useful 10 way to sort of proceed with these thoughts, which I think are all valid and important, and package them 11 12 so you can take them and run with them, how is the 13 best way to -- maybe we can start afresh with your tenure and Steve's and try to figure out how we can 14 15 take these ideas, package them to the point where 16 we can hand them off and know we've had a role to 17 play here in the process.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Yeah, let's work on figuring out what the best way to move forward is going to be here. What I'm seeing here is a paper that looks like, if you all adopted it, would be a

18

19

20

21

very helpful approach and would give us some . 1 background and some highlights of points we all 3 think are important and would help us. That's the kind of input I'm looking back from you because 5 then I can take that and go to the admiral and go to the others and say this is what our experts are 7 telling us or I can go to Steve and say this is within our control, let's go ahead and do this or 9 not. But what I wouldn't want is to be writing our 10 words for your report. I really, I hope that what 11 you could do would be give me something that is a 12 third party's efforts so that I don't get 13 criticized for saying oh, Jack, they just said that 14 because you set them up. And so some further 15 vetting among the group I think is appropriate. 16 think what Scott has done to give us something to 17 chew on is excellent. What's important it seems to 18 me right now is that we talk about these ideas and 19 make sure we've got all the ideas on the table and then we can work with Scott to do some wordsmithing 20 21 of the document and get the document back out for

comments and at that point it can become a recommendation.

. 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: With the one caveat that Scott doesn't have to generate all that. You gotta have a collaborative --

MR. DUNNIGAN: We'll work with you on that, yeah.

MR. LAPINE: I think what's missing is we don't have all the inside information to put some meat on these bones. We need some help telling us, you know, what aspects of these recommendations you would like to see brought to bear. Do you want more NRTs, does it take more NRTs, does it take more contracting money. If we had some hints at least on that, we can craft a more specific document. But what we don't have here are all your inside information on these. not looking for secrets, your capabilities, what parts of your organization are weak in responding to these. Just give us some help and then we can craft it.

. 1

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

10

1314

15 16

17

18

20

19

21

MR. RAINEY: The other side of that coin would be for us to propose what we see as needs or requirements and feed it up that way. Adam can say hey, I was there and when this went down I needed, this was my first priority, whatever, from the port record point of view or the pilots coming into the channels, getting the channels reopened. So probably collaboration from both angles on that.

MS. BROHL: I was just going to say that if Jack's commitment comes to fruition to assist with this, not give us the words necessarily but help prevent Scott from feeling like he's writing the entire document, it would seem to me some of these things would become evident. If you sit down and have a meaningful conversation like Andy was saying about as aspect, then someone like Andy will say well, I think what you're saying is this but it might be better this way. I think that just the commitment from Jack saying you're not going to do it in a vacuum by yourself and nobody will respond to your phone calls. It won't be you alone in the

office with an echo coming back to you, which I'm hoping would go a long way to addressing that concern.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Exactly.

. 1

MS. BROHL: A technical question here, I wanted to ask you to elaborate a little on your comment about interaction with coastal zone stakeholders. Are you talking -- probably coastal resource might be a better term, I don't know, than coastal zone, but are you talking about federal as well as local as well as private? Is that what you mean by coastal zone stakeholders?

MR. RAINEY: Yes. And that's just, again, that gets right into the specific what's the proper characterization. But what I was getting at essentially is that to coordinate very vertically as well. That may be an inapt characterization, but there's a lot of players that are not within the federal government who have a very big role in response and recovery. And it's broader -- I was trying to put a placeholder in there in writing

this is to try to acknowledge that it's clearly . 1 bigger than the maritime, what you would call the maritime industry folks. There are a lot of other 3 stakeholders beyond the maritime people that have a 5 role. The API folks, but also local and state response folks. And I don't think that that's unappreciated in any way. I just think that the 7 plans to me seem to primarily be the federal piece 8 and I think a lot of times there are statements 10 that we're going to do this but they really don't get it to nitty-gritty of exactly how it happens 11 12 and then when something happens there's a 13 tremendous amount of confusion. Andrew, you've been through the 9-11 on the ground from that role. 14 Maybe you could talk about that a little bit. 15 16 CAPT. McGOVERN: I think post 9-11, post 17 Katrina and now, what most ports are standing up,

Katrina and now, what most ports are standing up, and maybe this is just another way to craft this, but most ports are standing up using what they call a port coordination team and we call it something else, but basically every port is putting together

18

19

20

21

. 1 a NTF recovery group, local, state, private, federal people, but a fairly small group, you know, 3 maybe a dozen people or so. Instead of I guess NOAA going out and trying to find these local 5 people, make sure, maybe the recommendation is make sure that NOAA becomes part of these, the NAB 7 managers or whoever become part of these local recovery groups in their area and therefore then 8 9 they're in, you know. And they start -- if it's a 10 TSI, obviously it's strictly recovery, but if it's 11 a storm coming, most of these groups now stand up 12 as soon as they hear that something's coming 13 towards them. And they do it generally by 14 conference call, star, it's not something -- you 15 know, a NAB could do it and doesn't even have to 16 leave home or leave his office to talk to a port 17 that's maybe a couple hours away, he don't have to drive there and he could probably be on three 18 conference calls a day if it's coming to an area 19 20 where they don't know yet, the cone is still out 21 here. I think that's another way to say just make

sure that NOAA becomes part of these different port recovery groups.

. 1

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: Absolutely. And again as Bill suggested here in the onset or outset, definitely we could provide a lot of information very quickly to NOAA that would help start. other point I guess I'm trying to make is as these things increase in magnitude, you know, sort of command and control shifts a little bit and you may have a situation where Coast Guard ends up being the overall lead on-scene commander or FEMA or something like that and I think it would be important and is important for NOAA to recognize that they have some primary functions that are going to be involved here, and they're used to dealing with their stakeholders, and that message has to get -- as responsibilities shift you don't want to lose those linkages where NOAA is primary on somebody's survey. So the Coast Guard person needs to know that through the NOAA channels. It can't be that NOAA sends a scientific advisor for a 1 particular thing. It's a very big issue of kind of

2 cross training across all of these programs and

3 functions so everybody knows as all these sort of

4 hierarchical layered responses kick in that you

5 don't disconnect relationships along the way,

6 because those vertical linkages really have to

7 happen to be effective.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CAPT. McGOVERN: One of Bill's concerns was who do we put down, who you identify in these local ports. These port recovery groups have already done that job. Each port is a different animal so each port may have a little bit different makeup depending on who they think is important in that port for recovery. I don't know if anyone has seen this yet, this is the maritime infrastructure recovery plan. All right. Now, this is an official document. It talks about the Corps of Engineers. NOAA has two bullets, the Corps of Engineers has, I don't know, a lot, more than -one of theirs is, you'll love this, this is official government-speak, conduct high tech

channel service for the Corps. Who's going to do that? So instead of that being under NOAA, it's under the Corps.

. 1

MS. BROHL: Whose job is it from NOAA to make sure NOAA is in these kind of things?

MR. RAINEY: The recommendation I have up there, that's exactly it. I'm fairly familiar with all these plans and it's very clear once you start looking at them, the federal government does not acknowledge and recognize what NOAA brings to the table and NOAA has to assert itself and say maybe we're cast in a supporting role here, but we are the primary unique federal capability to do these services and by god, people gotta know that.

MS. BROHL: We've been talking about on the ground kind of thing. It also has to start up here. So Steve has another meeting to go to, somebody has another meeting to go to, this kind of thing, is NOAA knocking on the door saying how come I didn't get invited? Because I don't know whose job it is to make sure that NOAA has bullets in

1 there, there is an acknowledgement of how it works.

2 This feeds right back into what Bill says about

3 with the ATHOS 2, that the Corps is just

4 reinforcing the fact that they're the channel

5 person when in fact they are not really the channel

6 person. It all kind of feeds into itself.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

If I could ask, just elaborate real quickly on another point in regard to stakeholder relationships, in the discussion you talked about the response and recovery. There are other NOAA partners out in the field as well that may be an important part of recovery, but in terms of getting that, getting the, integrating the NOS message into the other departments in NOAA, whether it's emergency response, and hopefully kind of feed one another and expand into all areas, we talked briefly with Sea Grant, Sea Grant has field agents and Sea Grant used to be an organization like Agricultural Extension where you had an extension agent out there who saw what the needs were and brought that back in and you developed research or

. 1 studies or whatever to address those needs and then took it back out in the community, and Sea Grant 3 has kind of become wherever the money and they'll do a study based on the money and it's all about 5 space and species and what the field agent does on the local level, but maybe in the recovery aspect, 7 we take it to people like Sea Grant or the fisheries people in terms of recovery side of this 8 to continue that network. It's just an aspect, and 10 as this is fleshed out a little bit more in terms 11 of stakeholder relationships, perhaps some of the 12 recovery side more than response, that all of those 13 areas don't automatically think of relationship building. It's just another way to feed this 14 15 interrelationship is all.

report, it just came to light to me a couple weeks ago, and I was unaware that it was being developed, and it doesn't surprise me in the federal government because the services are so dispersed across so many agencies. So just having knowledge

16

17

18

19

20

21

that an event or report is being written is a

challenge. But hopefully with this CMTS and some

of the interagency coordination, some of this will

improve so that accurate information does get put

in these type of reports. As mentioned earlier,

NOAA's hired one of the first folks with this

executive secretary at the CMTS and hopefully I'm

looking to that as a high level communication tool

of what the various agencies are doing. Again,

capture our capabilities accurately.

these documents are comprehensive in nature and do

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DASLER: I think one of the reasons the Corps gets mentioned in there a lot is they're tasked with maintaining the federal channels, but their role they way they see it is it's an engineering effort to maintain it and they're looking at it more from dredge material management than from object detention. When NOAA updates

their charts, it might be single beam survey down

the channel, they update the channel requirements,

but nobody is really researching, we've seen that a

lot on several different incidents where the Corps
just missed a container that's dropped off of a
shop or anchor on the bottom, they're not really
doing that object detention, and that's a fatal
flaw or gap in the system. Everybody thinks
because they're tasked with maintaining those
channels they're also doing object detection. And

9 animal, each district of the Corps is a different

just like each port authority is a different

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I guess.

10 animal, and the way they handle that stewardship of

the channel is completely different from district

to district, and that's a real issue too.

CAPT. McGOVERN: We had that with Steve, remember you were going -- Steve was up in town, oh, we need you to survey this area, and he's like hey, no problem and then all of a sudden the Corps said no, no, that's mine. He wasn't allowed to survey. So it was like sometimes there's that turf

MR. DASLER: In the case of ATHOS, NOS is being brought in on the suit, so at some point

there needs to be that at least acknowledgement that NOAA has some roles in that and it's their

3 responsibility to make sure -- if the Corps is not

4 going to do it, somebody has to step up.

MR. DUNNIGAN: The Corps of Engineers is the authority for maintaining the channels. So they actually hold liability for the depths that they provide to NOAA and NOAA takes that data and applies it to the nautical charts. So they hold the legal authority, so.

MR. RAINEY: You know, we have talked about that. In the next topic I've got some recommendations or some proposed talking points to take a look at that as something that NOAA might consider and raise because it is certainly a federal agency coordination issue and in my little white paper on that I tried to touch on some things and pick up on the things Bill was raising and others.

It certainly relieves a lot of pressure on the meeting and opens it up for discussion if

. 1 the intent is to have a good full discussion and we can kind of pick up on these threads and package 3 them at a later date. So if that meets the approval of the panel, certainly we can proceed that way. Coming up time-wise on the agenda at least to shifting gears, are there some further 7 thoughts on this or we can shift to a quick briefing on the HSIA and then again after lunch we have a good section of time where we can pick up on the -- I think I'll just run through quickly my 10 thoughts on the CMTS and open that for further 11 12 discussion. Anyway, I appreciate all those comments and we'll work to pull from the record and 13 14 move forward. Why don't I then turn it over to 15 Helen for comments on the HSIA to sort of update? 16 MS. BROHL: Scott, thanks very much for 17 the work you did on that. Your experience you've had in the past has made a big difference in trying 18 19 to dissect all the information and turn it into 20 something we can go forward with.

Houston meeting we had proposed to have a statement . 1 on HSIA reauthorization, which was held off until 3 we received some comments from NOAA, which we did receive recently. And if you had any chance to 5 look through the comments from NOAA, some of them are easy, no-brainers in terms of just cleaning up 7 what was done last time or work that's happened and been completed since 2002 when it was last passed and the present. Obviously the panel has some 10 administrative cleanup. We no longer need to have 11 staggered terms at this point, things like that. 12 really believe that we are not going to be able to 13 take time to dissect every part of the 14 recommendations. And in some circumstances when 15 you look at even the first bullet on what NOAA had 16 recommended, you should have been able to pull it 17 off the table, it says prospective changes under 18 review by NOAA. It says include, on the second 19 bullet, add language about the need to address the 20 National Shoreline Survey backlog. Okay, that's a nice idea, but we don't have that language, that's 21

- 1 something we would have to follow up on. I don't
- 2 think we're in a position today to have long
- 3 discussion about any one of these bullets. And
- 4 | frankly, I think that there are some probably other
- 5 ideas that members have. Yes, sir.
- 6 MR. ARMSTRONG: Do we have a document to
- 7 look at?
- MS. BROHL: Yeah. I'm sorry, I just
- 9 pulled it off the back table. I thought everybody
- 10 pulled all these documents off the back table like
- 11 I did.
- 12 (Pause in the proceedings.)
- MS. BROHL: You all have these by
- 14 e-mail, you received prospective ideas from NOAA.
- 15 | So you've seen that in the past. I guess my point
- 16 is we're not going to spend a lot of time on each
- 17 one of these bullets except that since you have had
- 18 a chance to review them, this is an opportunity to
- 19 ask specific questions of the NOAA staff here on,
- 20 if you have a question what they're actually
- 21 getting at or what is it they're asking, just so

you can leave here with a better understanding so when we get together by conference call in the next two weeks that we won't have to go back and ask that question.

. 1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Then secondly, I have given back the statement that I had drafted from Houston and added a paragraph at the end and I would like us to look at that for possible approval today. So if I may, I'm going to presume that everybody might have had a chance to look at the document that you received by e-mail, which you now have again in front of you, which is the prospective changes under review by NOAA, and I'm going to open up the -- Scott, I know that you had a question by e-mail when you saw these and I was wondering if you could go back and ask the question again and perhaps if you received any response from it?

MR. RAINEY: Well, the short answer is no, I didn't get a response. I had a couple of just questions that came up as I read these, and these were I think ideas that Roger received back

. 1 from the various program offices on some 2 suggestions or comments or things they might be 3 looking for. I don't know to the extent they've been vetted up through Jack or beyond. I guess Helen's asked me to sort of present the questions I posed, and again I don't have a response to, but 7 one of them was about data. I was a little unclear 8 as to the suggested changes between NGS and CO-OPS about who's on first with the official data. 10 was some overlap in the language on the shoreline. Most of them were that sort of a level thing, I 11 12 don't think it would really bear any weighty 13 consideration on your work, Helen. To be honest 14 with you, I -- can you scroll that, the bullet a 15 little bit? I know that was one of the things I 16 was asking about. 17

Oh, the other thing that I might mention that I remember I posed, was wondering about, was there was a thought, to the extent there should be a charge, there was suggestion posed in this information about receiving I think a charge for

18

19

20

some of these services and I just asked was the

point of that because the amount of money received

wasn't worth the administrative burden of

administering, I just didn't know why they would

suggest that the fees were -- I just didn't know

that. They were just very minor points, I don't

think it is important to go into now.

8 MS. BROHL: I have a question on one of 9 the last bullets regarding the functions of the 10 administrator, said to promote the safe, efficient and environmentally sound Marine Transportation 11 12 System which currently is in there and to add and 13 to promote the nation's homeland security interest. 14 I was wondering is that just because NOAA has 15 received money under that type of a caveat and 16 that's why that was added, what was the thought? 17 Who actually made the original suggestion? If there was some meaningful -- I mean, it's not a big 18 19 deal, but what was the thought behind that? It may be that came out of Roger, I'm not sure, so. 20

CAPT. BARNUM: I personally don't have a

154 . 1 corporate entity on that particular bullet, I don't 2 know if Dave or Mike do. Anybody else here? 3 MR. ZILKOWSKI: Where are you pointing to here? 5 MS. BROHL: Second page, top bullet. CAPT. McGOVERN: We don't have that. 6 7 MS. BROHL: It's right up there on the 8 board. 9 MR. ZILKOWSKI: I'm still not sure I 10 understand what you're trying to get at. MS. BROHL: What I was asking, it's just 11 a proposal, that in the HSIA that you add, under 12 13 the functions of the administrator, the term and promote the national homeland security interest. 14 15 I'm kind of curious what the motivation was. Maybe 16 it was just a funding issue. We all know under 17 funding NOAA has received some money and I'm just 18 kind of curious about it. MR. ZILKOWSKI: Well, I'm not -- I 19 really don't know actually who put that in, but I 20

guess I can tell you that we have done more after

9-11 and then with the hurricanes to show people
that we are heavily involved in the security issues
and that it's not our primary focus but we support
it. We're like a service to a lot of organizations
that provide security and probably whoever put that
in is trying to say we're part of that process and
we shouldn't be forgotten, but I don't know.

MR. SZABADOS: I would echo what Dave had to say. Basically the organization does support those functions but has not been highlighted in our mandates or authorizations, so I believe that was the foundation for that.

MR. DUNNIGAN: In reflecting on it, I agree with that, that certainly points out the importance of the NGS and also the nation's homeland security interest certainly spilled its version of what could be derived from PORTS; is there something bad in the water, where is it going to go, particularly how to deal with it. So I think that was getting at the heart of those kind of issues, how NOAA's information services play

into homeland security on a particular incident.

. 1

2 MS. BROHL: If I could I'd like to ask 3 Jack a question, because Scott touched on it. received -- we've been asking for months and months and months to receive this kind of information. having received it last minute, given the fact you're now on board and Steve is on board, I'm a 8 little uncomfortable even having any discussions 9 about these without you guys have a chance to kind of massage them a little bit and think about them. 10 And if the panel is okay, if we could kind of give 11 12 these back to you guys, because the reauthorization 13 is so important and if we're going to go through 14 this and if we're willing to accept your -- willing 15 to take the time to review your thoughts on it, as 16 well as our own together, then I'd rather make sure that you have gotten everything you need rather 17 18 than what I felt was, because of the time constraints and busy schedules, hey, guys, give me 19 20 some bullets and we'll put them in here. I would 21 be more comfortable knowing that this was vetted

now that you guys are on board. Is there any objection to that as long as we can feel there's some time line by which we'd look at this in a meaningful way? Jack?

. 1

MR. DUNNIGAN: Thank you. This is

frankly one of the areas where I think the review

panel can be most helpful to us. HSIA is a

critical part of the legislative mandate that NOAA

executes. It needs to be reauthorized, it needs to

be reauthorized on a timely fashion. It's not

going to happen this year and it's not going to get

any attention on Capitol Hill this year. So I

think we have some time to do this the right way.

I think that we could probably work with you to focus a major part of our discussion in August on issues related to the reauthorization of the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act and we could come to you with a presentation about issues around things that need to be improved and fixed within that law and alternatives and pros and cons and have a good wide-open discussion and then that

1 would lead us all to be in a position sometime

2 early in the 110th Congress for the administration

3 to be able to come forward with a draft bill.

4 Clearly this is something I believe we're going to

5 say we want to do, we want to see reauthorized. I

6 don't see a future where we wouldn't want to do

7 that. The question is what are the real issues we

8 have to address.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Now, saying that, I do think it would be helpful for us to hear from you some of the problems you're perceiving out there that a reauthorized HSIA could address. I don't want your consideration to be dictated only by our thoughts of what's important. I think what's really important now, I think this is -- Helen's draft paper and the list of ideas are to me right now sort of good kickoff things that we can use as a jumping off point for discussion and maybe we can agree to come back to the next meeting with a more formal view of issues and options. We'll work with your leadership to vet that through and make sure

it's staffed properly and have a good broad

discussion and then you will be in a position to

say this is what we think you ought to be doing in

terms of this. But this is clearly one of those

areas where I think the panel can be completely

6 helpful in helping us sort out where we want to go
7 in the future on these kind of issues.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: I wanted to say one thing on that. I had a couple of opportunities to talk about that and Admiral West and I in our particular briefing talked about the Organic Act. One suggestion I would hope that follows on the admiral's pointing out the caution that the O is slipping out of NOAA a little bit on the NOS programs, the HSIA has been codified in Title 33, but I think that the versions kicking around on the hill that I've seen of the NOAA Organic Act, they just don't acknowledge NOS. The ones I've seen seem to be NOAA, National Weather Service and some other things. I think that it would be very

helpful and I would hope as you look for a vehicle

to move the HSIA, whether you could move it as a . 1 2 standalone piece of legislation, or I think we 3 tacked it onto Poland last time around, but you have to find a vehicle that's going to move and I 5 think to the extent the Ocean Action Plan is going to be taken up as an agenda item or the NOAA 7 Organic Act, I think that I would certainly like to see not the appropriations levels, we talked with 9 Admiral Lautenbacher about it, but I would 10 certainly be an advocate for seeing NOS's roles, missions and functions identified within the NOAA 11 12 Organic Act. To leave it out to me is saying when 13 we do this Organic Act that's supposed to kind of 14 be the enabling statue for this one NOAA team and 15 there's nothing in there about NOS, I think that 16 really is sending a message that is commerce and 17 transportation, all the things you do in NOS, where is it, it's got to be there because these are 18 19 critical programs.

MS. BROHL: From a practical standpoint, the problem with the NOAA Organic Act is that it

20

. 1 covers so many areas that you have to get it through multiple committees and that makes it very difficult. Kind of like the IOOS legislation, so 3 the downside of that is that the minute you take these programs and shove it into a larger bill that we're going to be, we might have trouble 7 reauthorizing again because we're stuck in a bigger bill that can't get through. Right now we have our 8 9 own little pretty package here. They talk about 10 IOOS and we say well, we're okay because we have 11 tides and location, we can move forward, so the 12 downside of that, even though I really respect the 13. fact that you don't want again to be -- I was going 14 to say something that shouldn't be in the record --15 the stepchild of NOAA, I really respect that and 16 understand that. From a practical standpoint, 17 having our own thing, even though resources committee may not be the best committee for it, at 18 least it's one committee. 19 20 MR. RAINEY: I quess I'd just say I

would try to take all roads to get to where you

want to go. You run it independently as a standalone bill and throw out everything you think's going to move and maybe something gets through.

MS. BROHL: I guess then the recommendation that the idea of determining issues and aspects of any amendments, proposed amendments we might have for HSIA should be concurrent with the panel and with you and the roads will meet and we'll find out where match or don't match in preparation for August, is that how you perceive it?

MR. DUNNIGAN: Yes. Is the committee willing to do that? I hate to put things off. Do you think it would be a good idea for us to have a full consideration, detailed pros and cons and issues come August?

MS. BROHL: I think what I'll do in preparation for that is send out an e-mail to panel members for a quick bullets back, doesn't have to be vetted completely, but you have some thoughts on

aspects of it that, again, doesn't have to be fully

2 vetted, just throw them back so at least we have

3 some bullets ourselves simultaneously for what they

4 may be developing and that will give us a starting

5 point. Is that okay with everybody?

MR. DUNNIGAN: Yeah, then we'll work with Helen and Scott to incorporate those into issues and options. We'll come with an issues and options presentation for you. Jon.

MR. DASLER: While we had this in front of us I just wanted to comment I guess on this adding the comment of promote the nation's homeland security interest. That's probably what we could call in the private industry skull crest. I think it's in here just as you pointed out. The professionals within NOAA are very passionate about what they want to do and have always taken on and to do as much as they can. Then you get back to the same issue, the Coast Guard was faced with taking on homeland security issues, just couldn't cut our budget, don't cut the Marine Transportation

1 charter budget. I think adding that stuff in.

2 What seems to be in here and constant catchup in

3 the budget, it's more trying to justify the budget

4 as opposed to becoming proactive and saying we'll

5 take on more, but we want to do that. I think it's

6 important if this is added the caveat of additional

7 budget to support what goes with it.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

haven't discussed.

MS. BROHL: We see that in so many different areas, organizations who had a core focus started chasing the money bus, core money dissipated and you wonder what the focus is. We all have examples of where that happened and I didn't know you were engaged in that. Your point is well taken and I think we have to think about that as compared to we know that's huge dollars and sums and we do know that in a Homeland Security supplemental NOAA did really really well once upon

May I go to the next thing? Now, the second thing I want to do before we stop talking

a time post 9-11, but the answer -- which we

about HSIA, everybody has a copy of this, the one . 1 in front of you, this is what you had in Houston 3 except there is a paragraph in bold that is added. I thought that the information was generally the 4 same or basically reiterating that HSIA is 5 important for a number of reasons. And I have two 7 changes to propose and I'd like you to consider 8 voting for it today. One which is not in front of 9 you which I actually just reread and thought read better, if you look to the old last paragraph that 10 began as the HSIA expires at the end of fiscal year 11 2007, I would change that last statement where it 12 says -- it's a one-sentence paragraph. That we 13 recommend a five-year authorization that would be 14 15 supported with funding levels commensurate to address certain things, I thought instead of being 16 finite that these are the things, that we should 17 just say like realtime hydrographic observations, 18 comma, get rid of and the, continuation of the 19 HSRP, comma, among other critical hydrographic 20 needs, just so we're not coming off as finite. 21

that's one thought.

. 1

2 And then you can see in bold at the end 3 we added another paragraph which basically says we acknowledge that there may be proposed amendments 5 from within NOAA and they may deserve due consideration, but we really believe NOAA needs to 7 be fully engaged. We recognize, Jack, that you're there, we're with you, but to the administrator we 9 would like to say time's awasting, we need to get 10 moving, and whatever form is appropriate and the 11 wording may be need to be corrected because I don't 12 know necessarily whether agency review is the 13 appropriate term, but whatever appropriate methods 14 are necessary to begin engaging, coming up with a 15 proposed bill and engaging Congress to get it 16 moving. Because Jack is correct, they got many 17 different things on their plate, but there's also 18 certain indifference to moving this forward and I 19 can tell you that if there's indifference, then 20 simple reauthorization is the easiest way to get it 21 moving, but we're not proposing a simple

1 reauthorization, we are proposing some meaningful

2 amendments, but there needs to be discussion

3 because the authorized levels, at the end of fiscal

4 year '07, which means September '07, they end. And

5 here we are at a really bad time, we're at the

6 second session of this Congress, which is the bad

7 time to try to get something going and finished,

8 and then we will have the first session of the next

9 Congress before it expires, and you generally like

10 to have both sessions of the Congress. So I was

11 just looking for any comments on the verbiage, but

12 the goal, which is to say let's just get it moving.

13 Jack.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: And I think that would be a very good message for you to carry back NOAA and carry back to the vice admiral. And this paragraph takes a long time to get there. You know, maybe what you want to do is strongly encourage NOAA to engage immediately, with a lot of people, with you,

with the community at large, in developing an

administration position to support reauthorization

of the HSIA. It could be just that simple.

. 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There's a sentence, however we note that HSIA expires, of course I don't think that's true, is it?

MS. BROHL: Authorized levels expire.

The authorization for MR. DUNNIGAN: appropriations expires and of course we haven't had a authorization for the Endangered Species Act for almost 20 years, we haven't had one for the Magnuson-Stevens Act for six, and yet Congress goes ahead and appropriates money anyway. That's not an excuse. But I think you need to take that as an opportunity to not rush into something that is not what we want. I think we have time over the next couple of months working through our August meeting and maybe the meeting after that to make sure we've got the right issues defined and the right options laid out and then have a chance to develop some thoughts so we can have an administration position.

The other thing is this is a public forum, so everything we do here is, can and will be

- . 1 used by you, by stakeholders, by constituents, in helping to carry this message forward. At some 3 point we the government will have to close our doors and come up with what we think is a 5 government position and privately we can run that by the panel and should. But we can't do that 7 quite so publicly then once we get to that point. 8 So I think, you know, telling us to get 9 on with it, which is what you said orally, is really what would be really helpful to us now and I 10 11 think it would help us to get the admiral's attention and make sure he knows we're moving 12 forward. 13 14 MS. BROHL: Any comments to Jack's 15 remarks? 16 MR. SZABADOS: This is not to Jack's. This panel was authorized by this authorization. 17 If it's not reauthorized on a time scale, does this 18 panel stay in place? 19
 - MR. DUNNIGAN: Of course I'm not allowed to give legal advice anymore, but the answer is no.

20

. 1 MS. BROHL: Maybe I was beating around 2 the bush too much trying to be far too clever and 3 it didn't work. In the last proposed addition paragraph, we just get rid of everything on the 4 5 first page, go to the second page and say, where it says at the top, just say the HSRP recommends that 6 7 NOAA begin immediate and serious deliberations with 8 any and all appropriate parties, even if that's 9 needed, with the goal of providing Congress with 10 agents' views or other appropriate communication to 11 facilitate reauthorization in a timely manner. Any 12 comments?

MR. GRAY: That would be the total message; isn't that right?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BROHL: No, no, no. Everything else would stay except you go to the last paragraph, you get rid of all the stuff in black on the first page, then go to the second page and get rid of everything up till on the very first line it says the, and just say the HSRP recommends that NOAA begin immediate and serious deliberations to

provide Congress with agents' views or other appropriate communication to facilitate reauthorization in a timely manner.

. 1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. GRAY: Well, if I understand what Jack just said, nonlegal advice of course, but we really don't have to say anything right now to the administrator about any of this if we don't wish to, and if that's true, I would then suggest that we say nothing now but take I think some of the issues that we have raised today, and the 11-point paper, Scott, you haven't discussed it yet, but it was passed out, there are some really needy issues dealing with the CMTS and so forth like that, and I think if the next message we as a panel send to the administrator starts to deal with some of those things, which I think have received some favorable comment and support today, why don't we not say anything now where we don't need to say anything now, because it's going to roll over anyway? Let's make the next thing we do hit him right between the eyes and say here are some things that really would make the operation of NOAA very much more effective if we can get them achieved.

. 1

2

3 MS. BROHL: Well, my thought on that is that I'm not sure why you think we don't have to 4 5 say something and why you would think we wouldn't. 6 Let me finish by saying that whether there are huge 7 things to make -- there are all kinds of recommendations that we could and should make to 8 the administrator. That being put aside, up to 9 10 this point there have been no real substantive internal dialogue discussions about reauthorization 11 12 of HSIA, and while I feel really really great to 13 hear Jack say that he has intention to really deal with this, I still think that's great, but I kind 14 of don't care. I really think that we should in 15 fact say directly to the administrator that HSIA is 16 part and parcel to the Hydrographic Services 17 programs, and even though there's lots of things to 18 19 fix, we'd like to see a dialogue begin to talk about how we might propose amendments to the HSIA 20 21 and reauthorization at meaningful levels.

MR. GRAY: I understood we didn't have to do anything, that was going to happen already and he would already know that.

. 1

MR. DUNNIGAN: Actually, Bill, this is a good point, this would be helpful for me to be able to carry this recommendation from you to the vice admiral.

MR. GRAY: Then I withdraw --

MR. DUNNIGAN: Because Steve and I are going to proceed to deal with you on this question, but if you have the opportunity to bring it right to his attention that this is something we're working on, Vice Admiral Lautenbacher likes engagement, he likes collaboration. I try not to hit him right between the eyes, and so I think this is a good way of setting it up for the future.

MR. GRAY: That's absolutely fine then.

It sounded to me like keep doing the good job

you've been doing.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Oh, no, although we like that too.

MS. BROHL: Tom.

. 1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. SKINNER: Getting back to your question, Helen, I like the proposed language you recommended. Do we need to move that?

MS. BROHL: Yes, we will have to move that.

MR. SKINNER: May I make that motion?

MS. BROHL: Yes, you may. We'll take time for discussion after the motion. Is there a motion to approve the recommendation, the resolution with the recommended changes?

MR. SKINNER: So moved.

MS. BROHL: Is there a second? Andy

14 McGovern. Is there any discussion?

MR. LAPINE: Just a point of clarification, when you read it the first, or the second time you added with any and all interested parties, are we dropping that?

MS. BROHL: No, that was one of the recommended changes. Oh, I see what you're saying. I did drop it the second time. I thought that

wasn't necessary, that deliberations if they're appropriate will include everybody. Okay.

. 1

No deliberation, no discussion. I call the question. All in favor say aye. Opposed?

(Unanimous aye vote)

MS. BROHL: Was I supposed to do that or were you supposed to do that? I apologize, I'm sorry.

MR. RAINEY: I get plenty of air time.

Thanks, Helen, for that. What I would like to do, I know we're eight bells here at noon and I'd like to -- the last time I took a look past the sign-in sheet we had five folks sign up from the public, nobody had indicated an interest in speaking, but I'd like to take just a minute here to turn around and again thank our public for their interest and ask before we adjourn for lunch if there's anyone that would like to address the panel at this time?

Okay. Well, thanks again for coming.

These are public meetings and part of the Federal

Advisory Committee Act process and we certainly appreciate your interest. So I'll make a couple, 3 just look ahead what we're up to. I suspect there may be a couple other people that are going to race back to check out as I am. But if we could try to adhere to our schedule. Looking ahead I'd like to 6 7 pick up then with some thoughts that I had on the, for NOAA to take or consider in their work with the 8 9 Marine Transportation System, pick up on that. 10 have a presentation from CORE external affairs staff and then Dave's remarks on the IOOS. I had 12 also one specific recommendation that I'll tag 13 into, it's the last one on my CTS, I asked for some 14 specific staff help for a graphic because I would 15 like us to address our concern about the ENC. 16 That's sort of what we're looking at this 17 afternoon. Under old business we'll go ahead and go through pro forma approval of our summary from 18 our last meeting in Houston that's been circulated 19 20 and posted. Helen has a new business issue for 21 consideration and again we have some public

. 1

5

177 . 1 comments. So that's basically what we're looking at this afternoon and I am aware that Bill and others have some tight schedules and may have to 3 leave, so we'll try to move that along with your 4 help in coming back on schedule. I think it will 5 go a long way, we can jump right into the 6 7 afternoon's agenda. 8 MS. BROHL: Lunch is CORE, what does 9 that mean? 10 MR. RAINEY: I believe it may be 11 available here. For folks who don't need to make 12 the run back to the hotel or on the way to or from, 13 there should be some sustenance out there. there are any other comments before we adjourn for 14 15 lunch? Okay. Well, thanks very much. It's been a 16 real productive morning. 17 (Luncheon recess from 12:03 to 12:50 p.m.)

MR. RAINEY: I wanted to risk one editorial comment, kind of a -- I'm taking Andy's remarks and I agree with them and take them out of context a little bit just to make one little point.

18

19

20

. 1 I was thinking about it as I was racing back to get my stuff out. I wanted to be, just comment on, 3 Andy made the suggestion that we're overshooting the mark, and I wanted to pick up on that from my 5 view of that. In part that's true and in part that's precisely what I'm trying to do. I can tell 6 you and I think, I don't remember if Steve Barnum 7 was in the meeting with me, but what I want to say 8 9 on that is that Congress stood this up and NOAA's 10 obviously accepted and moved forward, but in the 11 initial briefing I had with Admiral Lautenbacher he 12 didn't recognize I was in the room or who I was, 13 and I can tell you the initial mark for this panel 14 was probably lower than we would like it to be as 15 far as the expectation or the mark let's say for 16 what advice we may be able to provide. And it's 17 always been my interest and effort to try to pull this group together and have it deliver substantive 18 19 recommendations at a level that I think we're 20 capable of as a fact. I've been extremely encouraged with the remarks here this morning and I 21

think we have a real opportunity to do that in a thoughtful way. So, you know, to pick up on that, I completely agree with what Andy said, but I want us to strive to do that, I want us to exceed We have all been involved in so many expectations. FACAs and the biggest thing is figuring out the 7 next meeting date and you sort of celebrate the problem but you never say anything that hasn't been said or written in the reports for the last 20 years. So hopefully we can identify meaningful deliverables and really produce something, because 12 to do that, I think that that's what our challenge 13 is, to push our agenda if you will in supporting these programs up through NOAA, up through the 15 department, through OMB to Congress, and to tell 16 that story better. I think we have to in a sense 17 overshoot the mark because NOAA is looking at a 18 portfolio as we talked about, we're to the right of 19 the decimal point a percentage or two of what 20 Admiral Leutenbacher is dealing with on climate 21 change and all these huge overarching issues that

. 1

2

3

5

6

10

11

1 are much more in the public forum than our issues.

2 And I think that our challenge is to capitalize on

the fact of what we already know as a group, but to

4 make it well known that the programs that we're

5 talking about here within NOS are framework

6 programs that support and interact and affect

7 everything else NOAA is trying to do. So it's not

8 just this 1 percent in all the busy schedules and

9 meetings, I think we need to try to work together

10 and in a sense overshoot the mark, otherwise we're

11 going to be sort of, yeah, we know all that.

So that's always been my goal, to try to really focus us and try to harness our collective knowledge and get that story told in a better way.

So that's what I have been trying to be about and I

hope that is consistent with how you view the

panel. With NOAA's help, if we can get that

support in there, that will be, I think we'll be

19 able to achieve that.

3

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

Let me go just as I suggested then after, or before lunch and just jump right into --

I think it may be easiest, because I sent this around, let me run through it again. I've got a few recommendations, and again it sounds like what we can do is to put all of these on the table, take others on board, and then we can deal with them and 6 figure out how to package them and work with Jack 7 and Steve down the road. So this, I just direct your attention to the white paper I sent around on 8 9 some thoughts on the Committee on Marine 10 Transportation and then pull out from that, I think 11 ended up with 11 bullets. So working from there, 12 these were -- where I started on this was one of my 13 initial thoughts when I came into the HSRP was what 14 I characterized as a most wanted list or trying to 15 just quickly generate from the panel what they 16 thought were requirements, needs, priorities for 17 these services and maybe go back and provide some input. This is kind of in line with that. 18 there's something I have in new business that I 19 20 talked to NOAA about that we may be able to move 21 forward in furtherance of that. I'm fumbling here

. 1

3

a little bit from my list, but -- okay. Some folks gave me some extra papers I think. Okay. So I want to just quickly run through my ideas.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

What they have, what you're seeing on the overhead is the distilled proposed recommendations if you will from my white paper from the CMTS. Let me just maybe go through the recommendations and that way we can talk, if anybody has any questions or interest in talking further. But just quickly, the HSRP recommends that NOAA work within the CMTS. I just prefaced everything there, because everybody understands that NOAA, we advise NOAA and the CMTS is one of 13-some agencies, probably one of the primary movers and shakers there, but we're advising NOAA, so --

CAPT. McGOVERN: Scott, this is the first time I noticed it, we couched everything so broadly in terms of the CMTS, did something change between the last time we talked and now in regards to that relationship?

MR. RAINEY: Well, I think others would have some ideas, but the thing that's happening, we talked a little bit about it this morning, is that with the Ocean Action Plan, the aqua box and also the Committee on Marine Transportation at the cabinet level, and these agencies, as Jack was mentioning, there's an executive secretariat standing up to staff that and in each of the agencies involved or at least many of them are identifying FDEs to put on that executive secretariat to help staff that, so this is, Helen can jump in here too, but I think they met a couple or maybe three times and so that committee at the cabinet level is standing up. This is a sort of a successor effort, but bigger and hopefully more able to make some things happen in the former ICMTS, so there's that effort that's standing up. We talked a lot about the MTSNAC, which is the industry analog to that, and the Harbor Safety Committees and also by executive order the Homeland Security Advisory Council, which also has a Federal

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

. 1 Advisory Committee. So all of these efforts are out there and the CMTS is in the process of 3 standing up and a lot of our issues that we deal with on hydrographic surveys to my mind and I think 5 many of us see a logical interface or, you know, 6 that have a lot to do with the Marine 7 Transportation System. So I think my thinking or 8 the reason to talk about it a little bit more 9 specifically here is the timing. These are the 10 issues we're dealing with. There's a lot of 11 overlap in the footprint of the subject matter 12 here, and we are fact -- NOAA has a seat at this 13 other federal body, so perhaps we can provide some 14 input to NOAA that would be helpful.

The last thing I'll say and I'll back off, in Houston if you recall we had the briefing from Mike Snyder, who is an advisor within NOAA to Admiral Lautenbacher on CMTS, and he gave us a presentation that sort of covered the evolution of the Committee on Marine Transportation. Many of us were involved in that, we contributed to the report

15

16

17

18

19

20

to Congress and other things, but one of his themes was this isn't just going to be, you know, we're going to have deliverables and we're going to do some stuff. So I asked, made a point of asking -his jargon or parlance was outcome-based goals, so I had suggested that NOAA needs to be an active player here and not merely pleased to be invited at the table, but NOAA has important programs and should bring an agenda to that body and try to get, you know, not just coordination or just be at the table but to have sort of a plan on what some near term outcome-based goals are. So this is kind of all born out of that. I thought it might be timely for us to say hey, NOAA, we think we can help and play in this and we know you are a big driver behind CMTS and maybe here's some ideas you may want to take forward as part of your agenda.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BROHL: I can add something to that.

The timing issue I think is the big one, Adam, and
we did hear that NOAA is engaged. NOAA, Jack said
he's very enthusiastic, we know that Captain Barnum

is on the coordinating committee for CMTS, and that's really great. But because it's been -- CMTS has been organized for a year, but it's finally getting the staffing and the substance to really kind of move forward. So this is a good time to weigh in. But what's interesting is that in the last year they have created four issue areas so to speak, little team leader areas. You have infrastructure, which is handled by the Corps, you have the collection of maritime data by MARAD, you have emergency response and recovery type things with the Coast Guard, and I forget what the fourth one is.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CAPT. McGOVERN: National strategy.

MS. BROHL: National strategy. But there's nothing really in there, NOAA is not a team lead at this time and there's nothing that talks about navigation safety per se. Now, maybe they get incorporated in other things, but there's nothing about navigation services and the promotion of maritime safety. Now, I don't know whether that

is appropriate just as its own thing, I just don't know that, but to the extent that the panel has an impact or interest in hydrographic services and to the extent that the panel wants to make sure that they weigh in saying hey, NOAA, while you're there, again, even though we know that whoever from NOAA is there would certainly say I know about NOS, this is a good time to say hey, NOAA, when you're dealing with the CMTS, which you love and are enthusiastic about, don't forget those maritime services programs that directly impact and support maritime safety. And, as Scott reiterated in his statements, don't forget that, you know, you might have some overlapping interests with other agencies, you want it to be meaningful, maybe it's NOAA's job to pull CORE out and talk about some of those overlapping areas or Coast Guard when it comes to navigation buoys and things like that. Ι think that makes it important, even though you kind of think well, this is obvious, yeah, it's obvious but this is a good time to weigh in and have the

. 1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

panel say that we just want to make sure that everybody understands that these programs are critical components of the CMTS as well as those big picture things like infrastructure, which of course we'll fix in a year or two, right?

. 1

MR. RAINEY: What I would like to do
then is quickly go down this, I guess this is
Scott's kind of most wanted list or food for
thought on CMTS. Just going by the numbers here,
the HSRP recommends that NOAA work within the CMTS
to establish consistent federal datums. Programs
such as V-Datum and Height Modernization must be
full funded.

We know full well there has been extreme difficulty in that. Corps of Engineers, NOAA, there's different datums across different federal agencies, different datums within NOAA, different ways of managing it, and also that NOAA recognizes that and has programs likes V-Datum and Height Modernization that are addressing this and are critical programs that need to be funded to kind of

were down there last meeting, there were some conflicting datum issues and Mike Shaw of CO-OPS came down to help kind of sort that out. There are some tremendous issues there.

. 1

Second, the HSRP recommends that NOAA work within the CMTS to ensure — this goes to the ATHOS 1 — to ensure a full bottom coverage hydrographic survey is conducted of all federally maintained channels. This surveying should be conducted on a risk management priority basis; for example, starting with those waterways with significant hazardous materials, least under-keel clearance, nearest population, strategic ports/national defense significance, or other appropriate criteria.

I've got a couple here, and again, I had a white paper to present this, but my thought process on this is it seems to me to be an anomaly that, under sort of basic principles of risk management, NOAA has the full bottom coverage

survey and the multi-beam capabilities and NOAA's jurisdiction is outside of our federally maintained channels, high seas, EEZ, and it seemed odd to me that we're going to do a more intensive survey of areas arguably that are at less risk for ship groundings, whereas in the federally maintained channel you have extreme pressure on under-keel clearance and the Corps of Engineers have the jurisdiction there, but as it was just pointed out again here today, their priority mission is dredging and they're doing surveys to support their primary mission. So in the area where we know that we're bringing hazardous materials and thousands of people on cruise ships and all of our shipping is going, we arguably have the least information about what's on the bottom. And it makes -- it just doesn't add up to me. So a couple of these recommendations are trying to get at that. understand there's congressional and agency jurisdiction and we don't want to embarrass agencies, but this would be a perfect issue I would

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

offer, I think we could offer to NOAA to bring to the Committee on Marine Transportation saying are we putting our federal survey dollars and our capabilities and do we have this right, and it strikes me that we don't.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

What happens is the way we've dealt with these things is we've sort of, the government, we've sort of decided to put on the ship folks by insisting on certificates of financial responsibility, cleanup, we have an Oil Spill Response Fund, but we've done all sorts of things to put it on the users and I think that we need to step back or at least suggest a discussion be had on well, are we providing the best information and doing the surveys properly for the missions that really need to be done. So a couple of these go to that, so I read the first one. The second one would be the HSRP recommends that NOAA work within the CMTS to require full bottom coverage surveys at the completion of all navigation projects in federal maintained channels, anchorages, projects

and approaches to piers and berths.

. 1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The same thing goes to Andy McGovern and Captain McGovern's talk about op sale, and also NOAA did some extraordinary work surveying after 9-11 for homeland security purposes, they found enumerable, I mean tons of stuff right in the federally maintained channels, anchorages and approaches where the ships have to go. shouldn't shock us when we heard in Houston, the representative for the district of the Corps of Engineers down there, yes, we do channel condition surveys. Well, you know, they do them by running a center line in the quadrants or they do them because they know they have barges going through there at 12 feet and that's project depth so it must be okay because we haven't had an oil spill. We gotta do better than that.

Okay. I guess we're at 4 then. The HSRP recommends that NOAA work within the CMTS to require the regular monitoring and publishing of water depths in approaches and alongside piers,

either by the federal government, public port

authority, or private terminal operator. This

information should be provided to NOAA for possible

inclusion on charts, coast pilots or other

navigation tools, as well as published in notice to

mariners. This requirement should be enforced by the local USCG Captain of the Port.

I know again Captain McGovern could talk

about this, but you'd be surprised, the hardest information to get is a true depth alongside the pier, nobody wants to really say what it really is, just keep bringing the ships in. It really has taken in some instances an order from the captain of the port, yeah, we're going to actually have to figure this out, so just a talking point or suggestion, something to think about, but it all kind of hangs with the idea of where the ships have to go we may have less knowledge of what's there than we think.

And again, I won't read it, but another thing is we've known that the states in many cases

have permit authority for artificial reefs and fish havens, and when Captain Dave McFarland was head of the Office of Coast Survey he showed me a chart, we had basically mined our entrances to the Port of Mobile, Alabama and over at Mayport, Florida, Port Everglades, where we had a carrier fleet, with these artificial reefs to the point where we couldn't safely get shipping in and out of the channels because we don't even know what we have. Nobody is monitoring the stuff, they're just issuing permits. Sure, there's a Corps of Engineers function, but we're essentially mining our own ports with this stuff and nobody ever goes back and surveys it to see if it's in compliance with the permits, so I threw something out there for an idea.

. 1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

6, this was just -- there's no magic in the double spaces. We were trying to pull this together. HSRP recommends and encourages NOAA to encourage involved federal agencies to complete an inventory of federal products and services that

support the MTS, the idea there being NOAA has already taken that inventory of navigational services, they provided that early on, it was something that Bill Gray was working on and suggested, so I know that NOAA has a pretty good idea of that for us and also in the context of IOOS that they have identified the existing programs for the backbone, we've talked at length about that. think that would be a helpful exercise to the extent, maybe it's already been done, but one of the directives in the Ocean Action Plan is to try to coordinate these services, and there are some overlaps, maybe possible efficiencies to be had.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

7, the HSRP recommends that NOAA work to broaden funding for navigation projects to provide for reevaluation of aids to navigation, hydrographic surveying, and updating the waterways hydrographic model for accurate water level and current information. Now, I'm not saying some of this isn't extremely contentious, but I think Bill touched on it earlier this morning, but the idea is

1 the waterway is a system, and we have our

2 navigation projects, the Harbor Maintenance Trust

Fund and that's had some legal challenges and some

4 implementation issues. But when you do a

5 navigation project, you dredge out a channel, you

6 just changed the hydrography of the channel, you

7 may or may not need more or less or different

8 placement of aids to navigation. The fact that you

have or do not a port system or electronic

10 navigation chart for a port, all of these things

11 ought to be -- there ought to be somebody who has

12 an eye on the big picture, and I don't think that

13 we're there yet.

3

Number 8 is recommend that NOAA work

within the CMTS to encourage the continued

acceleration of completion of the backlog of

17 hydrographic surveys. NOAA needs more resources

18 both in-house and contracting. We've had some

19 revelations on the contracting side, folks

20 yesterday were mentioning it, I hoped they might

21 bring those to light.

. 1

mandated.

HSRP recommends work within CMTS to develop and require approved training courses for ENCs, again just a thought. I know that we've got some IMO work, model courses, et cetera, Coast Guard, there's some things out there, but these ENCs are not plug and play necessarily, and there ought to be some thought about not only getting the database done but we better be careful that people know how to really use these things before they're

Number 10 is sort of a balancing across

NOAA resources. My thought there being that -- and

again this could be more of a NOAA issue, but it's

something that I'd offer it as a CMTS issue as well

because when we're looking at other federal

agencies that are doing similar activities, there

should be maybe some coordination and some

efficiencies there, but what I'm saying is that

NOAA needs to balance its resources, including

partnership efforts with other federal agencies, to

produce hydrographic products. What I mean by that

is if we take a navigational chart, NOAA needs to . 1 2 balance its efforts between surveying, charting, 3 shoreline and other production elements and by that I mean CO-OPS has gotta have enough money to 4 5 provide the water level support so when they're out 6 there surveying they've got something they can work So there's a lot of pieces that have to be 7 balanced, otherwise you don't get to where you want to be at the end of the day. You've gotta fund the 10 Marine Charting Division, coordinate that with 11 hydrographic services, otherwise a backlog of 12 survey data will simply back up in the can because 13 NOAA doesn't have the resources to compile the 14 chart. I just editorialized here a little, not 15 only is that inefficient, it gives rise to 16 potential liability from accidents where it can be 17 shown that NOAA had knowledge of hazards to navigation but did not disseminate this information 18 19 to mariners. So NOAA's ability to balance its 20 resource is crippled by earmarks.

off is specifically toward ENC database. We would recommend acceleration, to work within CMTS in an attempt to accelerate the production of its ENC database to complete work in sufficient time to

5 meet the ENC carriage requirement implementation.

. 1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Barbara, would you put the visual up and -- I had asked -- this is something that we've talked about but it's something I'm really struck And while she's loading that up, I had asked for some help from NOAA staff and they got me this the other day, which I very much appreciate. point here is this is I think a good CMTS issue. NOAA, we've made decision that we're going to switch over to a central database, official database, S57, ENC data, and NOAA is running parallel processes right now so we can accomplish that. But the plan is to go to the electronic data, so we're pursuing that. At the same time -so the policy has been made that that's the way we're going to go. Not only is the way we're going to go, it's been decided by Congress that this is

so superior that they're going to require a carriage requirement and in fact they've enacted a law that requires the Coast Guard to promulgate a carriage of these electronic navigation charts, okay, and we talked about this before in our meetings, but I want a visual to try to drive this So what's happened is there's sort of a disconnect in cost and implementation here in that we have the law of the land that there is to be a requirement to carry these ENCs, yet we're not funding the program that develops these things in time to keep apace with the implementation of that requirement, or at least that's the concern I'd like to raise.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That first chart is showing you the

President's budget request and what's been

appropriated. I'm not even going to read the

numbers, I think you can see the visual of what

we've got. Can you go to the next one, Barbara?

This is the one to me that tells the

story. If you look at I'm going to say the top

line, and that may be misleading, but if you can see from where you are, the ENCs at the projection requirement, I don't know if anybody caught it, but earlier Jack talked about the hundred percent requirement. Okay? What I'd asked for is show me what NOAA had set out to do, what plan A was and where we were going to be. Now, the data marks on the graph here are where we are with ENC data production and the goal is a thousand. Now, that's I think maybe somewhat misleading but you get the general idea, there's a thousand or so charts in the portfolio, there's not a one-for-one border match going from ENCs to paper charts, but let's say the goal is a thousand here. Plan A, what we wanted to do was, we were going to have that done by 2007 and that's when the reg, the carriage requirement has to be promulgated. Certainly there will be a phase-in, but there has to be time for the, you know, he has to get them on his ships and get the equipment he needs and training and all that, so there needs to be some lead time.

. 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

· 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

projected state, is actually the bottom line, the yellow line. We're getting a partial funding and then Jack did point out there is some funding, but look at the shortfall there. Right now as you build more ENCs, it takes more money to maintain them as you build them because as we all know there's tons of chart corrections and things and it takes a lot of money to keep them up. So what we're looking at is we're about 550 and there's no -- that's about where we're going to stay if we we project this out. What needs to happen I guess, you know, what we're trying to do, what I would call the magenta line there, if we can get full funding from here out on the President's request on these ENCs, then we can maybe hope to hit those data points so that we will accomplish that, I guess the hope is to try get them completed by 2010. Well, that's three years, you know, post the carriage requirement promulgation. So we're well into the phase-in of that. That's the state of

What we have are present state and

play as best we can see it. And I very much appreciated this visual because I think that speaks volumes and so I'd like us -- again, we can always delay, but my hope is that this is concerning to us and that we could craft a recommendation that says hey, you know, take this to CMTS because we're not getting there from here at this point.

. 1

The last slide, Barbara, is really a compilation of both and I don't know if that gets too busy. But that's an attempt to put it all in one graphic, but to me the middle slide is really the story we're trying to tell and so that's sort of the visual to where I'm going with that.

I had the proposed recommendation number 11 and in the information that I provided in Houston I think that you may have in front of you, there was a recommendation that I wrote back in January in Houston to try to attack this. We did not take it up then, but I'll read that to you, which is in line with this thought. The HSRP is concerned that the current appropriations for

. 1 electronic navigation charts (ENCs) is insufficient to support NOAA's responsibility to provide and 2 3 maintain a complete portfolio of official navigation charts. The HSRP recommends that NOAA 4 assess its capability to complete and maintain the 5 6 ENC portfolio in time to meet anticipated mandatory 7 ENC carriage requirements, that NOAA based on its assessment prepare a strategic plan to ensure 8 9 timely completion of the portfolio and that the 10 assessment strategy include the impacts of 11 projected or potential shortfalls in appropriations 12 and resources in that this is, we see this as a 13 mission critical priority to NOAA. 14 Anyway, that's the summation and kind of 15 my first attempt to throw some thoughts out that NOAA might draw from for their agenda on CMTS, but 16 17 I would like to go ahead and open it up to members. MR. DASLER: What's the source, did you 18

MR. RAINEY: I explained verbally to NOAA and the Marine Charting Division, Ashley

19

20

21

do that or --

Chapel and others helped spearhead that working with Barbara and Steve because it was a specific thing I wanted to be able to pull together that was beyond my ability to graph it out and I wanted to try to put words to it, but to tip off where we're going with the new business, we've got a commitment from NOAA's strategic program office to, at least if we're interested and working with Jack and Steve, to help us with a kind of a brochure or something. To me visuals like this kind of tell the story. So this was, it was a specifically staff thing that they helped us with.

. 1

MS. BROHL: Scott, could I see this one again? First I guess you're proposing that we take number 11 and actually separate it out of the other CMTS discussion and address it separately, which I really think we should do, because I had so many other questions about aspects of other parts that I wouldn't want this to get bogged down. If that's the case I'd like to discuss --

MR. RAINEY: I'm not proposing to take

it out because I think the issue is that the Coast Guard has a rule-making and NOAA's got to provide the service, I think it's appropriately a possible CMTS issue but I also think we could send it up if you wish separately as well to NOAA. Again, now, just to be consistent with how we went this morning, I think we're kind of in agreement in this meeting we'll go ahead and just pull all the ideas we can on the table. I'm not proposing, I'm not making a motion or anything that we simply wordsmith or vote on this at this point, but I just wanted to open the discussion.

. 1

MS. BROHL: Then let me open and say that I think we should take out separately right now because the regulation is already in place with U.S. Coast Guard, this is extremely important and it's a serious issue. My only thing I would say is is there something we can add to this that is — it's great that NOAA can't — we should have them assess the capabilities and complete some kind of a portfolio or that — and what else, NOAA should

make a plan, do we need to make sure that the strategic plan, that we could say in here that methods for finding a solution could be through the CMTS or other methods, because it may be one that Congress has to be engaged with as well. I'm just saying that I like the discussion, I think it should be separate. If you want to mention it again later in a CMTS-specific one, fine, but I'm wondering if everybody would agree that this is something I think we can craft today and actually vote on and make a recommendation before it, except that I felt like we were missing one other bullet under it that perhaps talks about how, what you would do with it after you've done all that, after you've done an assessment.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. LAPINE: I like the whole document,

I wonder if we can work the whole document.

There's not a lot of controversy.

CAPT. MYRTIDIS: I'm not sure about number 9, what do you want us to do with investing resources to develop a training course? That I'm

not really sure about.

. 1

2 CAPT. McGOVERN: I didn't like the 3 wording that was there and I had already put together something different, basically based on 4 5 the requirements already in place for offering GNDSS. Basically say that, instead of wording it 6 7 like that, you require all watch standers to complete an approved course in order to serve on a 8 vessel equipped with ENC, which is basically what happened with GNDSS, you don't have to have GNDSS 10 training but you can't serve on a vessel with GNDSS 11 12 unless you've had the training, similar with ARVA, 13 and it would probably be similar with ENCs. the problem, as you mentioned, with the Coast 14 15 Guard, it was something they were thrown at, they 16 did not ask for this, but they were -- and it's 17 very -- basically says that all commercial vessels 18 shall have an ECS, electronic charting system, not 19 an Ectus but an electronic charting system, and 20 that's as far as it goes. Then it says the Coast 21 Guard shall promulgate regulations by January 2007.

1 Now, the implementation of those regs could be, I

2 agree, could potentially with CMTS because they

3 should coordinate with NOAA. NOAA says hey, I

4 can't have ENCs until 2011 and then the Coast Guard

5 can write their phase-in to coincide with that

6 hopefully and work together. But that was my

suggestion on number 9, basically to word it

8 different.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: Again, my attempt here is simply to throw some things on the table to give us something to start with. But you probably have the best insight because your ships are using Ectus.

What are your views, do you think that with the IMO guidelines that are out there, company policies, what do you see as a necessary training aspect to the use of more and more shift to electronic charts, do you see some issues there?

CAPT. MYRTIDIS: That's a good question.

The way it is right now we're very comfortable with what we're doing with what is out there because we have our private training if you will so to speak,

- 1 so we feel fairly comfortable. What we're not
- 2 comfortable with is the coverage of ENCs. Again, I
- 3 don't think, I don't think, number 9, again in my
- 4 humble opinion NOAA should not get involved with
- 5 the training courses or anything like that. This
- 6 is for other agencies to decide. That's again I
- 7 think so many other important things.
- MR. RAINEY: Elaine.
- 9 MS. DICKINSON: Just clarification on
- 10 this chart. This is an excellent illustration of
- 11 the problem. Are you saying the full funding would
- 12 have been the President's request, each of the last
- 13 three years roughly 6 million?
- MR. DUNNIGAN: Yes.
- CAPT. BARNUM: Yes, that's my
- 16 understanding.
- MS. DICKINSON: Okay. I agree that the
- 18 | ENCs are of critical importance and I have no
- 19 problem with leaving it with CMTS but also
- 20 separating it out as a separate measure. Our
- 21 greatest fear is this is another backlog that's

going to get out of control if it's not kind of nipped in the bud soon.

. 1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: One of the things I don't know how to get at, Jack, because I think maybe it would be helpful to validate priorities and requirements across the program, but I don't know how to get at sort of NOAA's assessment of their hundred percent requirement. I think everybody has what they would want to do, but as you pointed out and we well know, the likelihood of, you know, everything full up is not going to happen. don't know how you sort of within NOAA and across these programs, and again of course at NOS and on up, how you make those decisions and if there is a role we can play in saying from our perspective these are some critical path programs, some priorities. I know we've attempted to do that but I'm not sure we've had much success engaging in that sort of triage implementation.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Well, Steve can certainly correct me if I'm wrong, my understanding is that

we identified our hundred percent requirement here . 1 2 as having a thousand charts ready to go in 2010. 3 Now, how we're going to get there I don't know. The other thing we've identified is that unless the 4 5 money that the President has been asking for for the last three years begins to come through, we 7 can't expand beyond the 550, you know, because of 8 the cost of maintaining the existing charts. So 9 we're going to be there but we're only 55 percent 10 of the way to where we have to be with the electronic navigational charts. One of the things 11 12 that I would like to know, maybe you could help me 13 figure this out, is why are we not getting traction. 14 Andy asked earlier about getting the 15 word up through NOAA and the department and whatever. Well, we've done that. This is money 16 the President is asking for and Congress isn't 17 18 coming through with it. I can tell you the way the 19 typical budget thinkers are is that when they see us asking for money for three or four years and 20 21 Congress keeps refusing to fund it, they say hey,

1 let's back off, let's fight a different fight. And

2 this isn't a fight I want to see us give up on yet,

so I'm a little perplexed as to why we're not

4 having more success getting some traction on

5 something that everybody seems to think is so

6 critical and stuff we've been asking for. My

7 understanding is the hundred percent requirement is

8 based on a thousand charts by 2010 and unless we

9 get more money we're basically stuck with where we

10 are.

11

12

13

3

MS. BROHL: Scott, when I read this sometimes I felt like -- for number 1, the recommending that NOAA work to establish consistent

14 federal datums makes a lot of sense. I don't

15 understand it technically but policy-wise that

16 makes a lot of sense, but the second part, through

17 the CMTS, is it your hope through the CMTS there

18 would be full funding for V-Datum and Height

19 Modernization? I agree but isn't that a separate

20 issue?

21

MR. RAINEY: No, and I'm not going to

dive it too deep because then I'll start losing my . 1 2 ability to make sense on that, but I'm aware that 3 OMB has, A16 I think is the circular, there are a 4 number of forms that are trying to get out, and 5 Dave can jump in or Mike, but NOAA has the lead on certain framework data within the federal data, and one of the OMB circulars is to get these agencies 7 8 together to sort of coordinate that and I'm 9 thinking that is an issue not only there but also 10 something that could be discussed at CMTS because 11 there's particular applications in the Marine 12 Transportation System, you know, the way that for 13 example CO-OPS using mean low water or versus Army 14 Corps of Engineers with different datums for 15 shoreline, et cetera, it's almost like there's a 16 datum for each purpose, and to try to coordinate 17 those, and I think probably V-Datum may not be the 18 accurate thing, but my intent there is that that 19 may be an issue that could also have some play and some coordination within the context of the CMTS. 20 21 No, not specifically that they would somehow look

for that to carry the whole load.

. 1

MS. BROHL: Then should there be another 2 bullet in here that actually addresses that head 3 on, that through the CMTS, because you've got a 5 natural avenue for coordination, NOAA should pursue a leadership role with regards to V-Datum and 6 7 Height Modernization or NOAA should pursue a leadership role for the nation on other aspects 8 that may impact the MTS because you're in the room 9 with the Corps of Engineers and you can actually 10 maybe flesh that out and make that, decide it; do 11 you see what I'm saying? That actually the second 12 13 part of number 1, that I appreciate the fact that 14 consistent federal datums, but when you say NOAA has a lead on certain things but it's not clear and 15 consist, such as for example in the proposed 16 amendments to, the old proposed amendments to HSIA 17 there was some discussion about that NOAA should be 18 designated the lead for tidal or whatever because 19 20 it certainly impacts the MTS, so I'm wondering if that's something we could add to this. 21

. 1 MR. RAINEY: I think absolutely we could take any of these and go on, and maybe that's how we would take sort of the next step, is to open it 3 4 for these and others to comment and then sort of at the end of the day for folks to, if they have a 5 particular issue they think has some merit to flesh 6 7 out to go forward with and then we can really focus and properly use the expertise of our NOAA 8 representatives to give us the proper terminology 10 and kind of collaborate on how to flesh these out. Did you have something, Mike? 11

MR. SZABADOS: I think both of you are converging onto something which is important. A couple of things. Again getting back to the hydrographic act, there's some new language which will clarify NOAA's role with regard to datums. Right now it's case law and not in the authorization, and that's important and that needs to be done. But I think Helen was onto something where we need to focus on the role of what NOAA plays in data determinations, what levels as well

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 as the data that, Geodetic datums that Dave does,

2 because it's confusing to some of the agencies and

3 they don't use common datums or misinterpreted

4 datums, and the role really lies in NOAA. That

5 means identify and clarify. Dave, do you want to

6 jump in?

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. ZILKOWSKI: Just to build on that, there already are a lot of committees out there so maybe it's just a matter of how they most efficiently work together, the federal geographic committee and the federal geodetic subcommittee already have been agencies come together and they established whether the official horizontal/ vertical database, et cetera, and you can read about that. Published Federal Registers, you get that all the time. But it's the implementation of those things that are the leadership role. may be the way to put it, is that the leadership role implemented this one datum. The hurricanes in the gulf really brought this to light of what people were using, which datums they were using and

- 1 that clearly NOAA has then shown and they're saying
- 2 that they want us to take that leadership role in
- 3 realizing that we have the datum expertise.
- 4 There's a role for many different datums so it's a
- 5 matter of not just throwing them all out, it's a
- 6 matter of coordinating, and that's where V-Datum
- 7 comes in, you input a datum and output to a
- 8 different datum, you tell it this is my input and I
- 9 need it in this output. So it becomes a
- 10 transformation tool that is less confusing, it's a
- 11 tool for people to use and the Corps, USGS can
- 12 | input their data.
- 13 CAPT. McGOVERN: A couple of things. I
- 14 know I recommended some change in the language to
- 15 number 9, but that Minas has pointed it out I agree
- 16 with him, this is not within our balliwick to talk
- 17 about the training, it is a different agency and
- 18 I'll bring it there. But it is definitely a
- 19 different agency.
- The recommendation on the backbone, I
- 21 don't know exactly what number that was, that NOAA

. 1 has already undertaken the inventory of its 2 navigation services for the HSRP and also completed 3 an inventory of its programs that are included in the backbone. Two things with that. Number one, I 5 didn't know there was a determination of what the backbone is yet. And number two is are all the 7 programs included in the backbone or just the ones that are relevant to the IOOS? We keep talking 9 about PORTS as being part of the background, backbone, but this basically, that's already been 10 established and I don't know if it has. One other 11 question on your -- I'd like to propose expanding 12 your recommendation on the artificial reef, fish 13 havens, maybe add something. As you said, they 14 just put these things kind of willy-nilly, maybe we 15 can add some sentence in there about the fact the 16 placement should be also considered as, you know, 17 18 as it relates to the safety of navigation because not only do we worry about how high they go but 19 20 maybe it's better over here than over here. 21 maybe we can expand that with a sentence about

place, the actual placement of it. So that's

pretty much, only one question I wanted to suggest,

two suggestions. I don't know about the backbone,

has that been determined yet, what is in the

5 backbone?

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. ZILKOWSKI: Actually later on when I go through the IOOS presentation I'll highlight what that means. The backbone itself was actually defined back when we did the first development plan, it's listed in there somewhere. It's not as clear-cut as some people may want it and it may not be explained as well as others, so there's some ambiguity there, but I can tell you what NOAA is calling the backbone and other agencies, I don't have that here, but other agencies have done the same thing so we're trying to clarify that. Yeah, it's been defined and we're trying to put procedures in place of what gets added to the backbone and what this really means. And it's more than just observations, which I will explain in about an hour.

MR. RAINEY: Jon.

. 1

2 MR. DASLER: I had a comment on number 3 I don't know if that quite addresses the issue; we were just talking about full bottom coverages at 5 the completion of navigation projects. It probably should be extended to be following any regular 7 maintenance that's done on those. Oftentimes, I know of three anchors laying in the Columbia River 9 channel right now that are laying in the sediment where dredging operations could stand those up and 10 they could become obstructions and hazards, and 11 maybe even carrying it to the point of not only 12 just following regular maintenance. I know the 13 Coast Guard usually does this and requires it but 14 if there's reports of lost cargo or lost anchors or 15 vessels, anything that could be an obstruction, it 16 should be investigated and I think right now the 17 Corps don't see that as being under their 18 jurisdiction to do that. But at least taking it 19 20 beyond just completion of the navigation projects, because those projects were actually completed a 21

. 1 longs time ago, but they're doing regular maintenance on those that also could stand up other obstructions that are laying in the sediment and 3 those operations can stand up obstructions. 5 potentially change that text to read CMTS to require full bottom coverage surveys upon 7 completion, following regular maintenance and reports of lost cargo, anchors, vessels or other 9 potential obstructions of all navigation projects or something along those lines. I think we need to 10 carry it a little further than just completion of 11 the navigation project, if nothing else following 12 regular maintenance. I don't know if you want to 13 14 wordsmith that a little more.

MR. RAINEY: Again it kind of goes with the crux over how we actually make all this happen. I think these are tremendously valuable insights and inputs. It's always been a challenge for the secretary, we try to capture all this and then where does the ball bounce, to who, and these are all suggestions so does it fall back to me to try

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

. 1 field all of this and rewrite everything and try to 2 get it back and I can't do that. So we'll try to 3 leave a record of it, we've got contemporaneous notes being taken and we're doing our best with 5 That's really been the biggest uphill battle as we come out of the meetings is that I think 7 there's a lot of value happening at the meetings and our ability to pick it up on the fly and 9 package it and get it out in some form as a voted-upon statement of the panel. That's where I 10 think our challenge has been. So I'm making notes, 11 I know others are here, but it's really how we 12 13 follow up on this and how we figure out -- we've tried to work group things, tried volunteers at the 14 15 meetings thing. I know I put it out in my e-mail and formal correspondence, but truly help me 16 17 understand how best to engage with you so we can follow up on these things and get to a place where 18 we think we're ready to go forward and vote on and 19 20 make motions and things, because that's a real 21 challenge for me and the secretary to field all of

this and get it to a point where okay, we're ready to vote on it and move it up the chain.

. 1

MR. ARMSTRONG: I wonder if we could adopt a procedure whereby we vote on the sense of the resolution and then pending sort of a submission of final minutes or proposed minutes from the support staff that's circulated and sort of speak now or forever hold your peace on the final wording. You know, with an opportunity for objections if the final wording missed something that we consider important. I wonder if that's a mechanism that you could adopt.

CAPT. MYRTIDIS: I think -- I agree with you. I think this goes along with what we were discussing before, Scott, a formal report that NOAA would help us with. What I propose is that probably vote on the fundamentals or principles of the suggestions and then if it is some kind of wordsmithing it's to be done later. I think it's going to make life easier. What I have seen in the past, I think everybody is going to agree with me,

is we've taken hours and hours and hours on one

paragraph to change a comma and an and and it never

gets us anywhere. So we can say this is a good

thing, this is a good document, this is what we

want to say, we degree and then we can polish it if

you wish.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BROHL: Yeah, I mean I think you're right. I guess I don't see this as so much of a worry. Partly because we've already decided that, number one, we're going to reword it to be more as relates to a leadership role and less as a consistency issue. Two, Jon's already provided some wording to change it, that in 9 I think we've probably decided it should just be eliminated. maybe elaborate on number 11 towards what's already written from last time, so isn't that it? Or isn't that the straw man that then gets sent out right after this meeting we all kind of look over so we can massage it a little?

MS. DICKINSON: Well, first of all Scott has to send it to us all. Or somebody. Then Scott

1 says everybody massages it and gives him our ideas

2 of how we think it should be. We don't give him a

hard fast -- so my proposal was possibly -- we

4 handle it in our situation when we have a meeting.

5 Jon, if you feel that whatever paragraph you want

6 to change up a little bit, instead of saying I

7 think we could say this or that, can you write it

down and give it to Scott now, how you would like

9 it to read as opposed to be -- give it to

10 Barbara -- as opposed to -- instead of throwing

11 ideas to Scott and expecting him to clean it up for

12 us.

20

3

MR. ARMSTRONG: I wasn't suggesting

14 Scott, I was hoping that the support staff could be

15 picking this up as we go.

MS. BROHL: And I appreciate that and I

17 don't want to dump on Scott except that Scott wrote

18 this. To the extent that Scott wrote this and was

19 the first person to bring it up, he has some ideas

and I always think the person who brings it up and

21 has written it could possibly, I mean having done

that, it goes to Barbara now and we're going to get some comments. Then in some respects Scott was the vision for this. So not that -- I mean if -- I mean I guess I'm missing something. Make some changes and send it back out.

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: I think what I'd like to do is accept Jack and Steve's offer that yes, we can expect some follow-up NOAA support and the actual who that is or how that happens or whatever leave to them. But just to know that this has been a continuing running challenge for us to somehow field all this substance and get it out. I mean I take a stab, try to put some things out there for us to take a look at, and then it generates and by your views improves upon some things, but we really need that ability to work to pull it all together. Maybe we can just see how that can go from here. We don't need to figure out exactly how, but, you know, if NOAA can help pull this together and get it back to us, that would be tremendous. Let me go to Elaine.

MS. DICKINSON: Is there a numerical significance to the order of these? I mean to me the most important one is the last one on the list so I would rather see ENC, number 11, way, way up higher.

. 1

MR. RAINEY: I just put that there because I had the separate visual graphic on a different thing so I wanted to go from that to role. It was just an idea to identify these thoughts.

CAPT. MYRTIDIS: I don't think it's necessary to use numbers, use bullets.

MR. RAINEY: I completely agree It was just one way of trying to get us all on the same page.

MR. McBRIDE: Scott, I know we've gone around this many times, in between these meetings I do not have a great deal of time, I don't spend a great deal of time reflecting on and absorbing things, and I have a similar passion to one that you have, I have a board of directors, when they

meet our information is sent off in ten days to two
weeks ahead of time in final form and it should go
smooth as silk to the board meeting where they
approve the documents and the resolutions. Our
problem here in the first instance is we don't have
anybody to support this group and can draft and get
out to me a week ahead of time the resolution, you
writing it.

MR. RAINEY: I pretty much generated everything.

MR. McBRIDE: There ought to be a staff person somewhere supporting this group. I'd like to have it a week ahead of time, I can read it on the plane coming up, reflect on it coming into this meeting with these people here and not spend two or three hours drafting by committee, which is a waste of my time and quite frankly a waste all of our time. Thank you.

MR. DUNNIGAN: Briefing materials two weeks to ten days ahead of time will be done. I gotta tell you that sometimes it's very creative

for a group like this to send a couple of people off to write some things and wordsmith it. Primary generation shouldn't happen in a meeting, I agree with that, but that's the kind of staff support we're going to get.

. 1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Jack.

CAPT. McGOVERN: I was going to mention this when I talked earlier and I forgot. Jack mentioned before why ENCs, why they're not moving it. Possibly the worst thing that you ever did was the RASTER chart, because a lot of people believe that is, you know, an electronic chart. therefore what's this other thing you want to do, you know. I mean it's a possibility but it just could be that the only thing I could think of, a lot people, when I try to talk to people, the difference between the RASTER chart and the S57 chart is like they look like you, they just get glazed over, they have no idea what you're talking about. And that could be I think maybe the education part, how much better an ENC can be.

It's not necessarily, depending on the data that's
to be used to put it together, but how much better
it can be than a RASTER chart, especially when used
on --

MR. RAINEY: Sounds like training.

CAPT. McGOVERN: Training for Congress I

guess.

CAPT. BARNUM: I think as far as the FY '06 appropriation, it was cut but we never really got a real reason why it was cut. I think there was a target that Congress had to meet and it was just blapped without full understanding of what it was, I think there's several instances of that, including the --

MS. DICKINSON: Yeah, I think that's partially true. I think the problem is up on Capitol Hill you get the same glazed over eyes thing going on where they don't understand what this stuff is and I think they look at this like it's oh, here's another science project, you know. They just really do not know what it is. I guess

that's incumbent on all of us to make the case that

it really is significant, it's not just another

cool technology thing that, you know, we want to

do. We've got to support it more among them

5 because they don't know what it is.

CAPT. McGOVERN: Get rid of the RASTER chart, either have a paper chart or ENC, something.

CAPT. BARNUM: Certainly RASTER was looked at as an interim step until we went to the final electronic navigational charts and for some applications they may be useful, for some folks, but certainly this is a world standard, it's not something the U.S. is trying to stand up on their own, it's a worldwide standard that allows ship companies to put systems on ships that will be able to sail from one port in the world to another port in the world under seamless ENCs.

CAPT. MYRTIDIS: Last night we had a conversation and I think this is probably the most appropriate time to repeat a small part of it.

Listening over and over, to me, my mind, goes down

. 1 again to the same point, is how NOAA markets NOAA, not only on the outside but within also the federal government. Why they don't know what's a RASTER 3 chart, why they don't know anything about NOAA 5 other than the high beam sender, why people don't understand all these things. Why not? So this is 7

a recommendation. Market.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DASLER: We were talking about that a little bit and I think Admiral West has kind of continued to talk about, I think the bigger problem is you see all of this stuff as separate earmarks or items in the budget. It should be part of a comprehensive charting budget so everybody can't pick it apart and questions. It could be a real effort to try to educate somebody on all the intricacies and details. It should be just part of an overall charting budget without all the -- I think that's where the big problem is, is all the earmarks for these different things which make it good targets as Admiral West has said over and over again. If there's a way to do that and build it

more into a comprehensive budget as opposed to separate earmarks, I think it would be a lot better off.

. 1

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CAPT. BARNUM: Just to comment on that. Going back to my commerce and transportation hat and the message I'm trying to send both to the administration and I've been on the hill is that this is a connected set of services and that, you know, they all fit together to work as a system and you can't just remove one piece and expect the system to work. It's not like you can, as a sailor that I can -- you know, I need both accurate marine weather and accurate nautical charts and water levels. Remove any one of those I could be in trouble. I could sail away with good charts and water levels and run into a bad storm. Likewise I could have great weather without a good chart and hit a rock on the way out of the harbor. I gotta have all the pieces.

MS. BROHL: If I could add one more thing to the hill issue. There's a real disconnect

. 1 between transportation and infrastructure 2 committees or the maritime committees and the ENCs 3 or the charting and mapping things because they're under a different -- because they're under NOAA, which gets picked up by the resources committee on 5 the House, and I forget what it is on the Senate side, public works, I may be wrong. So there's a 7 real disconnect, but you'd think it would be easier in the Senate but it actually is less paid to in the Senate because of commerce, so there has to be 10 kind of multi-level addressing of this, whether 11 there should be addressing the line item side, on 12 the administration side, if you gotta get back up 13 to the hill, I don't think we've had a really 14 really good meaningful briefing between NOAA and 15 appropriations directly, not the professional 16 committee side by the appropriations side, since 17 Captain McFarland was there and had one with the 18 House side, and that really had a positive impact 19 20 on the charting and mapping component. And so I --Elaine said there's a glossiness, glassiness of the 21

. 1 eyes. Well, it's across the board on lots of 2 things. And I really firmly believe that no 3 matter, those of us in industry who go there, we still have our fingers crossed and eyes closed and 5 we're praying feverishly because when the appropriators get alone in the room there's not an 7 expertise going on there at all. These guys don't give you their fax numbers, if they do be sure to hide it or tear it up or eat it or something 10 because you're not allowed to have it. They won't 11 make appointments with you. We can get in to see staffers but staffers may or may not have an 12 13 interest in the specific programs, they make it 14 sound like maritime, but that's really not under 15 our jurisdiction. So there's a number of things 16 and it applies to all these programs but it's 17 gotten very difficult. Since you indicated, Jack, 18 that you're going to be trying to spend as much 19 time on that as possible, even if you can get a 20 general briefing where you send notices out that 21 the appropriations person can sneak in the back of 1 the room without having to be put on the spot

2 because they may not return your phone call

3 otherwise, but still they'll hear the briefing. Do

4 it often and as much as possible. But there's just

an absolute they don't know what these programs

6 are.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: Let me jump in. remarkably on schedule and our next speaker, I think we've got a good segue, Nina Young is a deputy director for external affairs from CORE here and they're at the heart of all the hydro policy things and things and Helen was just talking about some of the issues that are going on. I'd just ask Nina, what I'd like to do while she's setting up is to go ahead and let's take if we could please just a very short, like a five-minute recess, five-minute break, let's steal five minutes from the subsequent break here and then let Nina set up and come right back in and pick up right there with some of the things that are happening on the hill if we could. Thanks.

(Brief recess.)

. 1

MR. RAINEY: Okay, let's go ahead and come to order and we will reconvene. I'd like to go ahead and turn the floor over to -- three years into this I still don't have a gavel. Could we give Nina our attention on some observations she has with CORE and working with the issues here on the hill. Let's give Nina our attention, thanks.

MS. YOUNG: Thank you. I think the discussion you had is going to be timely to some of the slides I'll show later, so if I could have the next slide.

This is kind of the 30-second elevator speech. CORE's mission is to advance ocean research, education and policy and we try to do that by facilitating ongoing research in private and government institutions, again promoting ocean literacy, advocating for ocean research and policy and promoting ocean awareness. Next slide.

And this is where it gets really kind of dicey. This is the sad news. Only 25 percent of

- 1 Americans can find the Gulf of Mexico and the
- 2 Pacific Ocean on a map and in a survey that was
- 3 taken in the, in an aquarium, several aquariums
- 4 actually, most people got NASA right as the space
- 5 agency, but when it came to the nation's ocean
- 6 agency they thought it was OSHA. So the take-home
- 7 message is the public doesn't have a good
- 8 understanding about ocean awareness and how the
- 9 oceans impact their lives and it's probably even
- 10 worse on Capitol Hill. Next slide.
- 11 We've had a lot of interest in the
- 12 ocean. All of you are familiar with these various
- 13 reports culminating in the Ocean Action Plan. Next
- 14 side.
- And that's really going to be what this
- 16 administration charts its course on and what is
- 17 driving the ocean governance that you see in the
- 18 next slide. This is a ocean governance system
- 19 that's kind of still in its infancy, we're not
- 20 actually sure how effective it's going to be, if
- 21 it's going to even create a greater bureaucracy

that will be finally getting things done, but initially we're hopeful, because I think it does lead to greater integration. Next slide.

. 1

3

12

19

20

21

- 4 The next obstacle we have is really just 5 how many different committees have their fingers on ocean-related legislation and those are all the 7 ones you see there, and especially in something like the House it's very easy for one bill to be 9 referred to three different committees and then it becomes a nightmare trying to get it out of the 10 various committees. Next. 11
- And the same on the Senate. The Senate is a little bit more streamlined. We at least do 13 14 most of our work with the commerce committee and 15 that helps us a bit, but again, once a bill gets referred to several committees it becomes 16 17 infinitely more nightmarish in terms of trying to get something done. Next. 18
 - This year CORE attempted to do what we call Oceans Eleven to help us focus our research. And I'll walk through quickly what our Oceans

Eleven priorities are.

. 1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2 Next. One of the things that the 3 external affairs program tries to do is to solidify CORE's reputation on the hill so that we are 5 essentially viewed as a respected voice for the ocean and science community and we try to do that 7 by increasing appreciation of Congress, the 8 administration, the various agencies and even the 9 public and other NGOs, appreciate their view or 10 help them increase their appreciation of the oceans and to assist other members in the ocean research 11 12 and education community to effectively communicate 13 with the hill. Next.

This is kind of the breakdown of federal investment in ocean research. This is going to be married pretty closely to CORE's priorities for Oceans Eleven, but you see the top three there are really NSF, Navy and NOAA. Next.

How we essentially get our job done is we try to develop relationships with all the federal agencies, Congress, congressional staff,

. 1 OMB. We make hill visits and do a lot of briefings with all those various entities. Public relations, 3 we're trying to step up our public relations. We think it's important that we not only inform the 5 public, we have a group of -- all the media folks in our various members form a coalition called 7 SCAMPI, and the next thing we're really talking 8 about is how do we market cut. I think the ocean 9 community as a whole has been very poor at 10 marketing itself. One of our members in our last 11 board meeting said it's time we visit Madison Avenue and figure out what we're going to do in the 12 13 next couple years to increase our visibility. 14 So the first Oceans Eleven is to grow 15 the NSF budget and to fund the ocean observatories 16

the NSF budget and to fund the ocean observatories initiative. This year this particular item looks good because it's actually in the President's budget. So we're supporting the President's budget request, we're working with the coalition for the National Science Foundation, and again you're going to hear the mantra over and over again that a lot

17

18

19

20

21

of what we do is congressional letters, testimony, hill briefings and visits with appropriations staff or various committee staff. Next.

. 1

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A long time, and this has been a major recommendation within the Oceans Commission report, there has been the need for an actual NOAA organic act and this is something that CORE has worked on for a long time. We were expecting a markup today in the science committee of HR 50 or a new version that they actually just introduced this week, the organic act. They reintroduced the bill so they would again try to get out of that jurisdictional issue and keep it out of the transportation and infrastructure committee, so they reintroduced the bill, supposed to be marked up today, it's now going to be marked up on June 7. It's also been referred to the House Resources Committee. We're working very hard with all of those committees to try to move this bill along. Next.

Another very important document that's in its development stage is the Ocean Reserve

Priorities and Implementation Strategy. There was
a public comment on a draft that occurred from

March through May, some of you may have attended

4 the meeting in April up in Denver to review the

5 draft working document. Right now, since the

6 comment period, they're going to look at all those

7 comments, produce another draft, put it out for

8 public review again, and then also send it to the

9 National Academy. This is really going to chart

10 the course for ocean research over the next five to

11 ten years so I would encourage folks to get

12 involved in this process and to track it because

13 there are a lot of pieces that are important to

14 this FACA. Next.

3

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I'm not going to spend a lot of time on the Integrated Ocean Observing System since Dave is going to talk to you, but we're trying as best we can to move to the authorizing language through Congress. We have a version that was passed in the Senate, it's tied up now in the science committee and in the resources committee and we've been

trying to draft authorizing language that merges
various bills and work with those committees to
develop something that's supported by a large
number of groups and will help move this

5 legislation through so that we can finally secure 6 passage.

coalition. We've drafted kind of guiding principles. We have resolutions on the importance of IOOS. It has a lot of different interest groups that are represented and I would welcome anybody who would want to join that coalition. Here our goal is one message but many voices giving that message. I think that's going to be what's important to securing IOOS legislation, authorizing legislation, but also appropriations. Next.

We have a lot of -- we have an uphill battle on educating Congress on IOOS. All of you are familiar with the seven societal goals, but trying to paint a picture in the head of a hillstepper just what IOOS is is truly a challenge

and how it fits together. You can just keep punching through that.

. 1

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So as much as we can we're trying to develop fact sheets and such and pictorials that paint the picture of what IOOS is, what does it do once it's up and running and what will it accomplish. The biggest problem to overcome in Congress -- next -- is that there are already parts of the observing system that exist, and so people see the budgets for those observing systems and they say why do we need anything more, why do we need to appropriate any additional funds for this. That slide says it all. We need to somehow integrate all those various pieces, parts into a system that will help us to achieve what we want to achieve through those societal goals. Next.

The next item is NOAA research programs. Since NOAA is the third largest funding agency for extramural research, this is something we would like to kind of foster and approve the amount of money that NOAA has, but we're facing an uphill

battle as you can see from the slide. The programs
have been dramatically cut and they continue to be

3 on a downturn of sorts. We've developed a friends

4 of NOAA coalition. Next.

20

21

5 And what we're supporting as a coalition, and again this is a broad coalition of 7 environmental groups, research, commercial industry representatives and even some of the employee 9 groups in NOAA, we're trying to support a 4.5 billion request for the NOAA budget. This is a 10 11 coalition that I think, again, if any of you are 12 interested in joining, I have information, but we 13 have been effective in putting together letters to 14 appropriators, congressional briefings, we've been 15 working with the House Ocean Caucus on several 16 briefings. We go up as a group to meet with 17 appropriations committee staff, and pretty soon, I think in a week or so you'll see there will be a 18 Friends of NOAA website. Next. 19

The ocean research fleet is also a concern. As many of you have probably heard from

Admiral West, many of the academic research vessels . 1 2 are nearing the end of their life. We do have some 3 level of optimism because NSF has got money both to replace the ALPHA HELIX in the form of the arctic 5 research vessel; the Navy, we're still trying to encourage them to continue their support of the 7 academic fleet, although one of the complicating factors is they often put that money for the fleet in the basic research line item, so that's \$25 million for a vessel that's isn't going to 10 actual research. So we're trying to work with the 11 Navy to change that. NSF has 11.5 million for 12 13 three regional class vessels over the next six 14 years planned in their budget. Next.

This is just a schematic to kind of show the point I was making earlier, you can see the red line there, where we're looking at -- some of these vessels are nearing the end of their lifetime, there are vessels planned but it is going to, with all the various competing interests, it's going to take a huge effort to make sure the money is in the

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

appropriation process to ensure that these vessels get built. Next.

. 1

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Navy research is also an important source of funding for our research community, the ocean research community. Our major concern there is to some extent Navy's interest in supporting basic research has really waned in the last few years. I'll show you a graph later on that shows how much this, the 6.1, the Navy basic research fund is going down. It's actually declining. And that's quite a bit of concern for us. So we've been working with the National Security Research Coalition and testifying before the Department of Defense and the Armed Services Committee staff and making visits there to really let them know the importance of this particular research fund to oceanographic research and to the nation at large. Next.

Another item that we're doing is supporting Oceans and Human Health. This is a fairly new program, probably within the last three

to five years. Unfortunately while it's a very . 1 promising program, there's no proposed funding for 3 it in FY '07. With Hollings' departure we really lost a champion for Oceans and Human Health 5 initiative, and CORE believes that this is really a critical piece to support and we're continuing to 7 work with NOAA and also with NIH and other organizations to try to bolster interest in this and funds and again trying to put things before Congress to encourage them to continue to develop 10 legislation that would support the Oceans and Human 11 Health initiative. Next. 12

Ecosystem-based management is a term
that everybody has heard a lot out there. What we
think is very promising because this was definitely
a major recommendation from the Ocean Commission is
that the Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorizing
language, especially in the Senate, is starting to
move us toward ecosystem-based management. So CORE
is supporting that and also the Oceans Research
Priorities Plan is very interested in trying to

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

look at scientific research in the oceans more from

2 an ecosystem perspective, an integrated

3 perspective, and we think that's really critical

4 and will help us better achieve the ecosystem-based

5 management that various agencies and Congress often

6 talk about. Next.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Marine mammals and sound, this is a kind of a hot button issue. There was a FACA the Marine Mammals Commission was in charge of convening to look at the impact of sound on marine mammals. At the end the FACA kind of imploded last September, there was no consensus that was reached, the various groups went back to develop their own individual statements that would be incorporated in a report to Congress. That will probably happen if not this month, probably looking more like next month. The research caucus put their statement The research caucus is looking more at a together. focus that's more on a natural research plan to integrate and better understand the impacts of ocean sound on marine mammals, so CORE is going to

be working with our community to determine what

type -- how would that research program, that

national research program, what would it look like,

what amendments are needed in the Marine Mammals

5 Protection Act and how would it be implemented.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Could I interject here a comment? This is an issue that's going to have potentially significant impact on hydrographic services in this country because we measure the water depth with sonars. There are people in this country who would like us to move to the point where there will be sort of no sonar sounding of the sea floor except under very restricted conditions of marine mammal lookouts and watches and exclusions. So this is not just some additional research effort, this is something that has potential impact on hydrographic services.

MR. DASLER: It's already happening in the state of California. We're doing charting for NOAA on the California coast and we have to have what they call a geophysical permit to operate

1 acoustic sources in California state waters and you

2 have to turn out off all acoustic sources if marine

3 mammals are spotted within a nautical mile of your

4 operations.

5 MR. ARMSTRONG: Forgive the

6 interruption.

7

MS. YOUNG: No, that's fine.

Next slide please. All right. Ocean

9 science and education, you probably know that

10 there's a conference coming up on ocean literacy.

11 We've got again another coalition working to

12 support regional workshops that would then carry on

13 some of the outcomes and dovetail nicely with the

14 whole conference. There is the competitive

15 legislation that's out there that's trying to

16 promote not just ocean literacy but essentially

17 | science literacy, science and education literacy,

18 and wherever we can we're trying to -- much of that

19 legislation names National Science Foundation, NASA

20 and does not really name NOAA, and so we've been

21 working to try to get NOAA inserted into that

legislation wherever possible. Next.

. 1

Finally, there's remote sensing and the battle that we have here is while the NASA budget is increasing, the shuttle and the space missions are really taking money away from the NASA science programs. Much of the satellite work and the science work that we need to better understand the oceans is really dwindling within the NASA budget.

Here's where it starts to get really grim. This is the budget projections for the next several years. You see NASA looks fairly good but there's that downturn I was talking about in the Navy budget, their 6.1. NSF continues to increase, but NOAA, while that number kind of looks like a flat line, if you really were to blow that up there's also a decreasing trend in that budget as well. Next.

For those of you that aren't familiar, don't live, eat and sleep budgets like we do here, this is kind of the what happens over our life

1 starting in February when the budget is introduced

2 by the President. We're in that May-June time

3 frame where things are going to start to move very

4 quickly and the appropriations bills are going to

5 be marked up in the appropriations committees and

6 we understand that the bill that will include NASA,

7 NOAA, NSF will be marked up probably around June

8 | 14th. Next.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So here's kind of what we're looking at for FY '07. This is a second year where we're in the same budget cycle where they essentially combined NSF, NOAA and NASA budgets. Last year that didn't help NOAA very much. It creates a sense of competition and from CORE's standpoint we would like to see increases in all of them, but when we -- now that all of them have been put together, it really does create a competition among the three that means that there's always somebody who has to be a loser and somehow we're going to have to turn that around. Next.

The National Science Foundation, as you

1 can see, is increasing. We're happy about that.

2 They are on an upward turn, especially when you

3 look at their geosciences, their major equipment,

4 which is where the ocean observation observatories

5 initiative is. All of those numbers are looking

6 good and there are sizeable increases in there for

7 ocean-related research. Next.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But then there's NOAA. And what we're shooting for as I said earlier is the 4.5 billion club, which is the Friends of NOAA coalition, because in reality what we're seeing there is a decreasing trend that for me is pretty alarming.

And you can see it's a 3.6 billion this year in the administration requests.

What that translates into for the various services, again everything there in red tells a story. It's just decreasing at a scary rate and it means that a lot of the things that we've all talked about in the course of this meeting and in other meetings are just, it's going to be difficult to fund them, and I think at this

- 1 point NOAA is just trying to hold on to what they
 2 have. Next.
- And this is an even greater breakdown.
- 4 | See some of the numbers in red, education programs
- 5 are down, Oceans and Human Health initiative at the
- 6 bottom is zero, extramural research is up from last
- 7 | year but again not quite as good as FY '05. And
- 8 just more and more. You can see that there have
- 9 been some pretty sizeable decreases in some of
- 10 those line items from FY '05. Next.
- 11 Again, NASA is doing fairly well, it's
- 12 increasing slowly. The NASA Science and
- 13 Aeronautics Exploration, which does a lot of the
- 14 ocean-related science, is on the increase, but
- 15 again when you start to tease that out you'll find
- 16 that a lot of that increase is not going to
- 17 ocean-related research. Next.
- Then we finally come to ONR, which
- 19 continues to decline. Next.
- I'm just going to give you a little bit
- 21 of update on where we are on some of the ocean

legislation. And what you see there is the pieces

2 of legislation that were adopted by the Senate that

3 are awaiting action in the House and the ones that

4 | CORE is really focusing on are the National Ocean

5 Exploration Program Act and the Ocean and Coastal

6 Observing Systems Act.

Next one. So in the House this kind of gives you a summary of who we are. There's really been very little action on these, coral reefs, tsunami, there's been no action. The National Ocean Exploration, there was no action on the science committee side although we've heard that they are considering having a hearing on Capitol Hill Oceans Weeks for that and there was a hearing in the House Resources Committee, so we think that that particular provision has a good chance of moving.

We talked about the NOAA Organic Act.

Actually there was a version that was passed by the science committee at one point but now they've reintroduced the bill, they're trying to move that

- 1 bill through the science committee so they get away
- 2 from the jurisdiction issues, and then you have to
- 3 have another markup by the resources committee.
- 4 Next.
- The Ocean and Coastal Observing Act, we
- 6 have two versions of a bill in the House. One is
- 7 identical to that that was passed by the Senate and
- 8 we understand that the House Resources Committee is
- 9 kind of tinkering with a bill of their own that
- 10 kind of combines Mr. Gilcrest's bill and the
- 11 Waldon-Allen bill, and so we're trying to encourage
- 12 action but we haven't seen an actual bill come out
- 13 of the House Resources Committee, so we're
- 14 concerned if we can actually get that particular
- 15 authorization bill to move. But we haven't given
- 16 up on the bill yet.
- 17 Magnuson-Stevens Act, we have a bill in
- 18 the Senate, we have a version of the
- 19 | Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization that was marked up
- 20 last week in the resources committee and now
- 21 | they're helping to take that to the floor possibly

sometime in June. Next.

. 1

2

3

5

7

So as not to be outdone by Jack, who had a picture of his boat, I thought I would end with a picture of my boat where I'll be tomorrow. Thanks.

MR. RAINEY: Thanks, Nina, very much.

That's a great overview of what's going on. We probably have time if you folks have some

9 ahead. Are there a couple questions here? Helen.

MS. BROHL: I have a quick question.

11 Admiral West has always been very verbally

12 supportive in the panel on, in support of the

13 existing NOAA programs, especially those we cover

14 under NOS, as the base for IOOS. How do you

15 reflect that and support that when you're out and

16 about on the hill, how do you incorporate that

17 interest?

18

19

20

MS. YOUNG: We've worked with the coalition that was formed, we've worked very closely with Dr. Spinrad, and so we've worked very

21 closely in making sure that everything that we

. 1 developed in terms of fact sheets they feel comfortable with, and so we start by, for example, one of the questions that we were getting from the 3 hill was we understand that NOAA is spending 700 5 million on ocean observing. And so that created an uproar at some point, and so we developed a fact 7 sheet that explains that those are really NOAA's pieces of ocean observing and they're important but 9 they need additional support and need integration and this is why we're asking for 438 million to 10 integrate those provisions, so as much as possible 11 12 we've worked closely with them.

MS. BROHL: But is that additional money, which we appreciate in some form, but what about the aspect, do you guys at all -- maybe this is better asked under the Friends of NOAA concept, to what extent does CORE actually say to people on the hill that the coastal observation programs that currently are run by NOAA should be the baseline foundation, backbone of the IOOS, and should receive more funding in addition to whatever we'd

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

like to do that might benefit our members?

. 1

20

21

MS. YOUNG: I think we're talking about 3 all NOAA programs. We're not out there asking for earmarks and in fact our membership has moved away 5 from asking for earmarks, and as you heard from Admiral West, he's been a huge advocate to say we have to get away from earmarks. So our view is we want to see -- when we talk about the 4.5 billion, we're not breaking that down. We're thinking, you 10 know, our opinion is NOAA's base programs have to be supported, have to be funded, that they're not 11 12 funded sufficiently now, and we know in fact and we've heard Admiral Lautenbacher say they've got 13 really about 7 billion dollars in responsibilities 14 15 that they have been given through various pieces of authorizing language, so when we're asking for 4.5 16 17 billion, that really isn't enough to fulfill everything that they've been requested to do by 18 Congress. 19

MS. BROHL: The National Waterways

Alliance has been fairly successful by giving that

one number for the Corps of Engineers, that we need

55 billion for the Corps and everybody asks for 5

billion, so that's a great idea so you didn't get

too many elbows in the kitchen on the details. Can

we possibly have your presentation provided through

our website so we can get copies? You had some

really good numbers there.

MS. YOUNG: Sure.

MR. RAINEY: Thank you very much.

MR. DUNNIGAN: May I say something? I really want to congratulate Nina. I think this is a really comprehensive presentation, very critical to a lot of things that NOAA does. One of the things in addition to commerce and transportation services that I've really gotten clued into over the last year or two is Oceans and Human Health. I don't know if you know this, but we've actually collected tissue samples of dolphins off of South Carolina and found Lipitor, which does not occur in the environment naturally, but they are in dolphins. Estrogens are accumulating in animals in

our coastal oceans. We've got some serious health
issues to think about here. So the scope of what
we have to do in NOAA is really pretty significant
and important and we certainly appreciate what CORE
has been trying to do to bring the big constituency
together and we need to keep continuing to support

MR. RAINEY: Okay. Let me turn it over

them in the way they do that.

to Dave Zilkoski.

MR. ZILKOWSKI: Yeah, I wear a couple of hats, being part of this as the director of the National Geodetic Survey but as Helen mentioned earlier I'm also NOAA's IOOS project manager. I'm going to spend a little bit of time here going through what IOOS means to NOAA and I think you may know some of this already, I apologize for that, I'm not sure what you've learned before, but a lot of times when I talk to people I'm not sure everybody fully appreciates what IOOS is about, so I think going over it may be helpful and then we can build on this and in the upcoming meeting

possibly there will be some action I need to do for the August meeting in Alaska that I can understand so that I can prepare others for that so we can really get to the issues.

. 1

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

First, IOOS is not just NOAA. I think you all know that, but I'd like to emphasize that because I have to emphasize that within my own organization. There are ten agencies actively involved, that's what you got labeled under the X on that diagram. But the new JSOT, the Joint Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology, has established something that was listed on one of your slides dealing with the, what we called the IWGOO, Interagency Working Group on Ocean Observations. But anyway, of that I now have something like about 18 agencies that want to become members of this IOOS group telling me what they think IOOS is about or what it should be doing, so this will be a fun time for me.

What I'd like to point out is that we have a definition that's been agreed upon by all

. 1 these agencies and you can read it up there, but it's for the most part broken down into subsystems. 3 There's observations, which are important to it, but there's also the data management and 5 communication and modeling analysis. So my point here is it's more than just observations, which is 7 what most people think about. And when we -- I spent a lot of my time answering what is the \$700 9 million investment as opposed to what really is IOOS about. And the name says it all, integrate, 10 11 okay? We have a lot of ocean observing systems, that's where the 700 million comes from. I'm going 12 13 to show those to you in a minute, but IOOS is 14 Integrated Ocean Observing System. So it's taken 15 all of the ocean observing systems and making them interoperable and integrating them through this 16 DMAC and modeling analysis. 17 This is hard to read but hopefully it's 18 better on your diagram. I like to show this 19 20 because now I'm trying to emphasize what NOAA is

doing, because NOAA has been given the leadership

. 1 role, we are the chair of this IWGOO, so we have put in place where we have named an IOOS project 3 manager, which is me, but we have also an IOOS deputy, which comes out of OAR, which is Rick 5 Spinrad's group, Mike Johnson, who heads up our ocean component. We have a DMAC focal point, Kurt 7 Scheblin, which is out of NESBIS, another one of our lines offices that's part of this whole group. 9 And then we have some NOS staffing that helps support this group. So NOAA has established as 10 group where they've got an NOS lead with an OAR 11 12 deputy and a NESBIS DMAC point. They're truly 13 trying to look at this, this is integrating within 14 NOAA first, getting our act together, showing the 15 rest of the community how to go forth on this. Inside NOAA we have the National Ocean Council and 16 17 the, or NOAA's Ocean Council and NOAA's Observing 18 System Council. So I have to answer to both of 19 these councils, which Jack is the co-chair of the Ocean Council. So I have four other AAs that I 20 21 have to answer to and get oversight for everything

. 1 Then I've got this IWGOO, but then there's I do. the Joint Subcommittee on Science and Technology that Rick Spinrad is involved in, who's a co-chair, 3 and Rick Spinrad is still engaged in -- he moved to 5 OAR, still engaged in IOOS through being NOAA's executive. He's an AA so he's NOAA's executive for 7 IOOS and I answer to Rick. So I have lots of people that I turn around and answer to and bosses that tell me what they would like to see, but the 10 point here is NOAA is really trying to take serious how to move IOOS forward and get it implemented, 11 12 and it takes a lot to do that.

So I've mentioned several of the components and I think Nina showed some of them, but there is observing systems, which is a global ocean part of it, and then there's a coastal part of it and I'm going to break that down in a second for you, but there's also modeling and analysis subsystem that's bringing different models together, how do you use the observations, do you determine where you really need observations,

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

creating products and really bringing the . 1 usefulness of the data together, and then most 3 important DMAC, Data Management and Communication, making these things interoperable. We have some partners we have to deal with. I told you about just inside NOAA how many people I have to work 7 with and try to get oversight and get their input. We also have all these other federal agencies I have to deal with through the Interagency Working Group as well as the regional associations that 10 involve with trying to get their input into what 11 the IOOS is about. In order to implement IOOS I 12 13 need all these players, I need them all working 14 together and being part of the process. Now, what are the reasons for IOOS? 15 NOAA has missions, they have programs. I think 16 17 Jack mentioned it earlier today, 45 programs. These programs do not do their, collect their 18 observation for IOOS. That's not why they do it. 19

They have their mission. I'm going to talk a

little bit about Mike's program, the water level

20

. 1 program. They don't do it for IOOS. They have their mission. And he does this to support you, 3 what you're doing. So IOOS is the integration of these to create something better than, putting all 5 the parts together to be greater than the whole and to be a more efficient way of doing, but the 7 programs fall into these different things. and efficient navigation, if you look at all these things, ecological forecasting, public health, you've already heard most of things come through in 10 11 our discussions, how we all fit into it. Those are 12 our missions and commerce and transportation is 13 part of the safety navigation and Steve is the lead 14 to that. All of the programs that we have in NOAA fit into one of those goals, that's where their 15 priorities come from, that's where they look at it, 16 what are my priorities, how much can I get, who am 17 I competing against for priorities. You have to 18 put priorities. You said earlier what do you want 19 20 to stop doing when you look at what you have and you see all of the soft systems I have, what are 21

. 1 you going to stop doing? How are we going to 2 change the way we do business is probably, because 3 we do stop doing some things, but it's a very slow process for the most part. We can't stop doing most of the things we do because of our mission. 5 We change the way we do business, we went from 7 paper charts to electronic charts, we didn't stop doing charts but we stopped doing paper charts. But that's the process. That's what IOOS is about, 10 that's what's going to help make us do. These are 11 the observing systems I deal with, to deal with IOOS, all of these, climate, commerce and 12 transportation, weather and water, ecosystems, I 13 14 broke them down into the goals, and you can see there's 30 of those systems. Those are all the 15 16 systems that are part of IOOS. In some shape or form they're part of IOOS, involved with it. 17 18 when I go to a meeting and we talk about 19 observation, I'm talking about 30 systems that I'm 20 looking at and these are all based on what's in the 21 backbone, and we talked about that earlier, this

document, if you have not read this document, the

first U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing System

development plan, if you haven't seen this you

should get this. This document tells you basically

what's the backbone, what are core variables we

6 measure, what's the strategy behind it.

Now, it's pretty vague in places, got a lot of ambiguity in it, it's got a lot to be interpreted, that's part of what we're going to look at in this IWGOO on really focusing and saying how do we really implement something like this.

This is not an implementation plan, it's a development plan, it's not how we can implement.

There's another one coming out that's called the IOOS Development Plan for 2006 to 2008, which is the second of this because it's an updated document, and these documents are starting to become available and we'll get you these copies too, but you should read these because that tells you more information about what IOOS is about and what we're trying to move forward, and there could

be a lot of good help, I think this group can tell
us about how we might be able to implement IOOS and
some strategies of what we could do. Next one.

. 1

Now I talk a little bit about the water level program and you know better than I do what this information is used for. If you look at all this, marine transportation, nautical charting and shoreline mapping, recreational boating, hazardous, you can read them, it doesn't say up there IOOS, it doesn't say that we do the water level program for IOOS, we don't do them for us, we do it for the programs. That's what the importance of these programs are. IOOS is going to make it better we hope. That's why we do it. Next one.

So what did IOOS do in this case? We did get some funding, how did we help improve to make it better? These are some of the enhancements we do. There are a lot of people that do tide gauges, USGC, state, Corps of Engineers. We looked at how can we for a little bit of money enhance the system to make it better. How can we get tide

gauges on ports, we all know that, so how can we enhance, advance IOOS in the most significant way and by building better partnerships, by upgrading existing systems such that they're already being maintained, so for a little bit of cost we can improve. That's one example. Those are the kind of synergies that we look at trying to do that.

Next one.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So what are some of the '06 investments? Data Assembly Center. I'm going to show you a picture of what that means, but part of what IOOS is about is interoperability and integration. order to make some system efficient, you have a lot of data, people need to be able to get access to your data as well as you want to get access to their data. So the first thing you do is make things interoperable. You don't try to make them integrated first. One group does not trust another group very well until they see what they're doing, they don't trust the quality. They can't do it as well as I can do it, but nobody can do it as well

. 1 as I can do it. Okay. So what you do is you make it interoperable, get that data out there. Part of 3 what we look at, get it out there, do a little bit of quality assurance on it, set up some standards, 5 some protocols so that everybody agrees this is how we're going to do it and you put it out there and 7 let everybody use the data the way they want. will build trust, that's what this is about, it's about trust, getting the data out there and 9 10 trusting that the other group is going to do something as well as you're going to do it that you 11 12 know. Get it out there, people do it and 13 ultimately other people will say well, I trust them and I trust that data so I'm going to continue down 14 15 that route and now I'll be able to put my money elsewhere because I know I can use that. That's a 16 difficult job. We're going to do it but that's 17 what a lot of it's about. Next one. 18 19 We are always trying to improve

We are always trying to improve technology because, once again, we, for the most part our mission hasn't changed. It's been

20

modified slightly, but for the last 200 years . 1 surveying the coast we have done. Actually February 10th will be 200 years, from 1807 we've 3 surveyed the coast. Then you got the surveying the 4 5 coast and moving on to the geodetic service that we've built the country and we used to do it with 7 some old tidal observations and some using, used to use booby towers and now we're using satellite information, but we still do the same thing. We 10 still put in control, put in less control. We do it more efficiently, but it used to take us four or 11 12 five months to just observe let alone adjust. Now 13 it takes us less than one week to do it. But we're still doing the same thing. So we're always 14 15 improving technology. That's part of IOOS, to try to do that to build on and make the next generation 16 17 systems. Next one.

Some future applications. We can't put the whales on drugs but what we can do is say well, we know what the whales are doing and we know what the shipping industry wants to do and if we can

18

19

20

build a good system that plans to say well, here is . 1 where the whales are and in real time. 3 actually recently in the past when we had the Volvo race that came up, the regatta thing that came up, there was an airplane taking pictures trying to 5 find out if there were any kind of whales in the 7 area such that they were able to go, you can almost in near real time put this information out on the web, but it's like a notice to mariners. You have 9 the information, the sooner you can get it the 10 sooner you can tell someone. But here in this demo 11 what we did is we took the information of what the 12 13 shipping industry does and the ship's course they normally would take, but we also put in where are 14 15 the mammals, what was the history of where they were, so you could plan and say this time of year 16 17 they were here so chances are I'm going to have to That's just an example of a demo project. 18 reroute. 19 But this is what IOOS brings.

Integration, bringing disparate information together in real time, and real time in

20

quotes means a whole lot to different people, but
bringing things together so you can do better

planning and be more efficient and we're trying to

do more of that. Next one.

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We also have to abide by what inside NOAA is standard architecture. IOOS is one set of, one group of people that get together to deal with ocean observing. We also have surface observing, which we call ISOS, and we have upper air observing, which there is no acronym so we call it IUOS, but all these different groups, one in the ocean, one on the surface, one in the upper air, all have different groups, they're all measuring observations, some similar, so we need a standard architect to be able to train and share data. There are some common data that we share. One example is you have weather information on buoys and we've just converted some weather buoys to actually give us information about currents. was part of IOOS in the conversion to upgrade those buoys that were for weather information, now

provide information about currents and
temperatures, salinity, such that information can
be shared with a different community. But we have
to follow certain standards and guidelines so
inside NOAA we're trying to set up a management
system that fits to all without creating the
bureaucracy that slows things down. And this is
inside NOAA and I gotta deal with the same thing
dealing with all these different agencies with IOOS
and we're doing that. Next one please.

This is what we -- the National Data
Buoy Center, and what we call an IOOS Data Assembly
Center. This is where we believe that if you can
develop the data management communication protocols
to standards that all of the data elements, the way
you believe everybody should report in a standard
form, that we can get them back out to everybody in
the most efficient way. So what we have here is
that the people on the outside, some people in the
regions that are collecting weather information or
water level information are sending it to NDBC and

. 1 they're turning around and doing a little bit of quality assurance on it but not much, basically 3 agreed upon, and they turn around and get it back If somebody wants this data they go to one 5 site and gather all this data, knowing it has certain meta data around it. This once again is something about sharing information in the most efficient manner. How many sites you have like this I'm not sure yet, we're working on trying to 10 do that. We have a group of people, companies 11 looking at what it's really going to take. How you 12 do models that you have is another thing you have 13 to look at in data assembly. This is physical 14 information, how do I handle biological, chemical, 15 we're not sure yet, but the concept is get the data 16 in a common format, make it interoperable first, 17 this is not integrated, someone gets it in, gets it 18 back out, someone else is taking and probably using 19 it in integration but right now it's just 20 interoperable. Next one please.

The role of modeling and analysis, this

. 1 is where we haven't done a lot with this yet. We do some modeling but we haven't really used it from 3 the standpoint of IOOS. Just as IOOS has a set of ocean observing systems that are the part of the Integrated Ocean Observing System, we have models 5 that people use and they're part of IOOS. But the 7 real key in IOOS is once again interoperable integration, bringing those together as well as evaluating what's the best way of doing it. How 10 many observations do I need, do I need all these temperature observations or currents over here or 11 12 water level information, or do I need more? Now, 13 this is what I always get asked the question, you 14 say you need 300 tide gauges, why? I look around 15 and people who did that stood up and said well, we 16 need about 300 tide gauges, so was there rigorous 17 study behind that that someone said we need that? 18 There's probably some data they can pull out, but I 19 doubt it comes out saying we need 300 tide gauges. We're at a point now where we can do those kind of 20 21 things and maybe we need 300 and maybe we don't.

. 1 What we will do is if we can show credibility of 2 saying this is why I need it using these models 3 that shows me, maybe it's not 300, but we clearly know it's more than we got now, so it's probably 5 less than 300, we probably will through efficiencies come up with something, who knows what 7 it is, 250, 275. We can stand behind it. can say to people this is why I need it. the importance of models. This is where we can go 10 with these ocean systems simulation experiments, 11 what they call OSSEs, as well as data simulation. 12 One of the things that IOOS can bring to you is 13 that once you make those interoperable, people will 14 integrate them. They'll start using some ocean, like in terms of hurricanes, some ocean temperature 15 16 information that they get that they'll put right 17 back into the model and then a day later or less 18 start updating the model. So that's how they 19 improve their hurricane track. They have to get almost realtime data to be able to improve that. 20 21 If they can get realtime information they'll give

you a better where the hurricane is, where the track is. Next one.

. 1

2

3 This is one example of an OSSE that NASA They were using some simulated information where they said well, if I had some LIDAR wind profiles how much would it help me. It was just a very simple diagram that shows three tracks where if you have one without the LIDAR data, one with the LIDAR and then the actual path, which is hard 10 to see but you can see it. With the LIDAR data you 11 can see that you get a little bit closer to truth. 12 So that right there shows well, hey, it's 13 important, I can use this observation. 14 question you might have is well, is there another 15 set of data that might give you a better, accurate track? Once again, you gotta answer those 16 17 questions. As soon as I put that up someone asked me well, what happens if you use the Data Institute 18 19 information. Well, this is information during a 20 hurricane that you can get, it's from a satellite, 21 it's a whole lot better. In a hurricane in the

. 1 middle of a path, Data Institute data is hard to 2 get back to you. It may give you research 3 information to be able to say I need some more data actually right in front of the hurricane sending 5 back information, but those are all things that, once again, IOOS is about, trying to improve the 7 system and make it better. Next one please. 8 Now, the GEOSS and IOOS, if you're around the admiral any length of time he says 10 GEOSS, I think it's a reflex he has, GEOSS. Global 11 Earth Observing System of Systems. It's really bringing all the systems around the world 12 13 interoperable integrated. That's really what GEOSS 14 is about. And IOOS is similar. They're parallel. 15 We're a little bit farther along than a lot of other counterparts that deal with the other surface 16 17 observations. The ocean community is farther along. And the term GloBoo, the Global Ocean 18 Observing System. It's been around, GloBoo's name 19 20 has been around since the middle '80s, so they

really took a long time to try to get going, but

. 1 they are now pushed to get funding. They got it basically from the climate change and weather. 3 need global information to be able to do weather and it's out in the oceans that you're influencing 5 draughts in the center part of the United States. El Nino affects the center part of the country 7 where you grow things. That's the significance of it. So climate change dealing with how the weather patterns are have to do with the center part of the 10 country. It doesn't have to be specifically local 11 to become part of IOOS. My point here is that 12 there are GEOSS goals, nine of them. There's seven 13 societal goals that you've heard a lot of people 14 talk about and I want to point out the NOAA mission 15 goals. I changed the order of these things. 16 looked at that and I moved ecosystems to the 17 bottom. There might be a Freudian slip there, but anyways part of what I wanted to show here was that 18 19 NOAA deals with the goals, that's what we're about. 20 We have to meet -- the societal goals all fit into 21 NOAA has a contribution to all of the societal it.

- 1 goals as well as the GEOSS goals, but we are
- 2 mission goal driven. That's how we work inside
- 3 NOAA, and all of these different goals are part of
- 4 | IOOS in some shape or form. Next one please.
- Now, I have been doing a lot of
- 6 different briefings, I have spent time going to
- 7 | NOAA's deputy AA and talking about what IOOS is
- 8 about and trying to explain it and I have gone to
- 9 NOAA's AAs, what they call the NEC, NOAA Executive
- 10 Council, and I have spent time briefing the admiral
- 11 on this and the admiral really wants to see this
- 12 move forward, he wants to be able to try to get
- 13 some funding going in this, and we're making some
- 14 headway. What I've said over and over again about
- 15 IOOS and you've heard it, it's in the name, it's
- 16 interoperable integration and it's about
- 17 partnership, it's about building on relationships
- 18 and bringing everybody together and building a
- 19 synergy and that's what our focus is basically on,
- 20 our near term focus and priorities, creating
- 21 | interoperability among NOAA's high priority data

sets. ENRON and PORTS are part of our high
priority data sets. Regional associations and
Ocean.US can't be done without the help of these

4 groups in Ocean.US so that I can get the other

5 agencies involved in this process.

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Increase the effectiveness of the current Interagency Planning Office, and I don't mean to say that in a negative way or offend anybody, Ocean.US and how it's operating. I just think you have all of these federal agencies and you got Ocean.US trying to serve these federal agencies, they have a very difficult job. Now that IWGOO is established and we've got some different leadership moving through, we've got some different priorities, and ICOSDRMI, one of the different acronyms, but the development plan is important and all the federal agencies bought into this, we're going to try to take more of an active step of leading that by example, putting together what we think is right. And in vetting through these other federal agencies and seeing how they fit into it.

. 1

2

3

5

4

7

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

Utilize and optimize ocean observations through a modeling and analysis, I think we could use some of that.

Utilize IOOS conceptual design and cost estimates, we have two contractors that are out there collecting information and are going to give us a draft of a report in June, final's not done until August, but they are going to give us a draft of how say these can be implemented and they're focusing on more on data management communications rather than the number of observations they need in the water, it's a conceptual diagram. I will say it again the programs tell me how many observations I need in the water, not IOOS. The programs tell me what's important, what's not, in terms of meeting their mission. The IOOS is the integration interoperability and bringing it together and making the full product better, but it comes from the programs.

And then continue expansion of the global component. The global component has a lot

of support, a lot of push and they do get funded . 1 every year. They're not getting as much as they 3 ask for but they are getting funded and they've been moving forward because they had a good clear message that people understood and they went with 5 one voice and they got funded, and they support --7 from the climate change they went to the high priority as well as the information about weather that affects everybody in the United States. they really had a good message and they've been 10 pushing. We did develop that from a coastal 11 component and bring all these together. Next one 12 13 please.

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So what are my next steps? I mentioned early on that I have to answer to different groups, to what we call the NOC and the NOSC. One is Ocean Council, one is an Observing System Council. Observing System Council focuses on systems, observations and how do you make them DMAC compliant, what are their standards, how do you make them interoperable, how do they talk to

others, that's what they worry about. The Ocean . 1 Council, they worry more about well, how many 3 observations do I need, where do I need them, what are my priorities, how do I use these observations 5 in the most efficient manner, how do we talk to each other and get working with the other agencies. 7 So I have to answer to both of them and we're developing a project plan which will explain some of what I've just been talking about of how we do this from a NOAA level and then into an interagency 10 11 level. A project management plan, how do we set 12 priorities, how do we decide on what we fund and 13 what we don't fund. I receive from NOAA every year 14 an annual guidance memorandum and we're doing the 15 planning right now for '09. So I mean I'm spending '06 money. You heard about '07 right there and 16 17 that's going to be talked about in June. I got '08 18 questions now that I think Tuesday I go and talk to 19 people about '08 and I'm planning for '09. All 20 those years have to come. So inside NOAA we're 21 now -- in that annual guidance memo they talked

. 1 about integrating and Interoperability, talked about making the ocean systems more integrated, 3 more interoperable and meeting the needs of NOAA and their programs. So this is the first year that all of these goals and programs will be focused on this, so I developed a guidance memo myself to send 7 to them and I will be meeting with the program managers involved, all those ones I mentioned as well as the goals, to be able to get from this 10 annual guidance memo to get into these programs 11 what IOOS does and come up for every goal, and 12 Steve will be part of this process, to come up from 13 every goal what is an IOOS alternative to doing a 14 better job, what can IOOS do, it will be IOOS-15 focused, from the goal of saying if we do this this 16 will help IOOS move forward. I think they have a 17 very good chance of being funded and pushed this 18 year because all the senior leaderships say this 19 sounds like a good idea but we don't see the 20 programs and goals talking to each other and fully 21 understanding what it means. It's not their fault.

That's what my job is. And that's what I'm going to be spending lots of time talking to people on and that's what I have been doing.

. 1

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

At the same time we have to support GEOSS like I am, but more important that NOC and NOSC will allow me to continue support of what I call IOOS Focus Group. I have goal members on a focus group that come and meet with me twice a month and we talk about what are the issues of IOOS, how do we move this forward, what are our priorities, how do we build this project planning. So I'm not building this from an NOS standpoint, I'm building this as a NOAA project and they're going to help me build it within the goals, and then I have the IWGOO, which is interagency, so I have all these different agencies that I have to talk to them and develop a work plan saying how do we move this forward and what are their priorities, how are they working their observation, how can we integrate what NOAA in doing with what USGS is doing or with the Corps of Engineers, to two big

. 1 players that we have a lot to do with, and regional 2 associations, trying to get the regional associations in the process of certification or 3 accreditation is a big thing. We believe the regional association can meet a lot of people's 5 needs and I think the NAB community is starting to do more to be engaged in the regions, but we're asking the regions if they're going to be certified to actually get some money, which we're trying to 10 do in our own budget, to make it competitive 11 grants, not just earmarked, competitive grants that 12 come in and you have to have a business plan. So 13 if you're now working with the NAB community, it's 14 not part of your business plan, then you can say 15 well, no, that's not a good enough business plan. Private industry, navigation community, 16 17 universities, state and local, I mean all of these 18 people are part of the business plan of saying how are you in your region going to implement your IOOS 19 20 part of this, how are you going to work with other feds, all of these things have to be part of a 21

. 1 business plan from the community before you're able 2 to move forward. This is part of what we're trying 3 to build in this accreditation. And the last part of that is the system design for utilizing 5 conceptual design. NOAA has paid for this. Ιt came as a \$2 million contract. We paid for this but it's not just NOAA, it's, the design of IOOS is all the federal agencies, so once we get it we're going to take it to the IWGOO and say okay, how do 10 we implement this.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In Ocean.US they have what they call
DMAC working groups, two or three working groups.
They have a system set up to be able to take this
information and start working within the agencies
to try to implement how they're doing this thing,
so we have to look at now that we have the guidance
how do we take it forward and move it. This is
only the plan. This is where, if you looked in
some of these documents you'll see that they said
DMAC is somewhere around, the first year they need
like \$18 million, just talking about data

management communication. I'm not sure how you move \$18 million in one year, but those are the kind of things that the IWGOO needs to really focus on and try to get within their federal agencies talking to each other, and so we're going to take that leadership role and do that. Next one. That's it.

. 1

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: Dave, thanks. I wanted to say one thing and then open up for some questions but I would ask that maybe -- we've commented and had a chance to talk to Dave about it, and I know this will be an ongoing thing, but I guess for my part I wanted to just sort of -- when I look at this, to me one of the threshold questions and I think many of the comments we've made thus far from the committee on the IOOS and the backbone issues is that certainly we've expressed support for that, but one fundamental question I have in looking at all that in the context of Nina's presentation for example when we're looking at the budget numbers, and I don't remember the exact figures, but with

the 600-some million fiscal year '05 now we're down . 1 to 300-some million, we're talking flat line or severely declining projected resources, my 3 fundamental question is, I very much like how you 4 characterize IOOS as supporting or enhancing and 5 coordinating and integrating existing, that's a 7 wonderful way I think to characterize it, but my question is does NOAA have a spend plan, is there some look at, in this phase in particular, what I 9 10 would characterize as a capacity-building phase for IOOS, is there a look at, is there a concern 11 12 there's somewhat potential for zero sum gain to be played here as far as you're going to need money to 13 make these enhancements and we're in a declining 14 15 fiscal environment, where does that money have to come from. We've all heard of the 4.5 billion 16 17 target. In other words, as we're trying to build IOOS and enhance this, is somebody watching our 18 existing navigational programs so that as we're 19 trying to make them better, they don't collapse? 20 IOOS is not a 21 ZILKOWSKI: Yeah.

. 1 substitute for ocean observing systems. anything if you get from my talk here, I said the 3 ocean observing systems are program driven, so the programs get that. So if you do IOOS it's always 5 above core, what we call above core. It's like I got this now and if I want to integrate and make it 7 interoperable, then it comes above. That's why it's not been funded, by the way, because it's above and it costs more to do it. And right now 10 the limited, I'm going to leave Steve if he wants to a little bit from a goal perspective, but until 11 12 now it's been focusing, people have been focusing more on above core doing other things in their 13 different programs. See, we filed these guidance 14 memos that are coming out. NOAA's been through a 15 change here in terms of how they work, having the 16 17 admiral come in there, trying to get us thinking in terms of more of a business and trying to say what 18 are your requirements working together, get out of 19 the stovepipe. So in that case he put out a new 20 21 guidance memo from the leadership, this is what we

.1 think is important, and this year they're talking about the integration. We need this so it's taken some time to do that. So I think this year, when I 3 say this year I'm talking about '09, all right, 5 this year is never the same year, it's always years out, so I think this is the time that they'll still 7 say this is good, let's look for alternatives, but saying that, the actual programs themselves still will be at your base and your core. And you've got 10 a limited amount of increases that you can work 11 with and this is how the goals will have to 12 prioritize and say well, based on what I'm hearing 13 from all the programs this is where I think I can 14 justify the increase. I don't know if Steve wants 15 to say something else about that.

CAPT. BARNUM: I don't have much to add to that, but certainly IOOS is a strong priority with NOAA. Certainly with my goal hat on, many of the services that are in the portfolio, such as mapping and water levels and ENRON are considered heartily as far as the goals. So certainly from my

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 perspective at commerce and transportation, as
 2 those services increase those aspects in my
 3 portfolio I would be pleased.
- MR. ARMSTRONG: Could you tell us how
 the IOOS program is compatible, not compatible,
 coordinates with or doesn't coordinate with the
 NSF-funded ocean observation program?

8 MR. ZILKOWSKI: As was mentioned earlier, OOI is part of NSF and IOOS from the 10 interagency point of view, and NSF is part of the ex-com Ocean.US. So we talked about that and what 11 12 they're doing will support IOOS. So their 13 observations are going in and some of the stuff 14 they're doing research on right now will be 15 operational data to us someday. Some of it is research that may not. There's a working 16 17 relationship that says well, we could use this data here and it meets the research needs and they do 18 19 that. If it doesn't they to do their research, so 20 there's some that fits into it, but to answer your 21 question, it is coordinated, we do talk part of

- 1 that. They know the IOOS goals so they're always
- 2 trying to meet those goals, but once again, they
- 3 have, just like our own programs, they have a
- 4 mission to meet so you don't want to take from
- 5 their mission, all you want to do is optimize how
- 6 they do their mission and understand where you want
- 7 to go. So we do have that good relationship and
- 8 there's tension a lot too.
- 9 MR. ARMSTRONG: In particular your data
- 10 | management and their cyber infrastructure, is there
- 11 some plan for compatibility there?
- MR. ZILKOWSKI: Yeah, that's one of the
- 13 biggest things that they always talk about.
- 14 Actually we learn from them and they learn from us,
- 15 but the goal is that whatever they're doing now
- 16 | will be compatible with what we're doing and what
- 17 | we're doing will be compatible with them. So it
- 18 gets back to this interoperability integration, so
- 19 the goal is always to make it interoperable first
- 20 and then integrate it into our process. You start
- 21 with interoperability first and then integrate.

. 1 There will be some issues that once they put something in and they're done with their research 3 and it may not serve their purpose anymore and it really is important operational data to the ocean 5 observing system that the IOOS and things need to come up with the funding to pick up and do this, 7 which is another case that you have with NASA. NASA puts satellites up there for a mission that has a time line. They want to study something and 10 once they study it they basically may not be interested anymore, so they may not want to keep 11 12 that data, but it may be operational data that we 13 want. Ocean color, sea surface height. We're finding that we want sea surface height because as 14 15 the water level gets warmer you can now see in our 16 temperature data, I mean that's information that we 17 want, so we have to figure out do we transition it. 18 So we're doing better with reserve to application or operations, and actually NASA and NOAA, I guess 19 it came in NOAA's budget, received money to 20 21 transfer that technology from NASA to NOAA, and

those are the kind of things that we as an agency need to work closer together and I'm hoping that the ISGOO will look at that more.

. 1

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. SKINNER: Thanks for the presentation, Dave. That was very comprehensive and interesting. I just wanted to go back. You showed the slide on IOOS future applications and it happened to be the area from the approach to Boston Harbor and so forth. This gets back to something I mentioned early about the practical applications, STOA and National Marine Sanctuary is working with, I think it's University of California on buoys that can pick up and detect and transmit in real time data the communications between among both white whales and other whales that could be -- you talked about using historical data to show where the whales might congregate along the traffic separation schemes, this would be realtime data on where they actually are based on the information from these buoys, so I think that's a really a great application for this type of thing that not

only the mariners could back but also the

environmentalists and get some support for that

type of thing, after obviously you fully, the PORTS

system is fully funded. But that's the type of

thing that I think are the sort of future

applications.

Just one more example. Everyone, the folks from the Coastal Services Center kept saying what do you want to learn from ocean observation and I have no idea, I don't know what they can develop. And I kept whining at the GoMOOS ports and they actually came up with a proposed project to detect erosion rates based on the buoy data, which that project didn't get funded, but that was the type of things that if it did get funded and it worked I would be screaming like crazy to get off of GoMOOS. So I think that's the type of thing that really drives a program like this.

MR. ZILKOWSKI: Those are very good points, and I have been talking to Steve Marouski, who is our ecosystem guy, and those are things that

we're trying to link the ecosystem side with the

NAB side and that's a very good example how we

could actually work together and do that. And the

other one about the buoys, I think you're right,

those are both things that IOOS can look at them

and should look at and try to build the synergy to

make it happen.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BROHL: This was a really good presentation. You kind of saw it from the baseline outward instead of IOOS as a regional association, which is what you used to get in what was IOOS. So this was a little more of what you want to hear, understanding what you have and build from there, but with regard to core programs and then putting in something for IOOS to expand those programs to be more interoperable and things like that, my first question is if that's really how you're doing it, when do the different departments, offices, tell you these are our core programs and then we'd like another 10 percent to develop these specific IOOS goal things, or are they supposed to

incorporate that?

. 1

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. ZILKOWSKI: That's what we're doing, right what you said. What we're trying to do is explain to them what IOOS is about. First of all, even inside the organization they don't fully understand what IOOS is about, they hear it, they say it's observations and so forth. But what we're trying to do, and it takes lots of time, is meet with the program and the goals to say okay, how can you -- here's your base funding, what you want and that's good, and from an IOOS perspective we look at programs and say yeah, did you support this, yeah, we support that because it fits into the IOOS frame. But the integration and operability, what we're trying to do with the programs is say how can you make that system better that's an alternative, that that's what NOAA is looking for, above core type things.

MS. BROHL: Give an example -- didn't in '06 NOAA get a lump sum for quote/unquote IOOS without congressional designation?

MR. ZILKOWSKI: We got \$16 million for what they call ICOOS, coastal ocean observing, and that was, some of it was in what's called ORC where you can use it for whatever you want and some was in PAC, which is basically equipment and so forth.

6

7

8

21

5

. 1

3

MS. BROHL: How did you determine to use the money?

MR. ZILKOWSKI: Basically from the 9 priorities that you saw. We're consistent about 10 our priorities and it's integration, 11 12 interoperability, regional associations, Ocean.US, 13 the management structure that we need to make this 14 happen. I mentioned that you got people -- I got 15 the A team. My salary actually comes out of the 16 Geodesy budget, but you have other people that work 17 for me that I have, I have some contractors to help 18 bring this material together to try to, just to 19 build it and then you've got Ocean.US, which is being stood up by NOAA to try to get the other 20

agencies integrated and working through the

1 process, and the regional associations. So if you

2 look at that priority, that's basically how we were

looking and trying to do it with that, with the

4 IOOS.

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BROHL: How much of that 16

billion -- sounds like it all went just towards

standing things up. Did any of it come back to

8 hydrographic services?

MR. ZILKOWSKI: I'd have to look at the actual for '06, but we put some money in for hardening of the tide gauges, I don't know if that was '05 and then supplemental came in so they didn't need it in '06. We put it in for the data management communication, put it in for the Data Assembly Center, we put it in for dealing with upgrading existing systems. For the most part it didn't go back into observing programs if you will. Integration interoperability enhancements was what our priorities were there. We did some pilot projects, which people had the opportunity to buy equipment and do things where it would have been

- . 1 from the standpoint of the theme of integration interoperability, getting the data out, 3 collaborating and working together, those are the 4 things, but we have -- I don't have it with me but I 5 can get you what we did in terms of our projects we funded. We had \$4 million or something that we 7 went out and got people to put in proposals of how they would do some of those kind of things and gave 9 them a lot of opportunities to just think about how 10 that would be integrating and moving.
- MS. BROHL: So even if it didn't go

 directly to line items that we understand that

 relates to hydrographic observations, under NOS it

 invested in projects which will go towards helping

 to integrate those programs into the larger

 observing system?
- MR. ZILKOWSKI: Yeah, that's what we ladd.
- MS. BROHL: I have one more.
- MR. RAINEY: Go ahead.
- MS. BROHL: Thank you. The question

comes back to regional associations. I understand
that many regional associations have to be
approved, they have to have an approved business
plan and you're very vigilant to make sure it's
going to be an operational program, but how will
you ensure regional associations are not used just
as a slush fund to pass money through for pet
projects and that they will be accountable to being
meaningful in the IOOS as a whole?

MR. ZILKOWSKI: That's a good question.

Part of the business plan and their work points

were looking at what -- when they get money right

now, it's with them what you're going to do with

the money, so we would have a work plan, we would

be approved by the plan, but it would be following

their business in long-term projects, so what we

look at is what's your goals, what are your

priorities and what, if you got money, what would

you do. So we would be asking that. Part of their

plan would also be able to go out and not just get

federal money. There are a lot of states and

locals that benefit. The state of Florida, tourism . 1 2 benefits dramatically from our foghorn system, so 3 they participate in this process, they see the benefit, so we're hoping that as we build this and 5 show the benefits, that the actual users out there will sit there and say I do want this and I want a 7 little bit more and that they're going to build what's going to be -- actually build it that's going to make it a success. You have to get 10 private industry engaged in this process because 11 they're really the ones that are going to build the 12 products and services and get the users engaged 13 with this process.

MR. RAINEY: Thanks very much. Thanks for your forbearance here. We went through a couple of breaks. What I'd like to do is take another, go ahead and take another short, say five-minute break if we could, and then we'll really be on the home stretch. When we get back from the break I'd like to entertain a motion to approve the meeting summary from Houston, get that

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

. 1 out of the way. If there's any other old business, 2 to dispatch with that then, and then Helen and I 3 each have one piece of new business to the extent there's others. I would like an opportunity to --5 I think we're going to make our schedule and we'll give the public another shot, but to have a little bit of a dialogue in closing with Steve and Jack about how we might take them up on the offer for NOAA's staff support with an eye toward the 9 10 proposed Alaska meeting, if they think that we can regroup and have some meaningful work. So that's 11 12 what I would see on the last final lap here, so if 13 we could just adjourn for a short time, say five 14 minutes, please.

(Brief recess.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: Okay, let's please try to reconvene. In the view of the chair I believe we've got a quorum so I'd like to entertain a motion to approve the meeting summary from Houston.

Moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing none, I'd like to vote to approve the

1 meeting summary from Houston. All in favor.

2 Opposed. Okay, so moved.

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I'd like to move -- is there any other old business at this time? Okay.

MR. McBRIDE: What are we doing with the draft recommendations then that, your 11 points you made up?

MR. RAINEY: My suggestion from my sense of the meeting today was that, and I'm hoping to go through a couple points here, I have a point here and Helen has under new business. I just confirmed with Jack that he's able to stay with us and still have an eye on 4:30. My hope is that we can reengage the dialogue with the offer of NOAA's support and talk about next steps to pull this together and including some of these ideas we shared and talked about today and going ahead, looking at pulling this together and coming up with a substantive agenda that makes it worthwhile to go to Alaska and move forward. I'm hoping we'll cover a couple of topics and then come to some sort of

sense of how to proceed on that.

. 1

2 This is sort of a, a conceptual outline. 3 We recently received support from NOAA in conjunction with their office, I think I'm calling it right, the Special Projects Office. And again 5 going back to sort of the initial thoughts we had 7 on coming up with an annual report or most wanted list or something that had a little more shelf life, little bit more professionally produced 9 obviously beyond our organic capabilities as panel 10 11 members, but with NOAA's help that would tell the story better. I know many of you have seen these 12 kind of things, one of the -- I just grabbed an 13 14 example from a different agency, but this is the 15 NTSB, National Transportation Safety Board's most wanted list and they have from their various modal 16 17 offices sort of their most wanted and their priorities. Everybody knows about the FBI most 18 19 wanted that you see in the post office and such. This is simply an opening kind of salvo as a 20 21 possible vehicle for something that could be used

. 1 internally with the NOAA leadership. And then obviously we, again, the fact that we advise the 3 NOAA administrator, but as Jack mentioned earlier today, these are public meetings, it's a 5 transparent process and our discussions and advice and recommendations is public information that then 7 can have useful validation of these programs beyond NOAA itself up through the department, Congress, OMB, what have you. So there has been an offer and 9 10 I would like us to consider accepting that, and we just have a couple mockup slides that only speak to 11 the ideas, not in any way a polished document. But 12 13 this envisions it would highlight some of our panel 14 recommendations, give a little bit of background on 15 the panel, the members that are on the, represented on the panel, and basically it's not more than a 16 17 vehicle to help NOAA tell the story. And I don't 18 think that there's -- there is some initiatives underway, many of us have been involved in this MTS 19 initiative, Industry Day, lots of things you've 20 seen in NOAA banners and things we've had in our 21

previous meetings, but is yet another vehicle to

try to advance this message and education, so I

just offer that as -- there's been some initial

talk and I'd like I guess today to get a sense of

the panel if that would be something that the

members think would be a productive exercise and

something to pursue. I really had nothing more on

that. Just put that out there. There's been some

initial work on that and I'd like to get your sense

if you think that would be a worthwhile project.

CAPT. McGOVERN: I didn't understand the form in which you would use this.

MR. RAINEY: I think it could take -it's hard to say exactly how would it be used. My
thoughts would be that this would embody excerpts
of our recommendations, things that we thought,
again, most wanted or HSRP recommendations,
priorities, whatever, these would be kind of
statements of our concerns or interests in these
programs that would then be able to be. You know,
it would be hard copy document, it would have links

. 1 to ongoing active things. NOAA has a magazine, a virtual magazine on the site, website links, it would be sort of a -- it could be a leave-behind 3 for congressional hill visits, it could brief 5 across the line offices and programs of NOAA, we could ship a box to the IOOS folks, it would be 7 sort of our views and it's another vehicle, another mechanism to be heard. It would have some shelf life that people could refer back to and cite some 9 10 other information sources. One of the things that we've done, and I don't know the extent you've used 11 12 it, NOAA or other folks have, but one of the things that we have done is we have actually put together 13 14 a virtual library of all the stuff that I'm bearing 15 you with, all these resources over the last few 16 years, we've grabbed that stuff and on our website 17 we have a library that's beginning to be a pretty 18 comprehensive and good place to look if you want to have some references on these various studies and 19 20 statements and things like that. It's 21 alphabetical, it's cross referenced and other

. 1 things. We've taken some steps and we've done some 2 good things. This is another resource to try to 3 get that story out. I just offer that up. I don't think it needs any specific or official reaction 5 other than just a nod, maybe your thoughts, we ought to see what, see what we can do with it. 7 CAPT. McGOVERN: So nodded. MS. BROHL: Do you need a vote? 8 9 MR. RAINEY: I don't think so. 10 MS. BROHL: The only concern of course is who will take responsibility for generating 11 12 this? 13 MR. RAINEY: I think we can work with Steve on that. I know we have a commitment from 14 15 the Special Projects Office. 16 MS. BROHL: Where are they located? 17 CAPT. BARNUM: The Special Projects 18 Office is located in Silver Spring, under NOS 19 Special Projects Office and -- Office of Management and Budget, so we have talked with them, they 20 provided some initial mockups, but again, it would 21

318 . 1 be a professional publication that would again reflect the recommendations of this panel that 3 could again be left behind or given to folks. 4 MS. BROHL: The only thing I'd like to 5 see is that, a time line by which it will be generated, at least for initial review so we're not 7 talking about this again in a year. Is there any possibility -- everybody thinks this is a great 9 idea, nice to see our logo, see us in real print. 10 I think that kind of helps legitimize that you 11 really exist. Given everything on the plates do 12 you think there's a possibility of having a mockup 13 for August, for the August meeting? 14 CAPT. BARNUM: I think that's a very real possibility to have a mockup draft. Hopefully 15 it would get you to ten days before the August 16 17 meeting so you can review it. 18

MS. BROHL: Thank you.

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: Elaine, I don't know, I was going to approach you because I know your experience and background in journalism and that

- you're a publisher of Boat US magazine, really
 professional, I always enjoy that, but this would
 be something you would be interested in, you could
 help us in the mockup and things.
- MS. DICKINSON: Yeah, I'd love to help.
- 6 MR. RAINEY: I'm certainly interested in
- 7 this and others may be as well. I know that's --
- MS. DICKINSON: I think it's a great
- 9 idea.
- MR. RAINEY: Let me turn it over to 11 Helen.
- 12 MS. BROHL: I believe that at the last 13 break you were handed a flier that says NOAA's Vision for Coastal Management at the top. Well, 14 15 you heard today, I don't know if you caught it, but Admiral West happened to mention in passing when he 16 17 mentioned Emily Woglom being on detail to NOAA, 18 that she was doing, working at a project regarding 19 NOAA's vision for coastal management. I actually learned about this just yesterday because Emily and 20 21 I exchanged calls. She had an interest in finding

. 1 a maritime contact to provide some input into this project and I mentioned in passing to her gee, this 3 is something that maybe the HSRP should provide a 4 little bit of input to. Now, as a result of that 5 conversation yesterday I drafted up last night this brief proposal for approval by the HSRP now. It is 7 very broad. This project, she's supposed to do it within the 90 days she's in NOAA, so this is in no 9 way some big heavy duty project for which we have 10 to provide any real super details. I really just wanted to weigh in. I think it's always good to 11 12 mention your name often and to be on board because 13 I don't really know what the future of this white 14 paper will be that she will generate, I don't think 15 that she was in a position to say where it will go. I asked her if there was a definition of coastal 16 17 management. She said no. What does that mean, 18 coastal management? There was no -- you're looking 19 like you don't have one. Does everybody have this? 20 Okay there we go, thank you.

So to the extent that we have a very

21

. 1 short window that she's working on this project, we can't really wait until August, to the extent that 3 I would like the HSRP to be on the radar for her, and perhaps, whether it's in her appendix or how 4 5 she summarizes the comments she received, doesn't really matter, I was hoping that you could just 7 read through this, and as I said, it's very generic but I still think it's important. As you recall, coincidentally the admiral said this morning that 9 the HSRP should somehow comment on this. 10 11 there's nothing to comment on, you know what I'm saying, it's not like there's a paper we can 12 13 comment on. What we know is exactly what I have 14 written here, and that is NOAA is doing some 15 preliminary consideration of what NOAA's vision will be for coastal management. They don't have a 16 17 definition of what coastal management will be, but the HSRP believes a lot of these hydrographic 18 19 services that we're engaged with have meaning on 20 coastal management all or in some form. 21 there's no definition so we can't address it in

. 1 particular. And I do just actually name drop some of the types of observations just because I could. And I name dropped physical observations including 3 4 PORTS just to name drop them and to say that we 5 really want in essence, that we recommend that the existing hydrographic observations and services 7 already provided by NOAA through the National Ocean Service and other line offices be the baseline from which the national vision for coastal development 9 10 be developed. Not saying how they should do it or what, I'm kind of thinking that if you were there 11 12 thinking I've got to do an outline of what coastal 13 management is and get this paper from HSRP and it says oh, okay, these observation programs, how 14 15 would I incorporate them even if it becomes part of the outline. And I was hoping that you agreed with 16 17 this and you had some questions or a motion to 18 approve.

MR. DUNNIGAN: I actually know quite a bit about this. We have a number of meetings every year with large stakeholder groups and one of them

19

20

21

. 1 is a national meeting for coastal program managers 2 which is held in March here in Washington, and that was shortly after I came on board and one of the 3 things I challenged at the time, and Tom and I were 5 talking about this at lunch, one of the things I challenged coastal managers to think about in March 7 was CZMA reauthorization and whether there needed to be some fundamental reexamination of the basic paradigm for coastal management and the state and 10 federal partnership for coastal management. CZMA 11 needs to be reauthorized, not going to happen this 12 year, and this gets back to something I was talking 13 about in the HSIA context a little while earlier 14 about how I really would like to see, and frankly 15 Vice Admiral Lautenbacher really likes to see NOAA able to engage on very substantive policy issue 16 17 rather than just deal at the margins and deal with technical stuff because we like to avoid 18 19 controversy. The fact is that Coastal Zone 20 Management Act business model has been in effect 21 for 30 years. It has done some good things.

would question whether or not the people that wrote that law 30 years ago could see where we are today, if this is what they had in mind or what they were hoping our coasts would look like. I don't know the answer to that question, but I do think we ought to be focusing on the next 30 years.

. 1

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The business model we have today doesn't serve everybody's needs. You get a bunch of state coastal program managers together in a room and some of them it's okay for, others of them it's not. I was shocked to find out a couple of years ago that when you talked to the states about CZM it's not about the money. I always thought it was about the money. For some of the states, the state of New York puts five, six times more money into it than they get from CZMA. Commonwealth of Massachusetts spends money, states like Florida, California, Alaska spends tons more money than they get with the \$2 million cap currently in the CZMA. For other states, for the territories, states like Delaware, it was the money but the fact is the

. 1 communities right now in a broad sense aren't being 2 served the same way. What I said to them was let's 3 engage in a long, as long as it takes discussion about what's important for managing our coasts in 5 an open and transparent process and have this discussion that everybody can be involved with so 7 that we understand what the issues are, what the pros and cons are. Sounds like what I was talking about for HSIA. And they have taken me up on that. 10 The Coastal States Organization is very interested 11 in working on this and left for the coastal program 12 manager to be a staff person to work on this. 13 Emily came over, is working in our office to help 14 make this happen. Our new director, David Kennedy, 15 Coastal Resource Office, is picking up the iron and moving forwards. What Emily is working on is more 16 17 like something that will become a foundational document that will allow us all to be able to move 18 19 forward. That's what she is really going to be 20 able to do in 90 days. The main reason for having Emily over at NOAA for 90 days is when she goes 21

back to OMB she will understand what it is we do and we'll have a good ally over there. Emily has been a good ally and a good person to work with for a long time. That's really what this is about.

. 1

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think what's here, I'm not sure, I wouldn't say vision of coastal management is what the project is about. The project is about trying to define the issues that are relevant in the policy consideration for reauthorizing the CZMA. think that the paper makes a good statement that the navigation community is an important part of that future and it needs to be fully engaged. This isn't just something for state CZM directors and the Coastal States Organization to try to dictate. We have to have a very broad engagement and certainly the marine transportation community and the hydro services constituency is an important part of doing that. So I think this is something that would be helpful for us to have just as an expression of interest and a good opportunity for you to get your oar in the water and make sure

1 you're going to be a part of this as we move 2 forward. The only parts of this that I would

3 question are the second paragraph because it makes,

4 it indicates like we don't know what we're doing

5 and I think we have a pretty good idea of what

6 | we're doing.

And the last paragraph because I'm not sure what it means to say that these programs become a baseline for international vision. I think it may be better if you strongly encouraged us, if this is what you want to do, to recognize the marine transportation values that are inherent in any visioning for coastal management and long-term uses of coastal zone and encourage us to make sure we keep you involved and the marine transportation community involved as we go about this process. That would actually be quite helpful for us to have.

MR. RAINEY: Richard, could you put a mark in the transcript there so we can pick up

Jack's language if that ends up being the sense of

the panel's -- thank you.

. 1

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

3 couple of changes in the language. I think they're 4 reasonably consistent with what Jack just said and 5 I was going to suggest dropping the second paragraph and sticking part of, after the line 6 7 offices be in the last paragraph, maybe that would be enough to meet our goals of getting our oar in 8 the water and not assuming that the coastal 9 management folks sort of don't know what they're 10 11 going to do yet. So I would offer those two minor 12 changes, strike the second paragraph and insert 13 part of after line offices be.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I was going to suggest a

MS. BROHL: I'm not sure I understand what you're saying about the last one.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Two words, part of, other line offices be part of the baseline from which the national vision.

MS. BROHL: Be part of the baseline from which, okay. I was going to say incorporated.

Jack, if that was added would that be a little more

clear?

. 1

MR. DUNNIGAN: Sure.

or not, it sounds to me it couldn't get at all to what Jack was suggesting. I would just make it a point again, I would prefer not to be asked to vote on things that are dropped in. It would be my preference if it's feasible, let's refine this and take a look at it at our August meeting, let's have a look and be able to understand the context and what's going on.

MR. DUNNIGAN: We would be able to come to that meeting with a little bit fuller explanation of where we are. By then Emily would be pretty much done with the project and David Kennedy could come and talk to you about what's the overall process, maybe have Kathy Andrews come out from CSO and be a part of that discussion as well.

MS. BROHL: If I could just add that I

appreciate the fact that there's not enough time to look at it, but Emily is going to be done in 60

. 1 days. 30 days of her 90 days is done and she will 2 have generated her brief white paper, so the 3 intention here was not to impact the substance of specific things but just to say hey, as you process 5 this, these are programs that we think should be incorporated in what you're looking at. That's the 7 extent of it. I appreciate the fact that you're nervous about it, but we don't have until August to impact what Emily is doing now, but to the extent 10 we're not going to sign in blood here that, you know -- I think this is so board --11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CAPT. McGOVERN: First of all, I don't agree we have until August. We have until whenever we have to decide we're going to do it. Secondly, it's just my personal view that I don't like to see things dropped in and make quick decisions.

There's never enough time to do it right, but there's always time to do it over. I would suggest, I would just like an opportunity to understand more fully what's going on, and Jack suggested he can tell us and that's just my

opinion, so I leave that for you and the group.

. 1

2 MS. DICKINSON: I think Emily is doing her homework because she reached out to us and said 3 she wants to meet with recreational boating and 5 find out what our coastal management issues are, so we're going to see her like next week. And our 7 issues are completely beyond the scope of this. 8 This is like one piece of it and I know it's important. Our issue is access, shrinking access 10 on all of our coasts. Marinas disappearing, docks disappearing, they're turning into condo 11 developments and the public is increasingly being 12 13 shut out of access to the waterfronts. And that's happening on all kinds of levels, so that's, you 14 15 know, that's our piece of it. I would say if 16 you're going to go with this and throw in some 17 language about marine transportation, also throw in 18 some language about the recreational potential of 19 the coasts and maintaining public access. But I 20 mean this is just one program and I am not even sure that's what she is focusing on for her 90-day 21

paper. I think it's a lot broader.

MS. BROHL: She's also coming over to

CORE shortly to hear their words. She came to me

to talk about commercial maritime. And I agree

with you that she seems to be pretty thorough. By

with you that she seems to be pretty thorough. But

just in the way that I trust she's being thorough,

7 just like we trust that Jack is going to pursue

8 HSIA, I really wanted the HSRP to be on a piece of

paper that said oh, you know, you know, when they

10 come later, they will have something that says

11 there is the HSRP, perhaps we should go talk to the

HSRP about the hydrographic services components.

13 So --

9

12

16

18

MS. DICKINSON: Why don't we draft her a

15 letter --

CAPT. McGOVERN: I like that.

MS. DICKINSON: -- that covers a few

more bases than just PORTS. We have time to do

19 that.

MS. BROHL: That's true. Again, it

21 wasn't to be so definite about all the areas that

1 are important as much as it has to do with wanting

2 the HSRP to sign on and to say hydrographic

3 services or hydrographic observations and services

4 are an important component of coastal management

5 and we hope they're going to be in the mix.

6 MR. SKINNER: Emily is very busy,

7 because I got a call today for an LNG contact, so

8 you're getting your money's worth.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

What about the idea -- I think the letter, the idea of a letter because I think this is drafted sort of in a formal manner and I think maybe if there was a letter from say Scott, and I can't even remember what the policies or recommendations were we approved, but maybe including those, they're all things we've already done. It would be the chair of the HSRP saying this is important, you know, that the hydrographic services are important to coastal management, here are some of the positions our panel has taken and we hope you'll look into what the Coast Survey and

all the other agencies that work on this, you know,

how they interact with coastal management. That
way it's just Scott sort of summarizing what we've
already done. You can do that without our
approval.

MS. BROHL: If we got that done in a timely manner where people could actually comment in a couple weeks and add on and get it to her in a timely way, would everybody --

CAPT. McGOVERN: Just have Scott send it.

MR. ARMSTRONG: He just summarizes our recommendations, we don't need to comment on it.

MR. RAINEY: I guess I'm just taking
this up in strides. What I would propose then is
to work with Barbara and Steve and pull together, I
have a file I'm trying to manage personally, just
basically our past recommendations. There's been a
couple of transmittal letters to Admiral
Lautenbacher and just sort of pull the body of
recommendations and put a quick cover to that. To
that extent we could pass it back through our

- channels. Advise the administrator and slide that to them.
- MR. SKINNER: I'd be more than willing 4 to draft a cover letter.
- 5 MR. RAINEY: All right.
- 6 MS. BROHL: Absolutely.
- 7 MR. RAINEY: All right.
- 8 MS. BROHL: Thank you very much.
- 9 MR. RAINEY: Then is there any other new
- 10 | business?
- MR. WHITING: When are we going to talk
- 12 about what we're doing in Alaska?
- MR. RAINEY: Right now.
- 14 MR. WHITING: That comes under new
- 15 business. I would like to change our public
- 16 comment to noon instead of 4 o'clock and advertise
- 17 it as that. That's one thing that I think you can
- 18 do in your agenda, to somewhere around noon because
- 19 that would give the people that had the decency to
- 20 appear here and we could have time to answer that.
- Now, the one thing that I dislike about

the panel is the length of time it takes for the minutes to get out. I think that that could be speeded up just a little bit. Maybe I'm wrong but I recognize that there's a process that everybody has to go through to get them out, but it does take a while to get the summary out and if that could be speeded up I would like it more because I don't take the time to go through this thing until right after this meeting has taken place and just before this meeting has taken place. If it's in between that I'm not thinking about this. If we can speed up the end of this meeting and make it a little bit later on the start of the next meeting, the drafts that come out a little bit shorter than that, that's all right, but that's my personal feeling.

. 1

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Now, I have taken the liberty to invite representative Don Young to speak at the deal in Alaska. He may or may not be available, he's got other things that he's trying to schedule. Fishing is one of them, golf is one of them. This is supposed to be his vacation time and he's trying to

get back to his home in Fort Utah. So if we could establish with his, you know, something that says you are invited and possibly he would be available.

There's about three conflicts that I am aware of that he would schedule around and we do have two days and if he could come in at any time. So I think he is available and then he asked the question what about Rayfield and I said, in a mistake, he probably set me up for it, Don would do fine, you know, but actually I want Mr. Young to be

there. But if not, he would send Rayfield. Now,

where that fits in new business --

MR. RAINEY: Well, I appreciate that.

That sounds good. That's I think what I'd like to do here in our remaining time is to kind of sort of revisit with Jack and talk about this. I think we had a lot of ideas shared. But I'd like to have a sense of the panel to pick up on what Larry I said. I fully appreciate and I'm in the same boat in a lot of ways, that we're here at the meeting and then we're going back to whatever we're doing and

. 1 then we're trying to get ready for the meeting. So I'd like to have a sense that we feel with some 3 sense that -- I know we've tried for years to get up to Alaska, but I would like the panel's sense of 5 commitment that we feel that, with Jack's and Steve's help and Barbara and everybody involved, 7 pull together a substantive agenda in the next couple of months to take to Alaska so that if we do get Congressman Young, that we have some things to 10 put before him and don't go up there and end up 11 with a nothing further. So I'd like to talk 12 about -- we covered a lot of ideas, it does take 13 the secretary -- just by the volume of this and the 14 nature of the transcripts and going through the 15 different levels of approvals when everybody is 16 sort of all of the board, it takes some time. So. 17 But certainly I don't disagree with anything you 18 said, Larry, and we're working toward that and so 19 kind of maybe have a little bit of discussion here 20 before we adjourn to kind of talk about which 21 things we might want to pick up and how we might

```
want to go about wrapping this up, flushing out an
. 1
   agenda for Alaska that makes some sense, and we've
   got some deliverables identified that will be
   meaningful.
5
              CAPT. McGOVERN: Scott, maybe, and
   Captain, maybe you can tell us, is it time to have
7
   a budget review on the FY '08 budget submission in
8
   mid-August or are we not timed correctly?
9
              MR. DUNNIGAN: No.
              CAPT. McGOVERN: No, it's not the right
10
11
   time?
12
              MR. DUNNIGAN: Yeah, that's correct. At
   that time we will be in between the department and
13
14
   OMB and we're not allowed to talk about budgets at
15
   that point.
16
              CAPT. McGOVERN: We are allowed to
17
   participate.
18
             MR. DUNNIGAN: We'd have to close the
19
   meeting. We could do that. Okay.
20
              MS. BROHL: We did it before.
```

MR. RAINEY: As a threshold question,

21

. 1 though I don't know if Barbara's heard back from everybody, to align this with Larry's suggestion, I 3 know August 10th is a bad day, you said we had a couple of days. Is the window that had been 5 suggested, I don't know if people had a chance to get back to Barbara on that, I don't think anybody 7 has, I'm aware Admiral Larabee is going to have a 8 conflict again, I can't remember whether you could or not, Andrew, but how many people at this point 10 think they would be able to make that, the 14th and 11 15th? What do we have for a quorum, just an 12 initial thought? Okay. Okay.

MR. DUNNIGAN: You don't like to travel on the weekends? Is that convenient for you?

CAPT. McGOVERN: Yeah.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: I don't know if we had

Congressman Young. I know that we've had some

talks with the vice admiral and I'm trying to

coordinate NOS or NOAA's schedule to try to find

something that was a reason for him to be able to

be there and do something that coordinates with

other substance, but those are all the tricky scheduling issues when we're trying to align the plan it's very difficult, but it looks like we would have a quorum at this point.

. 1

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

As far as, Jack, moving ahead now and trying to wrap this up, from what you've seen here today, what would be the next steps that we could facilitate working with you to try to wrap up from this meeting and have something packaged for Alaska from your view? It seems to me what happens is there's a good amount of discussion and information that gets passed. The devil on details is to try to grab ahold of this package and get it to a point where the panel feels that they want to vote to say something. That has been sort of our challenge because anytime we leave a meeting, my experience has been from my perspective that when we leave a meeting with business on the table it's extremely difficult. We do have a website, we have set up multiple-party conference calls, and we have managed to pull that off, but it takes a tremendous effort on Barbara's part and others to sort of realign all these people again to try to get a final vote. It's a fairly short turnaround to August from our experience. So I'm just saying I would just kind of like to kick around some ideas how we think we're going to go forward to wrap this up and bring forth something that would have some substance in Alaska.

. 1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. DUNNIGAN: I'm not sure what to say. Clearly we've made some commitments to you for the recommendations that you've made at this point. I will be carrying those forwards, Scott will be, I think I'll ask you to come perhaps with me and we can talk to the vice admiral and make sure those things get delivered. We will owe you a report out on these and other recent recommendations that you made. We should have had one of those for this meeting, but that's the kind of thing we'd like to do. We will work to -- we have to look at the record when we get it and make sure where the loose ends are and see how many of those we can get tied

. 1 And we need to get ready for the next meeting up. by making sure we have a good addenda. We've made 3 a commitment to you to have a comprehensive discussion of HSIA. We'll see what kind of budget presentation we can put together and we will also see what we can bring to you in terms of background 7 on the coastal management process that we have underway. Those I know are things that we talked about for doing at that August meeting. And there 10 may be certainly some other things that may happen between now and then that we'll want to get on the 11 12 agenda too and work with the chairman to do that.

I think you've actually made some decisions and recommendations today that when we look at the record we'll pick those up and make sure we get those things moving forward. That's good.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RAINEY: I guess one of the issues

I'm trying to figure out is how formal -- we had a

lot of discussion but at what point is that the

voice of the panel? And is the panel's expectation

. 1 here that -- my sense from earlier discussions was 2 that somehow we would get back to NOAA with the 3 record and be able to assimilate all the comments that were made, my initial draft of things, there 5 were some proposed suggestions, and my sense was we would somehow get that back to the panel and 7 whereby at some point we could vote and say yes, that's the recommendation that we've got to vote on, the majority of the panel thinks that is what we want to do. Is that the panel's expectation? 10 11 It's that step where it gets very difficult because 12 a lot of things are said and I don't want us to 13 leave a meeting or go on to a next one where 14 everyone has four different views of what the panel 15 expressed. I think we have some general concepts 16 but it's tying up the loose ends where it's been so difficult to me. 17

MR. LAPINE: I think you've put two or three real good issue papers on the table and I don't think anybody in this room had more than a few minor, almost trivial edits to those. And so

18

19

20

21

if they could be turned around, a la what Larry
said, in a week or two, I think we would still be
in this mode of HSRP, we could look them all over,
we can have a final vote in Alaska. I don't care
if we vote by e-mail, but I think you did a heck of
a good job, Scott, pulling this stuff together. I
don't want to lose any inertia over it. So I say
if we can get them turned around real quick while
we're still thinking HSRP, we can really move
ahead.

MR. DUNNIGAN: I think that's sort of what I was getting at. I think you have had some good discussions on some issues today. There was a lot of consensus around the table. I would hope you would allow your chair to sort of articulate that consensus on your behalf and maybe give you, as Lou suggests, an e-mail opportunity to get it written down and sent out to you. If you have a problem with it you can say no, but otherwise you'll let the chairman have the discretion to articulate that, then it can get to me, we can take

it back in to NOAA and make it happen.

. 1

the FACA law I didn't think we were allowed to do an e-mail vote. I've been through that in others where even a phone thing has to be put out for, has to be published in the Federal Register and you have to have lines open for the public and all that stuff.

MR. DUNNIGAN: I haven't looked at the charter for this one. I'm not asking that you make any further decisions. I think you've made some decisions today. I think it's appropriate for you to let the chairman articulate what that is and if he gives you an opportunity to comment as to whether you think he's got it right, that's not the same as having a meeting and taking a vote.

CAPT. McGOVERN: I agree a hundred percent. Just another quickie before we go. On the August meeting, I'm all for going to Alaska because I think it's an important area. Number two, though, the issue, I mean we've been meeting

. 1 for a couple years now and this is the second August meeting and we're doing it because 3 Congressman Young, it's the break in the session. But if he doesn't show up, then it's like, you 5 know, the issue I have I see with July and August, we only meet maybe two or three times a year, July 7 and August are not good times for a lot of people and a lot of businesses, a lot of people on vacation. You're either on vacation or you're 9 10 covering for people that are on vacation in July and August. It's just if we could, if it has to be 11 12 done because we could meet with congressmen I don't have a problem with it, but otherwise I would try 13 to avoid July and August obviously. Number one, 14 15 it's hard to get rooms and everything else, probably logistically it's going to be a nightmare 16 17 for Barbara to get us places because that's the season up there. But there was a meeting last year 18 in August too, and I unfortunately didn't make that 19 because I was just too busy in my business in 20 August. But I'm going to try like hell to make 21

- 1 this one. But as a suggestion in the future, you
- 2 know, I'll be really I guess annoyed if the
- 3 congressman doesn't show up and he sends John
- 4 Rayfield, so we could meet really anytime,
- 5 anywhere. So it's just for thought for the future
- 6 that if we can do that I would appreciate it. I
- 7 think probably other people, everyone says they're
- 8 going to show up but -- bad time of year.
- 9 MR. RAINEY: I think that's a great
- 10 point. The other thing that you look at is the
- 11 frequency of our meeting. You know, we're required
- 12 to meet a couple times a year and we've been
- 13 exceeding that, so is the pace appropriate, are we
- 14 outpacing the substance, that's something to
- 15 consider as well. Jon, did you have something you
- 16 | wanted?
- 17 MR. DASLER: Just to comment, you made
- 18 the comment earlier how it was kind of a real
- 19 | bottleneck and I think Jack's comments, I think
- 20 some real decisions have been made and it has just
- 21 been some minor wordsmithing and I'm all for that

just being summarized and moved on. We get too

hung up with trying to pass things back and forth

and it becomes a bottleneck. I think that would

just add a lot more momentum to these meetings if

we could have a summary like that and just

summarize what the decisions were and what the

discussions were, because I think everybody is in

agreement and it's just minor details.

MR. RAINEY: I really appreciate that and I'll do my best. But I want to say it's not a trivial matter for me to go back after the fact and try to see if I've been able to call on everybody and get all this. I will need NOAA's support to make those minor technical corrections and improvements, but if we can do that I don't see why we don't move forward. I appreciate the panel's endorsement for that.

MR. SKINNER: Hopefully that's the last time we'll do this because we'll be getting the stuff beforehand as Adam said and commenting before the meeting so everything runs really smoothly.

. 1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Just to follow up on something that Larry mentioned about the public meeting, what about having it at the start of the session because we might have an opportunity where somebody feels very strongly about something we're talking about and it would be good to get that input beforehand, so if we have a two-day meeting, say public comment at 9 o'clock the first day and 11:30 the second day, that way we're not waiting until the end, and, two, we might get some input that really shapes our discussion.

MR. RAINEY: I absolutely agree and we have done in times past, I always watch the people that sign it and ask people if they want to speak, it's absolutely important to get the public input. I would rather not set in stone a particular time because the meeting agendas are a little bit more We may be out on hydro assets or take fluid. some -- so we've had some different scenarios and I can perceive the same thing happening, but certainly take for action that we should allow

ample and timely opportunity for the public to address us.

. 1

MR. SKINNER: Revise my comments from the start of the meeting to the middle of the meeting somewhere.

MR. DUNNIGAN: If you want to see the Marine Transportation System of Alaska we ought to meet aboard a cruise ship in Southeast.

MR. RAINEY: That's actually been, a serious offer has been made by Captain Titus, but we have to figure out the Jones Act international voyage issues and also the public access issues, so if you can help us on we're on board.

MR. ZILKOWSKI: I wear a couple of hats, IOOS, I've been able to get within the IOOS stuff, but the National Geodetic Survey itself also has programs that needs to be looked at. So if you meet in Alaska, I would like to get on the agenda at least to give a briefing that I was supposed to give in Houston but we got derailed because of time and so forth, what you were doing. So that's

another issue. You mentioned V-Datum and you
mentioned Height Modernization, HTKG you mentioned
several times today already so I'm not sure just
how much the group knows about John C and where
we're going, so that would be something I'd like to
do.

MS. DICKINSON: Thinking about agenda items, looking ahead, one thing I'd like to hear more about that we haven't gotten back to in a while is the National Hydrographic Survey Plan. I don't know if it's being updated. I know we looked at the last plan, but it was several years ago and I don't think we really focused on that very much at all in any of our recent meetings, so I would love to here more about that.

MR. RAINEY: I'd think that would be a natural thing to bring in in the context of Alaska because so much of the backlog and charting and shoreline issues reside there, so I think that would be a headliner for sure. I've gotten quite a bit of push-back from the members that we're

. 1 killing you with presentations and I get that. we want to balance it appropriately to suit 2 everybody and if the members have kind of agenda 3 items or issues or things they want to put forward, 5 please do. And then we can help try to staff that out and work with you and split up the lead and workload and all, but if we want to hear from the 7 public, we want to respond to NOAA's request for advice, and certainly want to be able to generate things from our perspectives as well. Are there 10 any other comments? Okay. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Well, are there any additional public comments? Well, I'd like to thank everybody for today, especially Jack and Steve, and welcome aboard as everyone said. I really appreciate the commitment to me and the support. I know we can build on what we've done and I just think it was a good, productive meeting and we'll wrap this up and then look forward to another good meeting in Alaska. Is there any other, anything else to say or do we have a motion to adjourn?

1 STATE OF MARYLAND

COUNTY OF BALTIMORE

I, Richard D. Baker, Jr., a Notary

Public in and for the State of Maryland, County of

Baltimore, do hereby certify that the aforegoing is

a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings

indicated.

Richard D Baker @

Richard D. Baker, Jr., Notary Public

246:12 252:16 335:6 350:12,15 287:16 absorb 79:2 act 2:12 6:14 10:1 261:9,13 353:12 AA 268:6 286:7 absorbing 228:19 12:3 93:19 157:17 additionally 96:3 AAs 267:20 286:9 academic 26:5 248:1 159:11,17 160:7,12 address 3:7,10 83:7 abide 278:5 248:7 160:13,21 168:8,10 144:1 149:19 158:8 ability 12:3,20 94:8 academy 39:12 46:5 176:1 216:15 243:7 158:12 165:16 94:12,12 126:6 244:9 243:11 250:17 175:18 176:15 130:18 198:19 accelerate 199:3 252:5 258:5,6,18 205:16 321:21 205:4 214:2 223:8 acceleration 196:16 259:5,17 267:14 351:2 227:16 199:2 323:20 351:11 addresses 215:3 able 3:20 8:7,8,10 9:4 accept 156:14 227:7 action 26:15 65:1 221:3 14:17 15:7,8 19:21 93:11 114:6 127:11 addressing 131:21 acceptable 101:18 20:11 23:19,20 25:6 128:4 160:5 183:4 137:2 188:20 accepted 178:10 25:8 26:6 28:13,13 accepting 314:10 195:11 239:13 235:11,12 29:2,17 31:4,11 access 274:14,15 258:3,9,10,11 adequate 130:12 33:8,15 35:8 36:6,6 331:9,9,13,19 259:12 265:1 adequately 105:7 44:13 45:9 46:4 351:12 350:21 adhere 176:6 49:12 54:20 55:3,17 accident 38:16,20 active 7:6 115:1 adjourn 95:11 72:17 74:14 76:18 175:17 177:14 115:8 185:6 287:18 316:1 77:10 80:10,12 311:13 338:20 accidents 198:16 actively 115:4 121:11 83:12 87:19,20 accomplish 24:21 121:12 265:8 353:21 88:17,18,21 89:5,20 199:16 202:17 activities 56:5 197:16 adjust 276:12 91:19 101:21 103:9 246:7 actual 81:13 82:16 administering 153:4 112:14 149:12,16 administration 12:1 accountable 309:8 220:1 227:8 243:6 158:3 173:5 178:16 12:6,12,19 73:17 248:11 259:12 accounting 113:3,3 180:19 181:20 accreditation 293:4 283:9 298:8 307:10 158:2 167:21 183:16 205:3 168:19 234:7 294:3 310:5 232:15 273:2 Adam 48:1 97:10 235:13 239:16 accumulated 39:18 274:14 275:15 241:8 256:14 accumulating 263:21 119:13 120:7 131:7 277:7 278:15 accuracy 83:3,19 136:3 185:19 administration's 282:20 284:3 285:3 349:20 12:14 84:2 286:12 291:9 294:1 accurate 40:15 82:19 add 103:6 149:19 administrative 2:2 294:13 309:20 83:4 145:4 195:18 153:12 154:12 95:19 149:10 153:3 312:12 315:20 administratively 214:18 234:12,13 185:18 190:17 323:16 325:18,20 96:8 283:15 355:6 206:18 215:21 329:10,12 340:10 accurately 145:11 219:14,16 234:20 administrator 2:7 340:20 344:3 5:21 6:2 7:1 86:10 achieve 180:19 298:16 329:19 349:12 351:15 334:7 349:4 90:9 94:15 117:3 246:15,16 251:4 353:9 achieved 172:2 added 81:15,17 151:6 153:10 154:13 aboard 49:17 57:16 achieving 6:10 153:16 164:6 165:3 166:8 171:7,15 78:8 81:12 351:8 acknowledge 4:18 166:3 174:17 172:9,16 314:3 353:15 90:15 138:1 142:10 220:18 328:21 335:1 above-entitled 1:9 159:18 166:4 addenda 343:2 administrators 66:15 absolute 15:6 237:5 admiral 2:3 3:13 4:8 acknowledgement adding 163:12 164:1 absolutely 12:4 22:3 143:1 147:1 addition 48:2 93:4 35:11 55:2,14 58:14 23:10 26:19 34:4 acoustic 253:1,2 170:3 261:21 63:6 64:16 66:13 42:7,13 80:7 91:15 70:10 78:15 93:15 acquisition 37:15 263:14 116:5,12 122:17 additional 109:5 93:17 100:5 134:5 acronym 278:10 140:3 173:17 216:1 159:10 160:9 acronyms 104:7 110:6 114:10 164:6

167:16 173:7,13 aforegoing 355:5 58:14 144:18 222:1 335:12 336:18 178:11 179:20 afresh 133:13 324:2,12 352:12 338:4,8 339:2 341:9 184:18 233:9,20 agree 29:8 46:21 342:8 345:4 346:19 afternoon 4:12,16 248:1 260:11 262:6 42:10 50:4 51:14 76:20 88:11 89:2 351:7,18 352:17 84:13 95:2,9 176:17 262:13 284:9 94:19 116:5,12 353:20 alcohol 19:1 286:10,11 297:17 177:2 117:12 118:8 319:16 321:9 122:18 127:8 algablooms 21:9 afternoon's 177:7 align 340:2 341:2 323:15 334:18 agencies 15:10,17 132:16 155:14 aligned 16:12 55:16 340:7,18 342:14 44:5 77:13,14 158:19 177:20 admiral's 159:13 105:10 108:18 179:3 207:9 209:2 67:13 169:11 120:14 121:8 210:17 213:19 alignment 17:18 admits 79:16 144:21 145:9 218:15 224:13,21 Alliance 24:1 262:21 admitted 57:18 182:14 183:6,9 228:13 230:3 allocated 74:9 adopt 224:4,12 187:15 188:17 330:13 332:4 allocation 76:10 adopted 133:21 190:21 194:20 346:17 350:12 allow 292:6 325:18 197:16,20 210:6 345:15 350:21 258:2 agreed 17:1 29:8 adults 8:17 214:7 217:2,12 265:21 280:3 allowed 146:17 advance 238:14 220:14,15 241:8,21 322:16 169:20 236:10 274:2 315:2 251:5 265:8,16 339:14,16 346:2,3 agreement 103:1 advancements 85:18 266:1 269:8 279:9 206:7 349:8 allows 31:5 232:14 287:5,10,12,17,21 agrees 98:8 275:5 ally 326:2,3 advancing 32:1 alongside 192:21 advantage 114:5 290:6 292:16 294:8 Agricultural 143:19 adverse 64:5 294:14 295:4 ahead 4:7 15:20 18:4 193:10 22:4 31:19 68:15 **ALPHA 248:4** advertise 335:16 306:21 333:21 78:4 95:11 103:13 alphabetical 316:21 advice 27:14 29:4 agency 6:17 7:20 alternative 291:13 89:4 117:19 169:21 8:21 9:11 14:8,14 134:8 168:11 176:3 171:5 178:16 314:5 14:15 15:12 20:19 176:6,17 204:17 305:16 alternatives 89:17 21:18 59:11 60:2 206:8 229:2,7,13,20 353:9 advise 5:16 91:1 237:15 238:2,4 157:20 298:7 79:8 84:4,18 85:1 260:9 308:20 115:18 182:13 112:14 147:16 ambiguity 220:13 314:2 335:1 166:12 190:19 310:17 312:17 341:5 345:10 352:8 amendments 162:7,7 advises 5:13 218:17,19 239:5,6 166:4 167:2 172:20 advising 182:15 246:18 302:1 ahold 110:10 115:19 215:17,17 252:4 advisor 140:21 313:14 341:13 aids 75:6,10 195:16 America 23:6 29:12 184:17 agency's 110:7 advisors 111:7 114:11 196:8 72:14 American 27:7 97:12 aimed 6:10 advisory 1:4 11:10,12 agenda 5:19 27:12 ain't 53:14 Americans 239:1 31:2 89:8 148:5 12:4,21 28:1,11 40:3 86:4,7 88:14 160:6 177:7 179:13 air 33:19 72:20 175:9 America's 26:18 278:9,12 amount 72:18 108:2 102:1 176:1 183:21 185:9,17 204:16 138:13 153:2 184:1 312:19 335:18 airplane 277:5 advocate 160:10 338:7 339:2 343:12 airplanes 72:19 246:20 298:10 351:18 352:7 353:3 Alabama 194:5 341:11 262:6 Alan 109:12 116:2 amounts 19:1 advocating 238:18 agendas 92:15 Aeronautics 257:13 350:17 124:1 ample 351:1 alarming 256:12 analog 183:19 affairs 2:15 4:11 6:7 agent 143:20 144:5 Alaska 22:8 130:9 analysis 266:5,17 61:12,14 176:10 agents 121:9 143:17 268:18 280:21 237:10 241:3 170:10 171:1 265:2 311:10 affect 66:6 180:6 ago 11:18 40:13 57:5 312:20 324:18 288:2

anchor 146:3 anyway 116:11 246:12 346:12 143:16 144:13 anchorage 38:18 117:12 130:14 348:13 157:6 159:5 161:1 anchorages 191:21 148:12 168:11 appropriated 200:17 164:9 186:7,8 192:7 171:19 204:14 appropriately 206:3 187:17 190:5 anchors 221:8,15 265:15 353:2 332:21 aren't 29:2 81:21 222:8 anyways 52:7 285:18 appropriates 168:11 **Andrew** 75:20 82:10 82:5 254:19 325:1 apace 200:12 appropriation 231:9 115:10 138:13 apart 233:14 arguably 190:5,15 340:9 **API** 124:18 138:5 appropriations 64:17 argue 45:12 64:19 160:8 168:7 **Andrews** 329:17 apologize 175:7 Armed 249:14 Andy 7:13 48:15 49:6 264:16 203:21 204:11 ARMSTRONG 235:16,17 236:21 49:11 64:8 117:18 appear 72:6 335:20 125:13 150:6 224:3 127:8 128:16 appears 113:5 243:2 245:16 226:13 252:6 253:5 136:15,16 144:16 appendices 111:17 247:17 255:4,5 299:4 300:9 328:2 174:13 178:3 179:3 appendix 116:19 appropriators 236:6 328:16 334:11 117:2 321:4 armstronged 117:19 192:2 212:14 247:14 approval 148:4 151:8 Andy's 177:19 application 301:18 Army 38:10 75:16 302:21 176:18 320:6 334:4 76:5,11 214:13 **angles** 136:8 animal 141:12 146:9 applications 214:11 approvals 338:15 arrive 11:2 146:10 232:11 276:18 approve 123:4 arrives 67:21 animals 263:21 174:10 229:4 arriving 12:1 302:7,10 303:6 applies 147:9 236:16 246:20 310:21 articulate 345:15,21 annex 116:18 annoyed 348:2 appointments 236:11 311:19,21 322:18 346:13 articulated 43:13 annual 6:11 115:11 appreciate 3:16 4:4 approved 197:2 208:8 309:3,3,15 artificial 194:1,7 290:14,21 291:10 30:17 48:21 49:19 313:7 92:3 94:21 95:15 333:14 219:13 **April** 244:4 ARVA 208:12 anomaly 189:19 148:12 176:2 answer 30:7 73:3 199:11 215:13 **Ashley 204:21** aqua 183:4 75:7 116:10 132:12 aquarium 239:3 aside 90:20 129:17 226:16 241:9 151:18 164:18 261:14 264:4 aguariums 239:3 172:9 329:20 330:7 architect 278:15 asked 41:5,9 44:14 169:21 267:18,21 76:1 112:5 118:2 337:13,19 348:6 architecture 57:1 268:7,8 283:16 278:6 152:5 153:1 176:13 289:15 290:7 349:9,16 353:15 185:4 199:7,9 201:5 299:20 324:5 appreciated 63:16 arctic 248:4 area 25:1,12 26:16 212:14 261:16 335:20 91:19 108:4 203:2 answered 65:12 appreciates 78:10 27:5 54:6 56:18 281:13 283:17 85:16 88:8 110:17 320:16 329:6 337:7 answering 266:8 264:19 asking 150:21 152:16 answers 30:2 appreciation 241:7 120:20 139:8,19 anticipated 204:6 241:10 146:15 189:1 154:11 156:4 185:4 approach 6:20 134:1 190:12 277:7 302:8 212:5,17,20 213:6 anxious 30:18 anybody 26:14 75:17 302:8 318:20 346:20 261:10 262:3,5,16 79:15 119:4 131:4 approached 51:12 areas 14:1 15:5,6 293:8 309:19 346:10 22:13 24:2 25:7 154:2 182:9 201:3 approaches 192:1,8 26:3,9 33:21 41:15 asks 263:2 229:6 245:11 287:9 192:21 340:6 344:20 appropriate 110:13 41:16 44:12 45:8,19 aspect 73:9 136:16 144:6,9 209:15 134:15 166:10,13 65:7 67:6,7 76:4 anymore 44:19 94:16 106:21 261:15 166:13 170:8,10 169:21 301:3,11 aspects 107:5 135:11 anytime 341:16 171:2 175:2 187:1 107:15 118:21 162:7 163:1 205:18 189:16 232:20 348:4 122:2 129:10,16

215:8 299:2 attend 3:17,20 31:11 239:8 272:5 295:16 assemble 115:11 101:21 awasting 166:9 background 9:14 awful 99:17 109:6 assembly 274:10 attendance 96:4,13 15:13 121:20 134:2 attended 95:21 244:3 279:12 280:13 ave 175:4,5 219:9 314:14 attendees 3:5 307:15 a.m 1:11 95:17 318:21 343:6 attention 32:11 41:21 A16214:3 assert 142:11 backlog 149:20 assess 106:15 204:5 83:11 128:19 196:16 198:11 B 206:20 157:12 169:12 210:21 352:18 back 11:17 23:3 28:6 assessment 14:3 173:12 181:8 238:6 bad 8:6 10:2 31:4 29:17 34:5 39:19 106:19 110:12 108:19 155:18 238:8 46:1 53:19 57:12 128:7 130:18 204:8 August 57:2 157:16 167:5,6 234:16 72:3 77:5 79:21 162:11,17 168:15 340:3 348:8 204:10 207:15 82:10 83:7 88:4 Baker 1:21 4:18 211:7 265:2 288:8 318:13 90:14,17 108:20 asset 16:14 53:6 318:13,16 321:2 355:3.10 110:21 112:3,6 88:15 balance 74:4 80:20 329:9 330:8,13 113:18 115:21 assets 19:21 108:14 197:19 198:2,19 340:3 342:4 343:9 123:3 124:16,18 350:18 346:19 347:2,5,7,11 353:2 125:19 127:6,9 assimilate 344:3 347:14,19,21 balanced 73:19 198:8 128:21 129:1,2 assist 65:20 136:10 austere 5:15 balancing 197:11 134:4,21 137:1 241:11 ball 132:14 222:20 authorities 113:9 143:2,21 144:2 assistance 86:17 88:6 authority 117:4 balliwick 218:16 150:9,10 151:3,5,15 89:1 146:8 147:6,10 Baltimore 355:1,5 151:21 156:12 assistant 5:21 6:2 7:1 193:2 194:1 banners 314:21 158:19 162:20 58:15 authorization 165:14 Bar 7:7.8 163:2,18 167:15,16 168:6,8 169:17 Barbara 86:10 96:1,5 associated 6:6 12:8 174:2 176:5 177:5 18:21 22:12 24:18 216:18 259:15 96:12 97:20 101:21 177:12 178:1 199:6 200:19 203:8 39:8 48:5 authorizations 181:17 184:15 205:2 226:10 227:1 association 7:7.8 155:11 191:13 194:14 293:5 304:10 authorized 167:3 334:15 338:6 340:6 198:12,21 203:17 associations 269:10 168:5 169:17 347:17 213:1 216:14 220:9 Barbara's 340:1 287:2 293:2,3 authorizing 244:18 222:21 223:2 227:5 245:1,15 262:16 342:1 306:12 307:1 309:1 227:20 234:5 309:2,6 automated 85:13 barges 192:14 235:13 236:21 Barnum 2:4,5 5:8 Asst 2:7 automatically 144:13 237:19 251:13 available 16:4 38:5 43:2 71:4 73:12 assuming 328:9 279:17 280:3,18 assurance 275:4 41:1 98:4 125:9 144:16 153:21 282:17 284:2,5 178:7 185:21 280:2 177:11 272:18 300:18 302:6,9 336:18 337:3,7 210:15 231:8 232:8 **ATHOS** 38:13 75:15 303:1 307:7,17 avenue 1:13 215:5 234:4 298:16 75:20 82:8 143:3 309:1 310:19 313:6 317:17 318:14 146:20 189:8 242:12 316:9 323:12 326:1 aviation 71:10,20 base 260:14 262:10 Atlantic 9:12 10:10 334:21 337:1,21 298:9 305:10 72:16 11:4,16 340:1,6 344:2,6 avoid 12:13 323:18 based 129:3 144:4 Atmospheric 54:14 346:1 349:2,11 attack 203:18 347:14 204:7 208:4 213:8 352:9 attempt 120:2 199:3 awaiting 258:3 271:20 298:12 backbone 32:7 195:8 302:19 303:13 203:10 204:15 aware 94:1 113:1 218:20 219:4,6,7,10 177:2 214:2 337:4 baseline 261:19 209:9 220:3,5,8,14,19 304:9 322:8 327:9 attempted 211:17 340:7 261:20 271:21 awareness 238:19 328:17,19 240:19

bases 332:18 bells 175:11 56:15 58:19,19 336:3,12,14 338:19 basic 10:6 68:16 89:6 benefit 35:8 92:21 138:2 161:7 183:15 350:17 352:21 107:1 189:20 248:9 262:1 310:1,4 233:10 black 170:17 249:7,9 323:8 benefits 24:14 310:2 biggest 9:10 109:8 blame 38:16 basically 30:10 53:17 310:5 179:6 223:5 246:7 blank 112:6 57:18 58:4 60:10 berths 192:1 300:13 **blapped** 231:12 67:6,20 78:16 84:15 best 13:8 18:16 27:14 **bill** 12:7,9,14 19:10 blood 330:10 89:4 92:11 116:20 28:2 29:3 55:6 68:4 19:12 36:10 43:11 blow 254:16 138:21 155:9 165:5 68:6 90:4 133:13,19 58:17 77:4 82:2 board 1:1 50:14 166:3 177:1 194:4 161:18 191:14 114:1 118:7 140:4 154:8 156:7,7 157:1 208:4,6,9,17 209:7 203:1 209:12 223:4 143:2 147:18 158:3 181:5 228:21 229:3 213:9 219:10 272:4 223:17 244:17 161:5,8 162:2 236:1 242:11 280:2 285:2 286:19 281:9 349:10 166:15 173:4 177:2 320:12 323:3 301:10 306:5,9 better 23:11 24:21 195:4,20 240:8,15 330:11 338:16 307:2 314:16 29:20 53:8 59:1 243:11,15,19 255:6 351:13 334:17 60:15 62:8 63:3 258:21 259:1,6,9,10 Board's 313:15 basis 6:11 29:18 66:5 64:3.13 65:12 80:6 259:11,12,15,16,17 boat 18:10,11,16,19 68:1 80:17 86:9 81:8 85:6 136:18 **billion** 51:16 127:19 19:6,7,10,11,12,14 120:20 189:11 137:9 151:1 165:10 247:10 256:9,13 19:15 75:2 124:4,17 bathymetry 129:3 179:16 180:14 262:8,14,17 263:2,3 260:3,4 319:1 battle 223:5 245:18 192:17 197:8 296:16 307:6 337:19 247:1 254:3 219:20 230:21 **billions** 39:18 74:2 boater 47:3 Bay 18:13 47:4 83:14 231:2 234:2 251:4 bills 245:2 255:4 boating 18:13,19 beam 38:3,19 76:8 251:20 254:7 Bill's 141:8 19:2 78:12 273:8 82:21 145:19 233:5 261:16 266:19 bins 23:15 331:4 bear 38:15 117:11 270:4 273:5,13,17 biological 280:14 boats 18:9,20 124:3 135:13 152:12 273:21 274:3 278:2 bit 4:13 5:1 7:16,16 125:6 bearing 316:14 283:1,15,21 284:7 7:19 8:1 13:4 24:13 Bob 66:16,16 beating 170:1 288:18 291:14 33:2 36:20 43:18 **bodies** 15:16 beautiful 3:15 296:20 301:18 44:15 51:13 65:11 body 35:20 116:14 becoming 164:4 305:16 313:12 67:2 68:21 82:2 184:13 185:9 began 14:14,19 18:17 327:10 93:16,21 98:2 334:19 165:11 beyond 16:1 46:7 103:16 111:10 **bogged** 205:19 begging 37:21 48:2 69:8,9 117:8 112:17 128:9 **boiling** 105:14 beginning 6:7 24:14 138:4 152:4 205:4 132:15 133:4 **bold** 165:3 166:2 79:7 81:4 316:17 212:7 221:20 138:15 140:9 Boledovich 93:10 begins 212:6 313:10 314:7 331:7 141:12 144:10 bolster 250:8 begs 116:13 big 19:6 46:2 48:8 152:15 156:10 **bolts** 83:6 **begun** 49:9 54:2 58:13,18 59:19 159:14 177:21 **bones** 135:10 behalf 42:8 63:21 69:10,19 70:5 76:16 182:1 183:3 184:8 booby 276:8 345:16 78:14 82:6 99:13 226:6 233:9 240:13 border 201:12 believe 17:3,8 28:2 113:16,16 124:9 240:15 249:11 born 185:13 101:4 102:13,19 137:19 141:1 borne 109:10 112:3 257:20 264:14 149:12 155:12 148:18 153:18 269:21 273:4,20 **bosses** 268:8 158:4 166:6 177:10 185:15,19 188:4 274:5 275:3 280:1 **Boston** 302:8 230:11 236:2 196:12 233:18 283:11 284:15 bottleneck 348:19 279:13,16 293:4 264:5 292:21 293:4 297:11 310:7 311:7 349:3 311:17 319:12 320:9 313:9 314:14 320:4 bottom 38:4 60:21 believes 250:5 321:18 bigger 47:6 50:15 322:20 329:13 146:3 189:8,21

190:16 191:19 269:1 277:20 278:2 163:21 164:1,3,3,7 bureaucrats 45:16 202:2 221:4 222:6 281:8 284:12 200:16 212:19 bus 164:10 **bush** 170:2 257:6 285:17 286:18 288:17 233:12,13,17 234:1 business 2:19 13:14 bought 287:17 brings 105:20 142:10 242:15,18,18 bounce 222:20 226:20 277:19 247:10 248:14 54:1 62:3 63:11 broad 6:3 38:3,19 66:18 80:15 176:17 bounds 84:4,9 254:3,8,11,14,17 Bowen 58:14 49:7 76:8 159:1 255:1,11 293:10 176:20 181:19 bowl 37:21 247:6 320:7 325:1 295:20 301:20 205:6 271:2,6 box 69:6,12,16 183:4 326:15 306:16 317:20 293:12,14,15,18 316:6 broaden 195:15 339:7,7 343:4 294:1 297:18 309:3 breadth 24:12 broader 22:18 budgeting 70:14 309:11,16 311:1,3 break 3:9 92:2 95:9 137:20 332:1 **budgets** 246:10 312:4,11 323:20 95:11 103:10 **broadly** 25:6 182:19 254:20 255:12 324:7 335:10,15 117:19 237:17,18 brochure 205:9 339:14 337:12 341:18 268:17 310:18,20 Brohl 2:13 65:10 build 25:6 58:19 347:20 319:13 347:3 68:20 73:4 86:2 66:20 202:6,7 217:7 businesses 78:18 breakdown 241:14 90:7 121:2 128:18 233:21 264:21 347:8 257:3 132:2 136:9 137:5 Business/New 2:19 275:8 276:16 277:1 breaking 262:9 142:4,15 148:16 292:11,14 294:3 busy 92:11,13 156:19 breaks 310:16 150:8,13 153:8 296:17 304:6,13 180:8 203:10 333:6 **Bridge** 33:18 154:5,7,11 156:2 347:20 306:19 310:4,7,8,11 bridging 70:9 160:20 162:5,18 353:17 butt 60:19 brief 31:10 61:8 78:8 164:8 168:5 169:14 building 26:4 51:7 **button** 251:8 238:1 311:15 316:4 170:1,15 172:3 144:14 274:3 buy 19:6 307:20 320:6 330:2 174:1,5,8,13,19 286:17,18 292:12 C briefed 55:14 175:6 177:8 185:18 292:13 C3:1 352:4 **briefing** 91:18 92:4 186:15 205:13 built 33:12 249:2 cabin 124:5 100:6 148:8 159:11 206:13 213:11 276:6 cabinet 40:5 46:15 178:11 184:16 215:2 225:7 226:16 bullet 149:15,19 74:12 183:6,14 229:19 235:15 234:20 260:10 152:14 154:1,5 calculated 84:8 236:20 237:3 261:13 262:20 207:12 215:3 calender 92:11 286:10 351:19 304:8 305:19 306:7 bullets 141:18 142:21 California 7:6 8:19 briefings 4:8 242:1 307:5 308:11,19,21 150:3,17 153:9 252:19,20 253:1 243:2 247:14,16 317:8,10,16 318:4 156:20 162:20 302:12 324:18 286:6 318:18 319:12 163:3 181:11 call 67:5 69:17 73:11 **briefly** 143:17 328:14,19 329:19 228:12 102:16 117:16 bring 20:13 21:5 332:2,20 334:5 bumper 72:8 132:5 138:2,19,20 23:17 24:8 37:5 335:6,8 339:20 bunch 17:3 89:10 139:14 151:2 40:7 73:12 85:19 broke 271:14 324:8 163:14 175:3 Bunn 124:1 89:20 117:11 **broken** 266:2 202:14 237:2 132:18 173:11 brought 25:3 135:12 buoy 48:15 279:12 240:20 252:21 185:9 191:1 196:21 143:21 146:21 303:13 278:9,10 279:12 218:18 226:19 217:20 buoys 75:3 187:18 282:11 286:9 264:5 282:12 bud 211:2 278:17,18,21 289:16 292:7 289:12 306:18 budget 43:4 44:5,6 302:12,20 304:4 294:11 297:5 306:2 342:7 343:6 352:17 44:11,12 45:5,19 buoy-to-buoy 75:8 333:7 349:12 **bringing** 11:19 23:7 58:11 60:15,16 **burden** 153:3 called 9:20 11:11 23:11 54:1 190:13 67:21 70:12,14,16 bureaucracy 239:21 38:20 39:12 40:2 193:12 268:19 80:4 81:18 113:12 279:7

certified 293:8 cases 109:15 131:1 242:6 265:13 73:12 131:8,14 certify 355:5 193:21 272:15 306:3 138:16 141:8 cetera 197:4 214:15 cast 142:12 144:16 146:13 calling 220:14 313:4 217:14 153:21 154:6 catchup 164:2 calls 136:21 139:19 caucus 247:15 251:17 chain 108:1 224:2 319:21 341:20 182:17 186:14 chair 2:2,13 3:3 92:2 207:19 208:2 251:18 Campbell 48:12 caught 201:3 319:15 267:1 311:17 campus 92:13 209:18 210:15 333:16 345:15 canals 52:10 53:3 218:13 224:13 caused 38:16 115:7 chairman 1:14 90:13 can't 8:6 17:2,8 26:3 228:11 230:7 231:6 causing 38:21 caution 159:13 343:12 345:20 35:15 51:3 58:11 231:8 232:6,8,18 234:4 298:16 59:4 60:5 64:3 65:2 caveat 135:3 153:15 346:13 164:6 chairperson 87:14 72:1 79:12,12 80:11 315:11 317:7,17 81:6 87:17 94:2 318:14 329:3 **ceiling** 70:3,4 challenge 67:11 110:1 140:21 161:8 330:12 332:16 celebrate 179:7 73:21 92:14 145:2 169:6 206:19 334:9 339:5,10,16 cemented 116:8 179:12 180:2 222:18 223:11,21 208:11 209:4 212:7 center 22:6 99:19 340:15 346:2,17 223:2 233:13 354:1 100:21 107:4,11 227:11 245:21 captain 2:4,5 3:17 109:21 125:21 341:15 234:10 271:4 274:20 276:18 4:1 5:7 185:21 192:13 274:10 challenged 110:20 287:3 321:2,21 192:3 193:7,8,13 279:12,13 285:5,6,9 323:4,6 333:13 340:8 194:2 235:18 339:6 303:8 307:15 **challenges** 7:17 196:3 central 199:14 champion 250:4 cap 324:19 351:10 capabilities 95:4 capture 22:10 145:11 **CEO** 2:3 **chance** 31:10 60:15 222:19 96:20,21 97:14 98:9 ceremony 3:18 60:17 84:12 95:1 99:11,14 102:10 cards 113:10 certain 69:8 84:9 99:5 103:8,18 132:6 care 96:7 129:18 111:17 113:8 149:4 150:18 105:1,10,13 106:3 106:16,20 107:9 132:18 172:15 165:16 166:18 151:10 156:9 214:6 215:15 279:4 168:18 258:16 115:2 122:20 123:9 345:4 123:16 125:7 career 6:6 8:2,21 280:6 291:17 295:11 126:13 131:17 11:6,9 certainly 9:21 10:7 340:5 careful 197:8 chances 63:6 277:17 132:1 135:18 19:10 32:11 37:1 145:11 190:1 191:4 cargo 221:15 222:8 44:10 45:4 46:7,13 change 18:3,8 19:20 206:20 313:10 Carolina 263:19 54:7,20 55:6 71:5 23:5,6 165:12 179:21 182:19 capability 18:2 37:16 carriage 199:5 200:2 71:21 73:13,20 83:9 51:5,7 88:19,19 200:4 201:16 87:4,10 89:2 91:5 218:14 222:5 225:2 105:17 123:19 202:20 204:7 115:21 120:16 225:13 226:6 130:3 142:13 204:5 carried 54:14 123:5 147:15,20 248:12 271:2,6 capable 178:20 carrier 194:6 148:4 155:14,16 285:2,8 289:7 carry 55:11 68:13 160:7,10 176:1 297:16 335:15 capacity 18:1 49:3 187:7 201:17 changed 196:6 61:19,21 88:18,21 69:17 131:15 capacity-building 167:15,16 169:2 211:20 215:20 275:21 285:15 173:6 200:10 215:1 232:8,12 264:4 **changes** 17:16 149:17 296:10 capitalize 180:2 222:11 253:12 295:17 298:17,18 151:12 152:8 165:7 Capitol 28:21 34:9 carrying 63:3 221:12 298:21 319:6 174:11,20 227:5 44:4,13 45:16 53:21 342:12 326:16 338:17 328:3,12 case 35:7 146:20 changing 76:10 64:12 157:12 343:10 350:21 231:17 239:10 205:20 216:17 353:9 **channel** 38:17 41:13 47:6 58:21 76:6 232:1 273:15 certificates 191:9 258:13 CAPT 57:15 71:4 297:20 301:7 certification 293:3 120:15 142:1 143:4

closed 236:4 321:16,17,20 322:9 143:5 145:20,20 chemical 280:14 146:11 190:7 closely 24:15,16 322:12 323:1,6,9,10 Chesapeake 18:13 47:4 82:11,16 83:14 61:19 79:8 241:16 323:19 324:9 192:11 196:5,6 221:9 chew 134:17 260:20,21 261:12 325:10,11,15 326:6 chicken 33:1 **channels** 38:10 75:18 closer 283:11 302:2 326:14 327:13,14 chief 11:15 100:12 328:9 331:5 333:4 76:3,9 97:15 104:1 closing 311:7 child 58:5 club 256:10 333:18 334:1 343:7 136:7,7 140:20 children 8:13 53:11 clued 263:15 145:14 146:7 147:6 coasts 21:6 324:4 choices 36:8 CMTS 2:10 26:21 325:4 331:10,19 189:10 190:3 191:21 192:7 194:9 Chris 42:10 145:2,7 148:11 codified 159:15 335:1 chunk 109:8 171:13 182:7,11,13 coin 136:1 chaos 119:5 circular 214:3 182:19 184:2,18 coincide 209:5 **Chapel** 205:1 circulars 214:7 185:16 186:1,2 coincidentally 321:9 characterization circulated 97:18 98:6 187:9 188:3,9,10 collaborate 216:10 137:15,17 176:19 224:7 189:7 191:19 collaborating 308:3 characterize 296:5,7 circulating 98:2 192:19 196:15 collaboration 9:15 296:10 circumstance 119:9 197:1,14 199:2,12 11:8 15:19 77:9 characterized 181:14 circumstances 94:5 203:6 204:16 136:8 173:14 characterizing 118:6 149:14 205:16 206:4 207:4 collaborative 2:7 109:13 cite 316:9 209:2 210:19 135:5 charge 152:20,21 clarification 174:16 213:17,17 214:10 collaboratively 9:19 251:9 210:9 214:20 215:4 222:5 34:14 **Charles** 97:11 119:20 clarify 110:7 114:11 CMTS-specific 207:8 collapse 296:20 chart 50:18 194:3 216:16 217:5 coalition 50:5 242:6 collect 269:18 196:10 198:1,14 220:16 242:19 245:8,12 collected 263:18 200:15 202:8 class 16:16,19 248:13 247:4,6,6,11 249:13 collecting 279:20 210:10 230:11,12 classified 104:14 253:11 256:10 288:6 230:17,18 231:3 clean 59:14 226:11 260:19 collection 78:17 232:7,7 233:4 cleaning 149:6 coast 5:12 8:15 14:9 186:10 234:17 244:9 **cleanup** 115:20 15:11 38:12 61:20 collective 180:13 charter 164:1 346:10 149:10 191:10 collisions 41:11 75:10 77:11 79:8 chartered 93:19 clear 38:15 104:19 81:14 97:4,6 115:20 color 301:13 **charting** 39:13 43:5 110:3 122:3 142:8 119:6 120:13 Columbia 7:7 221:8 58:12 59:7 85:12 215:15 289:4 329:1 121:11,12 123:14 combined 255:12 86:1 93:10 198:2,10 clearance 189:14 140:10,19 163:19 combines 259:10 204:21 208:18,19 190:8 186:12 187:17 come 9:8 10:20 11:6 233:13,17 235:3,20 clearing 129:9 193:4 194:3 197:4 12:7,9 15:19 16:17 252:19 273:7 clearly 26:14 35:21 200:3 206:1,16 27:12 33:4,15 35:4 352:18 106:16 138:1 158:4 208:14,20 209:4 37:20 49:5,7 53:3 charts 51:6 81:3 159:4 218:1 282:3 221:14 252:20 60:6,12 62:13 63:6 117:21 145:19 342:10 276:2,4,5 333:20 63:7,9 65:4,14 76:2 clear-cut 220:11 147:9 193:4 200:4 coastal 15:5 25:7,13 76:7 77:18 78:11 201:11,13 204:1,4 clever 170:2 55:10 56:6 57:8 84:10 89:9,11 92:5 209:17 212:2,8,11 climate 62:10,17 71:2 84:19 109:14 110:8 94:2 113:4,11 213:8 232:10 74:1 179:20 271:12 137:7,8,10,12 258:5 118:11 142:19 234:13,15 239:16 285:2,8 289:7 259:5 261:18 264:1 157:18 158:3,19 271:7,7,8,8 climatological 24:18 268:16 289:11 162:17 163:8 169:4 chasing 164:10 close 27:19 35:5 303:8 306:2 319:14 212:6 217:12 223:6 check 176:5 169:3 339:18 319:19 320:16,18 237:19 238:3

communities 26:5 257:18 259:12 61:3,4 63:18 66:11 10:11,21 11:5,17 270:10,16 282:6 66:12 68:17 73:15 243:5 250:16 251:9 111:2 125:1 325:1 290:20 291:11,12 77:4 81:14,16 82:1 commit 25:11 community 25:1 32:6 292:8 293:12 82:9 99:12 103:5,9 commitment 12:21 34:11,15 48:11 296:16 297:17 114:2 120:7 125:14 29:6,6 55:1,18 64:15,19,20 65:4 301:6 307:7 312:21 129:19 137:7 61:18 77:16 91:4,20 72:17 109:11 116:9 329:12,16,17 163:11,12 171:17 93:6 136:10,19 120:21 144:2 332:10 336:14 177:19 178:2 216:4 205:6 317:14 338:5 167:20 241:6,12 337:6 342:13 343:3 353:16 221:2 234:4 244:2,6 242:9 249:4,5 252:1 comes 21:20 57:2 252:7 321:10,11,13 commitments 342:10 267:15 279:3 64:19,20 65:18 70:1 334:6,12 335:16 committed 15:14 284:17 293:6,13,16 75:14 90:14 132:13 346:14 348:17,18 17:8 26:20,20 46:11 294:1 326:11,16 136:10 187:18 350:7 46:13 54:10 327:16 218:7 266:12 267:4 commented 295:10 **committee** 1:4 7:19 companies 232:15 281:19 288:18 commenting 81:15 11:11,12,13,19 12:4 280:10 297:7 306:15 309:1 349:20 13:1 28:1,11 37:8 company 209:14 335:14 **comments** 2:2 3:7 40:4,4 46:12 58:7 compared 164:15 comfortable 156:21 5:18 13:5 31:9 86:4,7 87:8 88:14 comparison 41:15 209:19 210:1,2 43:14 47:8 48:21 90:5 102:2 161:18 compartmentalize 22:19 261:2 77:21 95:10,19 161:18,19 162:13 coming 17:4,15 22:21 101:2,9,17 123:5 176:1 181:9 183:5 compatibility 300:11 29:17 30:21 33:16 132:4 135:1 148:13 183:13 184:1.20 compatible 299:5,5 33:17 41:8 47:5 148:15 149:3,5 186:1 191:2 217:11 300:16,17 53:19 58:18 59:9 152:2 167:11 229:16 235:5,17 competing 248:20 67:21 72:7 83:5 169:14 170:12 240:14 243:3,9,14 270:18 85:11 128:20 136:6 177:1,14 227:2 243:17 244:20,21 competition 79:3 137:1 139:11,12,19 244:7 295:15 321:5 247:17 249:14 255:14,17 148:5 165:21 344:3 348:19 351:3 258:12,15,20 259:1 competitive 253:14 166:14 175:20 353:11,13 259:3,8,13,20 293:10,11 177:5 212:18 **commerce** 14:8,16 295:16 compilation 203:9 229:14,14 253:10 23:14 24:7 26:19 committees 115:9,11 **compile** 198:13 272:14 297:15 27:16 32:4,9,17 115:12 161:2 complete 102:15 312:18 313:7 332:2 33:11,20 42:6,12,14 183:20 217:8 235:2 194:20 199:4 204:3 comma 165:19,20 43:3 46:18,20 49:8 235:2 240:5,9,11,16 204:5 206:20 208:8 225:2 57:19 58:1,10 60:13 243:18 245:2 255:5 completed 149:8 command 100:20,21 61:21 62:11,13 64:5 **common** 217:3 202:18 219:2 106:21 107:4 108:1 65:16 66:3,10 68:18 278:16 280:16 221:21 109:16,21 111:16 71:5,8 72:4,7 73:2 commonly 38:5 completely 112:3 125:20 140:9 74:19,20 76:11 77:2 Commonwealth 113:15 117:12 commandant 58:15 78:12 129:11 324:16 126:13 130:8 79:10 160:16 234:5 communicate 84:17 146:11 159:5 commander 110:4 235:10 240:14 241:12 162:21 179:3 140:11 263:14 270:12 communication 228:13 331:7 commanding 9:17 271:12 299:1 110:2 120:17 145:8 completeness 106:1 commencing 1:11 commercial 33:12 170:10 171:2 266:5 completion 191:20 commendation 4:2 34:15 42:6 71:12 269:3 279:14 295:1 196:16 204:9 221:5 commensurate 129:9 208:17 247:7 307:14 221:20 222:7,11 165:15 332:4 communications 7:5 compliance 194:14 comment 27:19 47:1 commission 9:13 288:10 302:14 compliant 289:20

292:6 confuse 74:5 348:15 complicated 62:5 continued 196:15 considerable 104:12 complicating 248:7 confusing 96:11 217:2 218:10 consideration 2:10 233:10 component 86:1 confusion 111:13 152:13 158:13 continues 254:14 235:20 267:6 162:16 166:6 257:19 138:13 288:21,21 289:12 176:21 321:15 continuing 54:21 congratulate 64:15 333:4 108:19 118:16 263:11 326:9 components 121:6 considered 219:17 227:11 250:6 264:6 congratulations 65:9 188:3 268:14 contract 294:6 298:20 332:12 congregate 302:17 contracting 135:14 comprehensive Congress 9:16 45:9 considering 258:13 consist 215:16 196:18,19 145:10 233:13 58:2,3,8,10 60:11 contractors 288:5 64:1 68:10 79:10 consistency 225:12 234:1 263:12 302:5 93:19 158:2 166:15 consistent 180:16 306:17 316:18 343:3 188:11 206:6 con 101:7 contrary 113:7 167:6,9,10 168:10 170:9 171:1 178:9 213:13 215:14 contributed 184:21 concept 24:11 62:20 68:2 74:12 101:8 179:15 185:1 306:10 328:4 contributing 9:5 contribution 285:21 116:6 261:16 199:21 207:5 consistently 87:14,15 contributor 85:15 212:17,21 231:6,11 consists 84:18 280:15 Consortium 1:11 control 9:17 72:1 concepts 18:6 344:15 241:7,21 244:19 74:15 108:1 109:6 conceptual 288:4,12 245:18 246:8 constant 164:2 294:5 313:2 constituency 264:5 111:16 134:8 140:9 250:10 251:5,15 concern 41:6 137:3 326:17 211:1 276:10.10 262:19 314:8 176:15 200:13 congressional 6:7 constituents 169:1 controversial 5:5 61:12,14 73:16 constitutes 44:19 controversy 12:13 247:21 249:5,11 207:18 323:19 296:11 317:10 94:13 190:19 constraints 156:19 constructive 28:10 convenient 50:10 concerned 23:11 241:21 243:1 247:14 305:21 88:2 127:4 203:21 340:14 consultant 47:15 convening 251:9 259:14 316:4 concerning 203:4 congressman 338:9 consumption 19:1 converging 32:5 concerns 31:8 92:10 340:17 347:3 348:3 contact 117:20 216:13 conversation 136:15 141:8 315:19 congressmen 347:12 120:13 320:1 333:7 232:19 320:5 concluded 354:5 conjunction 132:9 contacted 117:16.18 concrete 119:21 313:4 contacts 54:20 conversations 121:10 connected 234:8 contained 105:11 conversion 278:20 concurrent 162:8 condition 192:11 connections 71:20 container 42:8 146:2 converted 278:18 Cook 42:10 conditions 252:14 **Connie** 50:21 contemporaneous condo 331:11 connote 21:8 223:3 cool 232:3 conduct 132:20 cons 89:17 157:20 contention 12:8 Cooperative 114:20 141:21 162:16 325:8 contentious 10:14 coordinate 92:3,16 102:8 108:6 109:5 consensus 251:12 195:20 **conducted** 189:9,11 cone 139:20 345:14,16 context 102:11,18 110:14 137:16 conference 58:13 consequence 93:18 177:21 195:6 189:1 195:12 132:5 139:14,19 consequences 125:3 214:20 295:19 198:10 209:3 214:8 323:13 329:10 214:16 299:6 151:2 253:10,14 conservation 6:5,9,13 352:17 340:19 341:20 12:3 coordinated 299:21 conservative 94:7 continuation 165:19 confirmed 312:11 coordinates 299:6 conflict 340:8 consider 14:9 98:11 continue 108:6 144:9 340:21 conflicting 189:3 147:15 165:7 176:8 247:2 248:6 250:10 275:14 288:20 coordinating 50:6 conflicts 337:4 224:11 314:10

108:13 186:1 218:6 349:14 312:10,21 314:11 credit 61:10 105:8 296:6 correctly 122:15 324:11 328:3 334:7 113:10 crest 163:14 339:8 334:18 338:8 340:4 coordination 48:4 107:21 108:17 correspondence 347:1 348:12 crew 38:15 124:6 351:14 110:18 138:20 223:16 crippled 198:20 cost 39:1 200:8 212:8 course 32:1 39:13 criteria 80:13 189:16 145:3 147:16 185:10 197:17 274:5 288:4 43:5 49:6 69:12 critical 22:2 28:14 costing 74:2 214:20 215:5 120:10 168:3.7 47:2 65:7 72:15 coordinator 87:21 costs 113:18 297:9 169:20 171:5 188:5 77:7 84:6 97:13 copied 37:7 **couched** 182:18 207:21 208:8 110:16 117:6 copies 263:6 272:18 couldn't 11:13 45:20 211:13 239:16 120:14 130:3 157:8 cops 131:19 74:14 100:5 163:20 244:10 256:19 160:19 165:20 copy 98:15 102:15 194:8 329:4 277:13 317:10 188:3,21 204:13 165:1 315:21 council 10:1 183:21 courses 197:2,4 210:5 210:18 211:16 coral 258:9 267:16,17,18,20 cover 114:16 260:13 213:6 250:6 251:3 corals 14:2 24:19 286:10 289:17,17 312:20 334:20 263:12 85:3 289:18 290:2 335:4 critically 122:20 core 2:3,14,15 3:14 councils 9:21 267:19 coverage 38:5 189:8 criticized 134:13 4:13 46:19 64:15 counterparts 284:16 189:21 191:19 cross 141:2 316:21 66:18 79:21 81:3,19 counting 39:2 210:2 222:6 crosscut 67:4 164:9,10 176:10 country 8:13 9:3 coverages 221:4 crossed 122:11 236:4 177:8 187:16 10:19 13:8 14:16 covered 113:5 126:4 crucial 51:14 57:9,14 237:10 238:7 17:4,12 21:17,21 184:19 338:12 119:7 25:18 27:18 28:15 240:19 243:7 245:7 covering 347:10 cruise 190:14 351:8 250:5,19 251:21 29:3 33:14 34:12 covers 161:1 332:17 cruiser 18:12 258:4 261:17 264:4 35:6,9,12,14,17,20 co-chair 267:19 crux 222:16 272:5 297:5,5,13 41:8,17 42:7,12 268:3 CSO 329:18 298:9 304:14,19 45:3 46:2,20 49:3 co-gold 14:6 CTS 176:13 305:17 332:3 49:15 52:2 54:17 CO-OPS 14:10 24:16 culminating 239:13 CORE's 238:14 63:1 65:6 68:3 32:20 97:4 152:8 culture 79:15 241:4,16 255:14 71:14 72:8 75:5 189:3 198:4 214:13 cure 59:16,17 corporate 107:12 123:20 252:9,11 craft 135:15,21 curious 40:8 114:13 154:1 276:6 285:6,10 138:18 203:5 154:15,18 Corps 15:10 77:12 country's 9:18 207:10 current 2:14 23:9 82:2 97:6 141:17,18 County 355:1,4 Craig 47:5 37:18 54:5 195:19 142:1,3 143:3 couple 3:12 13:11 cranes 33:16 203:21 287:7 145:13 146:1,9,16 16:1,18,19 17:18 crash 124:2 currently 47:14 147:3,5 186:9 18:15 21:20 25:14 crass 90:3 125:9 153:12 188:15 190:8 29:21 58:14 67:10 crazy 303:16 261:19 324:19 192:10 194:11 78:1,2 83:11 93:2 create 239:21 255:17 currents 278:19 214:14 215:10 95:18 139:17 270:4 279:1 281:11 218:11 221:18 144:17 151:19 created 40:3 186:7 customer 73:17 263:1,2 273:19 159:9 168:15 176:2 261:5 cut 81:18,21 163:21 292:21 176:4 183:12 creates 255:13 163:21 231:9,10 correct 44:9 80:8 189:17 190:17 creating 269:1 279:6 242:8 247:2 166:16 211:21 191:16 216:14 286:20 **cutesy** 66:11 339:12 218:13 230:1 creative 229:21 cuts 81:8 corrected 166:11 242:13 260:9 credibility 54:19 cutter 81:18 corrections 202:8 264:10 310:16 282:1 cyber 300:10

217:1,3,4,21 218:4 debris 38:17 76:4 delay 203:4 cycle 255:11 129:8,9 CZM 47:14 48:9 daughter 8:19 delayed 44:18 324:12 326:13 Dave 51:12 55:7,12 decade 54:19 delegates 111:18 CZMA 323:7,10 55:13,14 56:17 86:2 December 67:19 117:3 324:16,19 326:9 87:20 95:7 154:2 decency 335:19 deliberation 175:3 C&T 62:18 70:18 155:8 194:2 214:5 decide 210:6 215:11 deliberations 2:9,12 77:7 217:1,5 244:16 290:12 330:14 170:7,21 175:1 260:8 264:9 295:8 decided 19:3 191:8 deliver 178:18 D 295:11 302:5 199:21 225:9,14 deliverables 179:11 **D** 1:21 3:1 355:3,10 decides 70:10 Dave's 176:11 185:3 339:3 daily 120:12,12 David 2:18 25:15 deciding 80:14 delivered 18:5 121:10 55:5 325:14 329:15 decimal 76:15 179:19 342:15 **Danley** 100:11 decision 70:12 89:1 day 5:19 12:11 19:15 delivery 32:14 **DASLER** 81:12 34:3 107:17,18 199:13 demo 277:11,18 85:10 129:19 139:19 198:9 decisions 23:15 76:21 demonstrate 48:7 130:20 145:12 199:11 216:5 211:14 330:16 **Denver 244:4** 146:20 163:10 282:17 314:20 343:14 346:11,12 department 27:16 204:18 221:2 233:8 340:3 350:8,9 348:20 349:6 29:1 46:14,18 57:21 252:18 348:17 days 13:11 15:21 decision-makers 60:1 179:15 212:15 data 35:9 37:10,15,18 26:14 57:7 62:3 23:12 249:13 314:8 40:15 83:1 147:8 decision-making 119:3 229:1,20 339:13 152:7,9 186:10 318:16 320:8 92:20 departments 143:14 198:12 199:15,18 325:20,21 330:1,1,1 declaration 4:1 304:18 201:7,8 202:17 337:6 340:4 decline 257:19 departure 98:6 250:3 214:6,6 216:21 day-to-day 66:5 68:1 declining 249:10 depending 141:13 217:1 218:12 231:1 86:9 296:3,14 231:1 266:4 269:2,3 deal 25:8 46:3 49:4 decreases 257:9 depth 83:16,19 274:10,14,15,16 decreasing 254:17 52:20,21 72:2,17 192:15 193:10 275:2,7,9,14 278:15 99:13 113:16 256:12,17 252:10 278:16 279:11,12 153:19 155:19 dedicated 17:11 depths 147:7 192:21 279:14,15 280:4,5,6 171:15 172:13 deep 214:1 deputies 55:10 280:13,15 281:18 173:10 181:5 184:3 defense 189:15 deputy 2:13 4:11 282:11,20 283:8,10 228:18,19 269:5,9 249:14 46:13 63:9 237:10 283:15,18 284:1,1,3 271:11,11 278:7 deficiencies 39:5 267:4,12 286:7 286:21 287:2 279:8 284:16 40:14 derailed 351:20 288:10 294:21 323:17,17 336:17 define 68:6 326:8 **derived** 22:6,7 299:15,17 300:9 dealing 24:17 50:13 defined 115:16 155:17 301:4,12,12,16 62:10 64:18 84:19 168:17 220:9,17 derricks 33:16 302:14,16,18 120:11 140:16 defining 56:21 described 78:17 303:13 307:13,14 171:13 179:20 definite 332:21 106:17 308:2 184:10 187:9 **definitely** 27:8 119:1 deserve 166:5 database 197:8 199:1 265:13 279:9 285:8 140:5 218:18 design 288:4 294:4,5 199:4,14,15 217:14 307:15 250:15 294:7 date 148:3 179:7 deals 12:14,15,15,16 definition 114:14 designated 5:8,11 datum 189:3 214:16 285:19 265:21 320:16 104:15 215:19 217:19 218:3,7,8 dealt 12:10 120:16 321:17,21 designation 305:21 datums 188:11,16,17 191:6 degree 7:2,5 225:5 designed 37:16 213:14 214:14 death 81:7 **Delaware** 38:1,14 despite 40:16 215:14 216:16 debriefing 61:6 324:21 detail 30:9 57:7 71:4

122:5 319:17 diasters 112:11 275:17 287:12 311:20 325:3,6 329:18 338:19 detailed 86:18 116:20 dicey 238:21 341:3,19 344:11,17 **DICKINSON** 78:7 341:11 343:4,20 117:2 162:16 difficulty 93:21 details 233:16 263:4 122:21 124:7 83:16 210:9,17 350:11 320:10 341:12 225:20 228:1 188:15 discussions 2:9,12 349:8 231:15 319:5,8 Digital 39:13 20:3 28:20 29:7 detect 302:13 303:13 331:2 332:14,17 diligence 39:7 63:8 75:21 91:13 detection 146:7 352:7 354:2 diligent 90:13 97:5 99:9 156:8 detention 82:6 **dictate** 326:14 direct 88:12 181:7 172:11 270:11 145:18 146:4 dictated 158:13 direction 5:16 6:19 314:5 344:1 345:13 determination 219:5 didn't 9:17 29:15 18:1 43:19 68:11 349:7 determinations 30:8 119:9 142:20 directives 195:11 disgraceful 41:3,4 216:21 151:19 153:4,5 directly 72:12 172:16 dislike 335:21 determine 252:1 164:13 170:3 173:1 187:11 235:16 dismal 80:4 268:21 306:7 178:12 208:2 219:5 308:12 disparate 20:5 determined 220:4 255:13 263:3 271:7 director 2:18 4:11 277:20 determining 162:6 303:14 305:19 5:11 6:14,16 9:12 dispatch 311:2 devastating 14:21 307:13,17 308:11 47:14 61:20 67:12 dispersed 144:20 develop 6:18 28:13 315:11 346:3 102:4 237:10 display 78:21 48:6 54:21 89:14 347:19 264:11 325:14 displayed 99:3 92:15 110:12 117:9 difference 148:18 directors 11:18 48:9 dissect 148:19 149:13 168:18 197:2 230:17 61:7 93:7 124:12 disseminate 104:16 207:21 241:20 different 10:13 19:13 228:21 326:13 198:18 245:3 246:4 250:10 22:7,11 52:11 67:2 disagree 338:17 dissipated 164:11 251:13 279:14 86:18 111:19 disappearing 331:10 distill 120:4 289:11 292:17 119:16,18 140:1 331:11 distilled 182:5 303:11 304:20 141:11,12 146:1,8,9 disarray 116:2 distribution 37:11 developed 37:10 146:11 164:9 disaster 74:2 district 146:9,11,12 41:20 48:13,18 166:17 188:16,16 disasters 72:2 192:10 63:12 72:9 80:16 188:17,17 196:7 disconnect 141:5 dive 214:1 143:21 144:18 208:4 209:8 213:1 200:8 234:21 235:8 diverse 28:17,19 245:7 247:3 261:1,6 214:14 218:4,8,17 discretion 345:20 diversity 13:16,20 291:6 322:10 218:19 228:8 discuss 99:7 205:20 28:17 developing 132:9 233:19 235:4 240:5 discussed 164:19 division 100:13 163:4 167:20 290:8 240:9 245:10 171:11 214:10 198:10 204:21 development 65:7 268:19 270:7 278:1 discussing 224:15 **DMAC** 266:17 267:6 220:9 243:21 272:3 278:11,13 279:3,9 discussion 11:21 267:12 269:3 272:13,15 287:16 286:3,6 287:13,14 27:21 31:6 42:21 289:19 294:12,20 322:9 287:15 289:15 61:9,10 74:6 80:19 docks 331:10 developments 331:12 292:16 297:14 95:13,14 96:9 98:7 document 104:1 develops 200:11 304:18 313:14 106:9 111:11 105:18 134:21,21 devil 341:12 338:15 344:14 112:17 133:2 143:9 135:16 136:13 **DFO** 2:4 5:13 350:19 141:17 150:6 147:21 148:1,12 differently 133:4 diagram 265:10 150:3 157:15,21 151:10 207:16,17 266:19 283:7 difficult 23:9 30:3 158:18 159:2 167:2 225:4 243:20 244:5 288:12 35:18 36:8 70:8 174:9,14 175:3 272:1,1,4,17 314:12 dialogue 28:3 30:20 94:7 110:17,18 191:13 205:16 315:21 325:18 31:16 172:11,19 132:19 133:3 161:3 206:12 207:6 documentation 122:1 311:7 312:14 236:17 256:21 215:18 238:10 documents 70:16

dredged 38:11 291:19 295:21 98:1 102:13 104:14 dolphins 263:18,21 dredging 82:4 190:11 111:13 126:3 Don 336:17 337:9 296:20 298:14,16 221:10 don't 8:18 16:2 31:8 300:4 303:10 305:5 145:10 150:10 drive 139:18 200:6 229:4 272:17 34:17 35:1 37:19 307:11 308:4 driven 286:2 297:3 314:17 316:11 294:19 38:18 40:5 41:21 driver 185:15 42:2,4,21 44:18 317:3,9 318:19 doesn't 34:7 58:1 48:15 52:19,21 54:3 319:15 320:13,14 drives 303:18 80:5 84:9 90:18 driving 239:17 54:4 56:9,10 58:16 320:19 321:16 123:13 132:3 135:4 324:4 327:4 328:10 drop 174:21 322:1,4 59:14 62:21 63:4 139:15 144:19 65:12 69:8,9,9 74:6 330:8,12,15 332:14 dropped 146:2 322:3 162:20 163:1 329:7 330:16 190:17 198:13 75:3,8,18 81:18 334:12 336:7 dropping 174:18 82:21 83:13 84:15 338:10,17 340:1,5,6 239:7 273:9,10 328:5 285:10 299:6,19 89:9 90:2 91:1,5 340:13,16 344:12 drove 124:1 321:5 324:7 347:4 99:4 113:12 118:7 344:20 345:4,7 347:12 349:15,16 drugs 276:19 348:3 120:5 125:2 126:3,5 dual 41:7 doing 19:9 25:20 127:5,11 128:4,13 352:11,13 **Dubai** 42:8 28:5 34:1,10 40:5 132:12 133:5 door 8:5 101:19 due 37:12 166:5 48:12 49:14 50:8 134:12 135:9,16 142:19 51:10 54:18 57:10 137:9 138:6,10 doors 169:4 dump 226:17 68:2 70:2,15 81:7 139:17,20 140:17 dotted 122:11 **Dunnigan** 2:7 6:1,2,5 82:20 83:1 85:12 141:5,14,19 142:20 double 53:2 194:18 6:15 7:2,9,10 30:13 144:13 148:14 doubled 39:2 30:15 32:18 33:6 91:15 94:10 105:6 106:4 115:4 119:7 149:21 150:1 152:3 double-check 106:5 37:6 43:11 47:10 48:20 52:14 53:10 130:9 131:4 145:9 152:6,12 153:6,21 doubling 71:15 146:4,7 159:3 154:1,6,20 155:7 doubt 281:19 61:2,17 64:10 66:7 173:18,19 190:11 158:6,12 159:18 dovetail 253:13 69:14 77:4 80:7 83:9,18 88:11 90:17 191:15 197:16 161:13 162:10 downside 86:8 161:4 163:21 166:11 209:20 222:1 223:4 161:12 91:3 94:19 95:12 249:19 252:19 168:3 171:6,7,17,18 downturn 247:3 127:17 128:2,6 129:6 133:18 135:6 257:11 265:19 172:4,15 177:11 254:13 266:21 270:3,6,20 dozen 38:6 139:3 137:4 147:5 155:13 178:7 186:21 187:1 271:1,3,4,8,8 187:10,13 190:20 Dr 260:20 157:5 162:13 163:6 274:19 276:14,20 191:5 194:9 196:12 draft 101:5 106:11 167:14 168:6 198:8 201:3 203:9 169:20 173:4,9,20 279:10 280:1 281:9 128:8 158:3,15 286:5 290:14 208:10 210:3,3 229:6 244:2,5,7 210:14 211:20 229:19 263:10 245:1 288:7,8 312:6 291:13 292:3,20,21 211:3,6,12 212:3 294:15 297:13 213:14 217:3 318:15 332:14 322:19 329:2,12 299:12,14 300:15 218:21 219:11 335:4 344:4 339:9,12,18 340:13 220:3,14 221:3,18 drafted 151:6 245:8 342:9 345:11 346:9 300:16,17 301:18 304:17 305:2 312:5 351:6 222:13 225:8 226:2 320:5 333:11 319:18 321:14 226:17 227:18 drafting 229:16 Durham 49:5 228:11,18 229:5 drafts 336:13 duty 109:20 320:9 326:18 327:4,6 330:9 331:2 335:12 231:18 232:5 233:3 dramatically 247:2 dwindling 254:8 337:21 343:9 347:2 233:4,5 235:14 310:2 dynamic 121:7 351:21 236:7 237:5 238:5 draughts 285:5 **D.C** 1:13 8:16 draw 87:15 116:15 dollar 127:13 254:20 263:17 E dollars 39:18 51:16 270:1 273:11 204:16 E 3:1.1 dredge 75:18 145:17 74:3 127:19 164:15 274:17,20 281:21 earlier 24:13 74:1 191:3 262:14 287:7 290:13 196:5

ENCs 45:7 197:3,6 257:4 315:2 212:11 230:12 93:2 145:5 195:21 232:10 271:7 201:4 212:14 230:8 **EEZ** 190:3 200:10 201:2,13 248:16 256:9 effect 323:20 element 32:8 202:6,16 204:1 effective 15:18 22:20 elements 198:3 208:13 209:4 210:2 264:13 269:17 36:3 86:6 89:21 279:15 210:18 230:9 270:19 271:21 299:9 314:3 323:13 90:1 141:7 172:1 elevator 238:13 232:17 235:2 344:1 348:18 239:20 247:13 eleven 10:9 39:8 Endangered 168:8 ended 181:11 earliest 78:15 effectively 88:17 240:20 241:1,17 242:14 endorse 65:2 early 158:2 195:3 241:12 289:15 302:10 effectiveness 287:6 eliminated 225:14 endorsement 349:17 efficiencies 195:13 embarrass 190:20 ends 69:13 140:10 earmarked 51:20 293:11 197:18 282:6 embedded 99:1 327:21 342:21 efficient 22:20 86:13 earmarks 60:18 **embody** 315:15 344:16 153:10 270:6,8 198:20 233:11,19 emergency 44:19 energy 34:10 56:15 234:2 262:4,5,7 274:13 278:3 71:11,21 95:4 96:21 56:19 Earth 284:11 279:18 280:8 290:5 98:9 99:10 100:7 enforced 193:6 easier 224:20 235:8 efficiently 217:10 104:7,11 105:3,16 enforcement 131:16 easiest 166:20 181:1 276:11 106:18 107:7,8 engage 93:14 94:8 easy 51:18 149:6 effort 65:9 66:21 110:14 112:13 167:19 223:17 240:8 101:14 102:3 105:7 114:18 121:21 323:16 325:3 eat 21:10 118:19 123:19 125:12 122:14 143:15 engaged 27:5,8 54:11 236:9 254:20 132:18 133:1 186:11 77:14 121:12.13 echo 137:1 155:8 145:16 178:17 **Emily** 31:3 57:4,4,13 122:3 164:13 166:7 **echoed** 39:16 183:15,17 233:15 319:17,20 325:13 185:20 207:5 268:4 ecological 270:9 248:21 252:16 325:16,21 326:2 268:5 293:7 310:10 ecology 21:14 342:1 329:14.21 330:9 310:12 321:19 economic 12:15 efforts 2:7 6:8,18 331:2 333:6 326:12 14:16 22:1 35:13 12:12 57:6 85:12 emphasis 70:11 engagement 28:10 economy 21:19 87:2 97:1,8 100:1 emphasize 49:1 29:6 30:10 173:14 ecosystem 6:16,20 110:15 134:12 265:6,7 266:20 326:15 engagements 22:18 13:17 22:18 64:7 184:1 197:20 198:2 emphasized 93:16 71:1 251:2 303:21 egress 4:8 employee 96:14 engaging 166:14,15 304:1 eight 23:3 175:11 247:8 211:18 ecosystems 12:16 either 8:4 97:19 enabling 160:14 engine 18:17 22:10 23:10 24:4 115:7 193:1 232:7 enacted 200:2 engineering 145:16 347:9 62:10,16 66:8 ENC 176:15 199:1,3 engineers 15:10 271:13 285:16 E1285:6 199:5,15 201:8 38:10,18 75:16 76:5 ecosystem-based elaborate 65:17 204:6,7 208:9 228:4 76:7,12 77:12 97:6 250:13,19 251:4 68:21 137:6 143:7 230:21 232:7 141:18,19 147:5 ECS 208:18 225:15 **encourage** 45:14,18 188:15 190:8 Ectus 208:19 209:12 Elaine 77:21 78:5 52:20 167:18 192:11 194:12 editorial 177:19 81:5,13 210:8 194:20 196:15 214:14 215:10 editorialized 198:14 227:21 235:21 244:11 248:6 263:1 273:19 edits 344:21 318:19 250:10 259:11 292:21 educate 233:15 **elbows** 263:4 327:14 England 8:16 educating 245:18 electronic 81:2 encouraged 69:15 English 5:1 **education** 1:12 60:1 117:21 196:9 178:21 327:10 enhance 273:20 230:21 238:15 199:17 200:4 204:1 encourages 194:19 274:2 296:18 241:12 253:9,17 208:18,19 209:16 encouraging 30:16 enhancements

296:6,19 307:16 273:17 296:14 ESFs 104:11 evident 136:14 evolution 93:12 322:6 307:18 especially 10:15 121:17 231:3 240:7 184:19 **exists** 37:18 enhancing 296:5 enjoy 21:1 319:2 250:18 256:2 exact 112:19 295:21 expand 110:6 114:10 enlightening 114:5 260:13 353:14 exactly 81:5 122:19 143:16 212:7 219:21 304:15 **ENRON** 129:13 essence 322:5 124:14 132:11 137:4 138:11 142:7 287:1 298:20 essential 20:10 26:19 expanding 44:21 ensure 107:7 189:7.8 34:4,16 77:8 112:16 218:21 227:18 129:12 219:12 315:14 321:13 204:8 249:1 309:6 essentially 124:4 expansion 44:16 288:20 entail 114:14,15 126:14 137:16 examiner 57:4 enterprise 85:7 194:12 241:5,19 example 21:9 23:8 expect 227:8 234:10 86:21 88:13 93:1 entertain 310:20 253:16 255:11 expectation 178:15 311:18 establish 188:11 123:18 126:5 343:21 344:10 enthusiastic 185:21 213:13 337:2 189:12 214:13 expectations 179:5 expecting 226:11 187:10 established 217:13 215:16 261:2 274:6 entire 75:6 118:20 219:11 265:12 277:18 278:17 243:8 136:13 267:10 287:13 283:3 287:19 expenses 112:9,12 entities 242:2 estimates 84:8 288:5 295:20 303:7 304:2 experience 6:3 9:6 **entity** 154:1 Estrogens 263:21 305:19 313:14 19:2 23:21 86:3 entrances 194:4 estuarine 85:2 examples 164:12 94:17 104:3 108:10 enumerable 192:6 estuary 13:21 80:21 exceed 179:4 117:10 120:9 126:9 et 197:4 214:15 enumerate 118:14 exceeding 348:13 132:16 148:17 enumerated 102:20 217:14 excellent 37:10 86:5 318:21 341:16 104:10 evaluate 80:17 87:3 93:5 97:9 342:4 environment 20:20 evaluating 281:9 119:21 134:17 experiences 19:19 25:8 59:12 263:20 event 114:5 121:1 210:10 296:15 145:1 exceptional 121:20 experiments 282:10 environmental 7:4 events 113:15 115:7 122:9 expert 50:7 14:13 20:19 59:11 Everglades 194:6 excerpts 315:15 expertise 49:19 73:10 247:7 exchanged 319:21 76:17 87:11 107:14 everybody 7:13,14 environmentalists 17:3,9 18:5 57:12 excited 30:18 216:8 218:3 236:7 303:2 100:3 132:16 133:3 exclusions 252:15 experts 28:8 134:6 environmentally 141:3 146:5 150:9 excuse 44:8 168:12 **expire** 168:5 41:2 153:11 151:9 163:5 165:1 execute 67:3 68:9 expires 165:11 167:9 envision 69:16 175:2 182:12 188:2 92:15 106:20 168:3,7 envisioning 68:16 207:9 211:8 213:5 112:15 explain 49:18 220:20 envisions 314:13 224:21 226:1 executed 13:19 286:8 290:8 305:4 **EPA** 15:10 233:13 250:14 executes 157:9 explained 204:20 263:2 264:19 275:5 executive 9:12 27:3 equally 99:21 220:12 equipment 82:21 275:7 279:16,17 explains 261:7 55:1 102:4 145:7 201:20 256:3 306:5 286:18 289:9 183:7,10,20 268:6,6 explanation 98:19 307:21 313:18 318:8 286:9 329:14 320:19 325:6 334:8 exercise 107:16 195:9 **equipped** 131:2,5,5 exploration 23:13 208:9 24:8 257:13 258:5 336:4 338:6,15 315:6 **erosion** 303:13 340:2 349:7,12 exist 116:17 246:9 258:11 error 84:4,9 85:16,20 353:3,13 318:11 exports 40:19 85:21 everybody's 4:4,20 existence 8:5 expressed 295:17 errors 85:14 324:8 existing 123:19 195:7 344:15 ESF 126:7 everyday 73:7 212:8 260:13 274:4 expression 326:20

felt 53:16 120:8 171:2 341:8 favorable 171:16 extemporaneously facilitating 238:16 fax 236:8 156:18 207:12 118:19 facility 3:15 FBI 313:18 213:12 extended 221:6 facing 246:21 **FDEs** 183:10 FEMA 140:11 extension 143:19,19 fear 210:21 feverishly 236:5 fact 15:15 50:3 73:6 extent 65:8 88:1 75:15 84:14 97:9 feasible 329:8 fewer 20:13 92:17 99:5 123:3 fiasco 42:9 152:3,19 160:5 112:21 143:4,5 February 255:1 field 113:10 124:11 156:6 161:13 276:3 187:2,4 195:10 federal 1:4 5:9,11 143:11,17 144:5 172:16 178:20 226:18 249:6 223:1,21 227:12 261:17 311:3 180:3 184:12 196:8 10:7 11:10 15:10 27:21 28:11 32:7 fifteen 10:16 37:14 200:2 215:13 316:11 320:21 41:8 50:7 52:18 **fight** 35:12 58:8,9,10 321:2 330:7,9 219:16 246:4 261:1 261:6 262:4,12 77:2 97:5,7 99:15 58:11 60:11 62:19 334:21 102:1,10 105:9 213:1,1,2 314:2 323:19 external 2:15 4:11 107:6,9 108:5,16,20 fighting 50:9 60:7 176:10 237:10 324:21 329:20 330:7 349:11 110:19 119:19 62:18 241:3 figure 28:15 46:3 extra 182:2 factors 248:8 123:11 137:10,19 50:11 56:8 76:19 138:8 139:2 142:9 extramural 246:19 **failed** 73:12 142:13 144:19 90:3 133:14 181:6 257:6 fair 108:2 extraordinary 192:4 fairly 139:2 142:7 145:14 147:16 193:15 212:13 223:13 227:18 **extreme** 108:18 210:1 249:21 175:21 183:21 188:14 190:7 254:12 257:11 184:13 188:11,16 242:12 301:17 extremely 86:11 262:21 342:3 191:3,21 193:1 343:19 351:11 92:13 178:20 fall 38:14 222:21 194:20,21 197:15 **figures** 127:13 197:20 213:14 295:21 195:20 206:16 270:7 familiar 4:20 13:18 214:6 215:14 figuring 14:20 67:13 341:18 84:16 133:19 179:6 14:4,5 71:9 94:1 217:10,11,15 233:2 Exxon 22:9 41:10 241:14,21 269:8 file 334:16 ex-com 299:11 103:16 142:7 eye 47:5 196:12 311:9 239:12 245:19 287:10,11,17,21 filed 297:14 312:13 254:19 294:8 295:4 309:21 filly 20:6 eves 36:9 171:21 family 8:11 17:7 323:10 346:6 final 38:12 128:7 107:2 224:6,9,10 229:2 173:15 231:17 federally 38:9 76:3 232:10 311:12 236:1,4 **famous** 33:17 189:9 190:2,6 192:7 e-mail 150:14 151:11 fantastic 122:21 feds 293:21 342:3 345:4 151:14 162:19 far 23:10 56:21 108:1 feed 136:3 143:15 finally 11:15 186:3 240:1 245:5 254:2 170:2 178:15 144:14 223:15 345:5,17 257:18 346:4 208:20 231:8 feedback 91:8 295:15 296:13 feeds 143:2,6 final's 288:7 F feel 17:6 42:21 65:20 financial 191:9 298:21 341:5 **FAC** 94:4 86:13 88:3 90:11 find 3:8 23:11 24:14 farther 284:15,17 FACA 94:1 133:8 **fashion** 157:10 157:2 172:12 210:1 25:4 29:5,14 30:2 244:14 251:8,11 fast 5:6 45:6 130:5 226:5 261:1 338:2,5 60:8 63:3,5 74:21 346:3 226:3 feeling 136:12 336:15 92:5 118:21 139:4 FACAs 179:6 feels 341:14 350:4 160:4 162:10 239:1 Fat 116:2 face 41:7 45:21 60:16 fatal 146:4 fees 153:5 257:15 277:6 faced 30:3 163:19 fault 39:3 42:1 feet 82:18 192:15 324:11 331:5 facetious 66:11 291:21 fellow 78:9 340:19 facilitate 71:8,16 fellows 16:17 52:10 favor 28:5 175:4 finder 83:16,19 72:7 94:11 170:11 53:17 54:5 finding 23:17 207:3 312:1

291:5,15 352:13 271:17 279:17 287:21 301:14 319:21 **focuses** 289:18 286:4 315:12 fine 33:6 81:17 fits 73:1,2 246:1 321:20 173:17 207:8 253:7 279:6 299:20 focusing 26:8,15 56:12 85:5 258:4 forma 176:18 305:13 337:12 337:10 formal 103:12 158:20 272:10 288:10 fitting 4:4 fingers 236:4 240:5 finish 76:6,7 172:6 five 67:3 84:18 106:7 297:12,12 324:6 223:16 224:15 333:11 343:19 finished 167:7 106:20 126:18,20 331:21 foghorn 310:2 format 280:16 finishing 129:3 175:13 237:17 244:10 250:1 folder 96:6 formed 10:12 260:19 finite 165:17,21 276:12 311:13 folks 22:6 34:11,11 former 183:16 firmly 236:2 forms 214:4 53:6 78:5 92:13 first 5:5 13:13 15:21 324:15 five-minute 237:16 93:14 103:19 Fort 337:1 17:2,5 18:10 19:12 forth 41:16 42:21 22:17 60:12 61:5 237:17 310:18 109:13 110:11 43:3 76:4,12 171:13 five-pound 58:21 111:2,11 112:1 78:19 79:11 95:14 five-year 67:18 69:5 138:3,5,6 145:6 267:15 302:9 305:7 102:14,15 108:12 306:5 342:7 349:2 109:1 118:10 69:7 165:14 175:13 177:11 182:1 191:8 196:19 351:21 119:15 123:12 fix 31:16 35:13 216:5 232:11 242:5 fortunate 73:5 172:19 188:5 125:17 126:19 129:4 136:5 145:6 fixed 157:19 244:11 260:7 303:8 forum 168:21 180:1 149:15 152:9 167:8 flat 254:16 296:2 316:6,12 318:3 forward 10:18 12:7,9 13:2 16:8 18:3 170:5,17,19 174:16 flavor 97:7 328:10 182:18 191:17 flaw 146:5 follow 65:10 79:8 27:13 29:17 33:9 fleet 194:6 247:20 85:18 118:11 119:1 36:14 44:1 45:6,7 200:15 204:15 150:1 223:13,18 46:4 55:17 63:4 205:14 220:9 248:7,8 225:20 226:19 flesh 215:11 216:6,10 279:4 350:1 78:4 83:12 85:9 90:4 95:15 98:11 229:5 242:14 265:5 fleshed 11:20 144:10 following 52:1 221:6 113:4 120:4 133:19 221:13 222:7,12 267:14 272:2 flew 8:19 274:16,18 280:16 flier 319:13 309:15 148:14,20 158:3 follows 159:12 161:11 166:18 291:4 294:20 floor 103:4 114:1 238:4 252:13 follow-on 116:13 169:2,13 178:10 300:19,21 304:17 305:4 330:12 350:8 259:21 **follow-up** 86:14 181:21 185:17 132:5 227:8 186:5 216:7 223:19 firsthand 97:10 Florida 194:5 310:1 food 108:1 188:8 268:11 272:21 128:11 324:17 fiscal 70:4 165:11 flowing 72:4 footprint 184:11 286:12 289:4 forbearance 310:15 291:16 292:10,18 167:3 296:1,15 flows 83:5 fluid 350:18 forecasting 104:20 294:2,17 312:20 fish 10:21 24:4 46:17 270:9 325:19 327:2 342:6 131:19 194:1 flushing 339:1 343:16 349:16 foreseeable 113:15 219:13 fly 223:8 focal 267:6 forest 56:10 353:4,19 fisheries 6:11,15 9:7 focus 17:20 22:15 forever 79:6 224:8 forwarded 42:20 9:13,14,18 10:7,11 11:10,12,16 13:13 25:14 35:18 55:8,13 forget 111:5 186:12 forwards 325:16 342:12 23:13 34:20 70:21 81:10 83:20 108:15 187:10,13 235:6 foster 246:20 86:4 88:14 144:8 108:18 155:3 Forgive 253:5 157:15 164:9,11 forgot 230:8 found 10:15 16:10 fishermen 12:17 fishery 6:9,13 9:20 17:14 25:17 32:19 180:13 216:7,20 forgotten 58:4 155:7 240:20 251:19 form 32:8 101:5 38:21 58:8 76:3 12:2 106:11 166:10 120:17 122:1 **Fishing 336:19** 286:19,20 292:7,8 223:9 229:2 242:6 124:11 192:5 fit 71:16 111:1 234:9 295:3 focused 7:3 89:15 248:4 261:14 263:19 270:11,15 285:20

139:13 165:4 167:9 213:18 246:18 foundation 155:12 148:1 162:16 188:13,14 189:8,21 249:4 250:2 261:21 generate 87:4,18 242:20 253:19 273:16 285:1 135:4 181:15 255:21 261:20 191:19 202:14 210:11 211:11 286:13 301:6 320:14 353:9 foundational 325:17 generated 87:6 229:9 213:18 221:4 222:6 305:10 foundations 18:2 231:12 288:18 funds 246:12 250:9 318:6 330:2 four 6:17 8:9 11:17 generates 227:14 13:10,11 22:13 26:9 fuller 329:13 further 90:8 118:12 generating 317:11 fully 11:20 105:2,12 134:14 148:6,11 31:21 50:1 62:9,18 generation 86:15 107:3,6,9 130:11 182:10 222:11 62:20 64:3 67:15 230:3 276:16 71:6 76:14 77:13 131:2,5,21 163:1 338:11 346:11 generic 321:7 166:7 264:19 furtherance 181:21 102:13 108:7,12 Geodesy 24:15 55:11 114:9 116:19 117:1 291:20 303:3,4 future 7:19 10:4,17 305:5 326:12 11:2 13:6 25:21 55:12 71:10 306:16 129:15 186:7 26:18 28:15 33:10 geodetic 2:18 14:10 330:20 337:19 212:20 267:20 276:11 344:14 fumbling 181:21 39:13 43:5 46:9 217:1,11 264:12 fourth 25:12 186:12 fun 265:19 53:19 63:1 68:3,6 276:5 351:16 function 95:21 100:4 68:16 69:16 118:16 geographic 217:10 fractious 10:14 132:8 158:6 159:7 geophysical 252:21 fragmented 79:17 105:17 194:12 173:16 276:18 geosciences 256:3 frame 102:6 255:3 functional 106:21 305:14 130:11 302:7 303:5 320:13 Geospatial 15:11 framework 99:8 **functions** 104:8,11 326:12 348:1,5 **GEOSS** 284:8,10,10 116:20 117:3 180:5 105:4,19 106:18 284:13 285:12 **FY** 231:8 250:3 255:10 257:7,10 214:6 110:12 112:16 286:1 292:5 frankly 12:21 16:2 129:12 140:14 339:7 getting 12:6 25:19 43:12,21 88:4 133:4 141:3 153:9 154:13 34:13 36:7 55:21 G 150:4 157:6 229:17 155:10 160:11 58:9,10 59:6,7,7,17 G3:1 60:3 63:14 64:13 323:14 fund 39:17 191:11 gain 296:12 free 53:4,11,14 74:10 196:3 198:9 212:21 67:17 74:12 82:10 game 56:11 95:20 96:2,3 242:15 249:10,16 82:19 83:21 91:7,8 gap 82:6 146:5 frequency 41:15 256:21 290:12,13 93:21 97:14 105:8 gasoline 124:8 348:11 309:7 120:15 124:7,18 Gate 33:17 Freudian 285:17 fundamental 12:5 125:15 129:2 132:2 gather 280:5 friends 18:19 57:16 32:8 50:12 295:18 136:7 137:15 gathering 37:11 296:4 323:8 143:12,13 150:21 247:3,19 256:10 gauge 129:1 261:16 fundamentals 51:5 155:20 174:2 186:4 gauges 130:4,7,10,16 front 16:17 57:11 224:17 197:7 202:3 203:7 130:21 273:19 63:14 64:1 69:6 funded 80:2 188:13 212:13,14 213:4 274:1 281:14,16,19 90:20 99:18 122:7 188:21 262:11,12 216:14 240:1 261:3 307:11 128:14 151:11 289:1,3,6 291:17 267:14 275:9 289:2 gavel 238:5 297:8 303:4,14,15 289:3 308:2 328:8 163:10 165:2,8 geared 127:21 203:16 284:4 308:6 333:8 345:12 gears 148:6 **funding** 37:13,20 frozen 42:16 349:19 gee 320:2 fruition 136:10 39:6 44:7,20 48:1 Gilcrest's 259:10 general 42:13 63:7 frustrates 23:2 58:5 59:6 61:13 GIS 51:5 52:7,19 108:9 125:15 127:2 frustration 128:9 69:8 76:10 113:4 54:13 201:11 236:20 give 22:21 49:9 61:9 126:20 129:17 fuel 19:10,12 124:8 344:15 fulfill 15:7 262:17 154:16,17 165:15 71:3 75:11 76:2,8 generally 13:18 14:9 full 27:3 31:5 38:4 80:2 86:21 89:4 195:15 200:11 15:2 18:6 32:12 91:19 99:8 115:18 47:20 92:10 130:11 202:3,4,15 210:11

201:7,13,15 202:11 god 142:14 132:8 133:7 134:1 148:20 151:3,15 153:7 155:19 goes 21:21 35:20 203:13 205:6 211:1 134:11,16 135:20 211:11 212:3,9 57:19 73:9 92:9 136:11 156:11,19 156:13 159:6 162:1 213:21 224:20,21 163:4 169:21 164:20 170:5,16,18 110:21 164:7 209:10 213:2 216:9 168:10 189:7 192:2 225:10 227:1 230:5 176:17,18 177:6 230:7 231:18 234:5 226:2,8,9 236:8 180:20 181:17 194:13 208:20 236:7,18 237:13 222:15 224:14 182:7 188:7 191:16 238:6,8 257:20 278:19 282:21 192:8 193:18 227:1 232:21 238:10 239:15,20 283:15 284:2 288:6 199:17,20,21 325:21 239:21 241:15 242:12,20 243:16 288:8 305:19 311:6 200:19 204:17 going 3:8 4:11,15 5:3 244:6,9,15,17 5:6,20 8:6 14:7 15:7 314:14 335:19 206:8 212:2 216:2,7 345:16 351:19,20 219:19 220:7 17:21 18:5 19:20 245:14 248:10,19 223:19 226:15 21:18 24:21 26:12 248:20 249:10 given 8:12 68:4,11 227:17,20 228:8 27:2,2,4,15,16 28:8 251:21 252:7 255:3 69:6 70:3,3 74:21 229:2 236:3 237:15 31:4,13 33:15,20 255:4,19 256:20 76:6 151:5 156:6 238:2,4 247:16 35:16 36:4,15 37:3 257:16,20 260:6 259:15 262:15 260:8 267:15 43:1 44:4 45:11 264:14,14,20 266:21 318:3,11 271:18 277:7 280:4 46:13 48:2 51:15 266:12 268:17 gives 72:21 198:15 282:9 290:18 300:7 52:4 53:7,9 55:17 269:20 271:1,1,10 226:1 258:8 346:14 272:9 273:13 302:6 307:17 56:16 58:19,21 59:6 giving 4:16 89:1 245:13 262:21 308:11,14,20 61:2 62:19 63:15 274:10 275:6,10,11 64:6 71:17,18 72:8 275:14,17 277:17 glad 4:5,10 16:4 309:20 310:17 73:6,17 76:21 79:19 280:11 284:21 29:14 49:17 50:18 312:9,19 320:15,20 286:6,13 287:18 glassiness 235:21 327:16 331:16 80:5,11,13 83:10 glazed 230:19 231:17 332:11 336:5,8 87:19,20,21 88:11 288:6,8 290:17 Glenn 93:9 109:12 338:10 339:1 342:6 88:16,17 89:8,20 292:1,14 293:8,19 293:20 294:9 295:5 global 54:12 268:15 344:13 346:18 91:11,12,13 93:8 296:13 297:10 284:10,18 285:3 349:11 95:14 97:10 98:10 goal 6:16 13:17 43:3 106:16 109:19 288:21,21 299:13 309:5,13 globe 33:11 61:21 62:5,16,17,17 111:20 112:21 310:7,8,9,11 311:5 GloBoo 284:18 62:18,20 64:2,4 113:2 116:19 117:7 312:17 313:6 GloBoo's 284:19 66:8,9 67:15 68:1 118:5,19 121:3 318:20 323:11 68:14 69:15 70:1,8 125:5,21 127:1,9 325:19 327:1 328:2 glossiness 235:21 GNDSS 208:6,10,10 71:1,2 132:4 167:12 130:1,21 131:2,3,16 328:5,11,20 329:11 170:9 180:12 201:9 133:20 136:9,19 329:21 330:10,14 208:11 330:20 331:6,16 go 4:7 5:2 10:18 19:4 201:14 245:13 138:10 139:4 20:2 28:21 29:1 286:2 291:11,13,15 140:15 142:1 332:7 333:5 335:11 292:7 297:11 146:14 147:4 337:21 338:14 30:8 31:19 34:17 340:7 342:6 346:19 36:21 37:8,9 43:19 298:18 300:15,19 149:12 150:16 44:13 45:12 50:2 304:21 151:9,13 155:18 347:16,21 348:8 goals 6:17 62:9 63:20 156:13 157:11,11 352:5 51:6 53:20,21 64:12 Gold 71:6 68:7 78:3 79:6 83:7 67:8 76:14 185:5,12 158:4 160:4,5 161:6 161:13 162:3 167:7 **Golden** 33:17 87:15 88:4 89:18 245:19 246:16 golf 336:20 91:14 94:17 95:11 270:15 271:14 171:19 173:2,10 285:12,13,15,19,20 176:4 180:11 185:2 **GoMOOS** 47:16 99:6 103:13 106:6 118:9,21 119:3 286:1,1,3 291:5,9 185:3,3 188:9 190:4 303:11,17 good 3:2 5:9 7:10 9:1 291:20 292:14 190:15 192:14 123:3 125:19 127:6 10:2,6 11:21 13:5 298:11,21 300:1,2 193:14 199:13,20 131:2 134:5,5,7,8 137:2 142:17,18 305:9 309:17 328:8 199:20 200:1,17,21 17:14 19:15 20:13

greater 239:21 240:3 161:20 162:5 90:9 128:19 156:17 24:1 26:1 27:14,21 236:17 263:15 257:3 270:5 163:11 188:7 28:20,20 29:8 30:1 352:9,20 greatest 66:17 210:21 192:18 202:12,18 31:4,15 35:7 36:4 governance 239:17 Greek 5:1 205:14 225:8 227:4 36:10 39:9 42:5 231:7,21 295:12 green 61:11,16 239:18 44:3 45:1,4,9 46:6 grim 254:11 301:19 315:4 47:4,8 48:21 51:16 governing 15:15 334:13 343:18 52:2 54:15,16,16 government 12:18 ground 110:2 120:1 138:14 142:16 348:2 21:2 25:5 26:14 55:18 56:9,10 65:7 grounded 21:14 guidance 86:6 110:7 28:2 34:18 50:7 65:21 76:2,8 83:1,1 52:18 74:3 77:3,18 114:11 290:14,21 83:5 86:10,11 87:1 groundings 41:11 291:6,10 294:16 96:14 99:15 108:5 190:6 89:14 95:13 97:7 297:14,21 108:16,20 109:3,4 group 5:15 29:13 115:5 119:20 guide 92:7 110:20 113:10 36:20 51:4 54:5 120:10,17 121:1,16 126:12 137:19 57:9 63:7 72:9 94:4 guidelines 209:14 126:9 130:15 279:4 132:20 148:1,9 142:9 144:20 169:3 115:3 128:12 157:21 158:17 169:5 191:7 193:1 134:15 139:1,2 **guiding** 6:12 245:8 233:3 238:17 178:18 180:3 gulf 15:1 22:8 23:21 159:1 162:15 24:1 44:21 100:13 167:15 173:5,16,18 government-maint... 223:14 229:6,12 230:1 242:5 247:16 119:6 129:15 186:5 187:8,21 38:17 265:14,17 267:5,8 217:20 239:1 195:5 199:12 government-speak 267:10,11 269:10 gun 131:15 209:18 225:3,4 141:21 grab 341:13 273:1 274:18,19 guy 8:3 58:16,17 233:20 234:15.17 grabbed 313:13 235:15 237:9 239:7 275:10 278:7 59:13,14 303:21 242:17 254:12 316:16 280:10 292:7,8 guys 48:16 50:11 256:6 257:7 258:16 gracefully 119:3 74:7 156:9,12,19 331:1 352:4 groups 9:20 25:18 157:1 236:7 261:15 263:7 273:1 277:1 grades 35:10 grandchildren 35:16 120:12,16 121:1 289:4,10 291:17,19 H 293:15 298:7 300:7 grant 53:2,15,16 139:8,11 140:2 H2:7303:19 304:2,8 64:21 143:17,17,18 141:10 245:4,10 habitability 124:5 305:11 309:10 144:2.7 247:7,9 251:13 habitat 24:5,17 316:18 317:2 grants 293:11,11 278:11,13 287:4 half 12:5 38:6 41:11 graph 201:8 205:4 320:11 323:21 289:15 294:12,12 41:13 42:15.16 326:2,3,3,10,20 249:8 322:21 51:15 75:5 123:19 grow 242:14 285:7 327:5 337:14 **graphic** 176:14 Hampshire 93:7 341:11 343:2,17 203:11 228:7 Guard 15:11 38:13 hand 68:9 133:16 344:19 345:6,13 75:10 77:12 79:8 Gray 36:11 37:2 47:9 handed 90:14,15 347:7 350:6 353:18 74:5 114:3 117:14 81:14 97:6 115:20 98:14 319:13 120:13 121:11 353:19 119:2 170:13 171:4 handle 115:6 117:7 goodness 89:8 173:1,8,17 195:4 123:14 140:10,19 131:6 146:10 226:4 great 8:13,20,20 9:16 163:19 186:12 goods 71:19 280:14 Goodspeed 103:19 11:5 18:14 31:6 187:17 197:5 200:3 handled 107:18 gotta 60:11 90:19 47:17,17 48:9 77:4 206:2,16 208:15,21 186:9 108:20 135:4 78:8 82:12 86:19 209:4 221:14 handout 18:4 142:14 192:17 87:6,12 88:3 90:11 guess 35:3 38:3 40:18 hangs 193:17 68:20 82:1,9 86:8 198:4,9 229:21 91:2 172:12,14 happen 7:21 13:9 90:18 117:8 119:17 234:18 235:13 186:2 206:19 19:20 57:11 68:13 279:8 283:16 228:18,19 234:17 125:13 139:3 140:7 72:1 87:21 89:11 gotten 28:1 29:4,20 260:6 263:3 302:21 146:19 150:15 90:6 108:20 117:4 318:8 319:8 348:9 152:4 154:21 43:1 59:18 60:9,10

258:13,14 298:12 287:3 291:16 123:13 141:7 havens 194:2 219:14 haven't 40:9 46:5 354:5 292:14 306:17 157:11 173:2 313:11 314:17 50:20 51:9 59:18 heart 155:20 237:11 183:16 202:12 211:11 222:16 78:5 80:16 89:12 heartily 298:21 319:4,5 325:13 heavily 85:3 155:2 338:6 351:13 353:5 230:3 251:15 304:7 96:1 113:6 114:7 heavy 320:9 helped 14:6 128:10 306:14 323:11 119:10,10 133:5 heck 345:5 205:1,12 325:14 343:10 164:19 168:7,9 height 82:18 83:1,9 helpful 73:5 85:8 346:1 171:11 192:16 93:13 94:21 123:8 259:12,15 272:3 188:12,19 213:18 happened 13:12 281:1,2 346:9 352:9 215:7 301:13,14 133:9 134:1 157:7 42:12 54:11 88:15 114:6 120:1 149:7 hazard 105:12 106:2 352:2 158:10 159:6,21 held 96:9 149:2 323:2 164:12 200:7 hazardous 125:5 169:10 173:5 189:13 190:13 208:10 302:8 Helen 2:13 3:20 73:3 184:14 195:9 211:5 319:16 273:8 77:6 91:17 103:9 264:20 326:19 happening 33:10 hazards 101:8 198:17 122:16 124:14 327:17 59:1 183:2 223:7 148:15 152:13 221:11 helping 87:17 159:6 237:20 252:18 head 194:2 215:3 163:7 174:3 175:10 169:2 259:21 331:14 350:20 245:20 176:20 183:11 308:14 happens 15:5,5 18:3 heading 87:7 216:19 237:12 helps 69:1 85:9 18:8 62:14 64:2 headliner 352:20 260:9 264:12 311:2 240:15 267:9 70:9 138:11,12 headquarters 110:1 312:11 319:11 318:10 191:6 227:9 254:21 Helen's 152:5 158:15 here's 128:5 131:14 heads 267:5 283:18 341:10 headway 286:14 **HELIX 248:4** 185:16 231:20 happy 19:6 256:1 health 21:9 249:20 hell 75:4,16 119:12 254:10 255:9 harbor 39:17 58:13 250:4,12 257:5 347:21 305:10 115:9,11,12,14 263:16 264:1 270:9 hello 7:14 heritage 21:16 help 3:21 4:4 16:8 183:19 196:2 healthy 21:7,8,10 hey 7:13 90:19 136:4 234:18 302:9 hear 7:11 19:5 43:16 21:5 23:19,20 27:16 146:16 156:19 harbors 40:19,20 43:16 57:14 87:1 28:9 36:6 49:14 185:14 187:5,8 41:17 43:9 97:15 91:11 99:17,19 55:11 61:3 63:5 203:6 209:3 212:21 hard 7:11 48:3 84:10 283:12 330:4 139:12 158:10 68:6 69:4 86:14 98:15 102:15 172:13 185:20 87:11 88:16 89:16 he'd 117:19 130:19 226:3 237:3 242:21 90:3 91:13,13 92:3 he'll 5:6 70:12 243:18 266:18 304:12 305:6 332:3 he's 5:3 54:19 66:16 92:6 93:9 94:13 283:9 284:1 315:14 352:8 353:7 109:5 116:6 117:9 67:1,4 87:20 136:12 heard 21:20 42:4 315:21 347:15 117:11 119:8,11 146:15 185:21 hardening 129:13 44:17 48:16 81:14 128:13 132:15 262:6 268:6,6 130:15,20 307:11 87:3 90:19 91:10 134:3 135:10,20 312:12 336:18,19 hardest 193:9 97:9 99:13 113:6 136:12 140:6 336:21 346:15 harmful 21:8 121:9 123:6,14,21 169:11 176:14 hi 7:13,13 harness 180:13 125:2 127:9 130:14 177:5 180:17 hide 236:9 hasn't 23:5 179:8 130:20 192:9 183:11 185:14 hierarchical 141:4 275:21 247:21 250:14 189:4 199:10 205:9 high 132:17 141:21 hat 65:11 68:9 72:20 258:12 262:5,13 212:12 223:16 145:8 190:3 219:19 72:20 234:5 298:18 270:10 285:13 224:16 227:19 233:5 286:21 287:1 hate 162:14 286:15 290:16 240:20 241:10 289:7 hats 11:13 65:14 86:9 296:16 316:8 245:4 246:15 251:4 higher 66:3 228:5 264:11 351:14 319:15 340:1 255:13 271:10 highlight 96:19 123:6 273:1,16 283:6 haul 128:16 hearing 57:18 122:15 220:7 314:13

283:20,21 284:4 49:18 73:7 75:9 203:16,18 310:21 highlighted 155:11 **hurricanes** 25:4 43:7 highlights 8:2 134:2 78:11 89:14 99:7 311:19 312:1 104:3 155:1 217:19 134:10 159:12,21 351:20 highly 124:10 282:15 hill 25:17 29:1 32:11 180:16 202:16,18 Howard 100:11 hurt 35:14 34:9,12 44:4,13 203:4 213:17 101:5 hydro 52:16,19 128:1 273:14 312:13 HR 243:9 45:12,16 47:6 50:6 333:5,20 345:14 **HSIA** 148:8,15 149:2 237:11 326:17 50:10 53:5,14,21 350:18 61:15 64:12 67:20 hoped 33:2 196:20 154:12 157:7 hydrographic 1:1 158:12 159:15 94:9 127:14 128:14 hopeful 46:11 240:2 hopefully 72:2 160:1 162:8 165:1,5 2:12 3:3 5:10 27:10 157:12 159:17 37:10 40:15 73:9 231:17 234:7,21 101:17 102:5 165:11 168:1,3 122:12 126:16 235:14 237:20 143:15 145:2.7 172:12,16,20 238:8 239:10 241:4 179:10 183:15 215:17 323:13 130:5 157:17 241:13 242:1 243:2 209:6 266:18 325:9 332:8 343:4 165:18,20 172:17 **HSRP** 2:2,7,9,12 5:13 184:4 187:3 189:9 258:14 260:16 318:15 349:18 195:17,18 196:17 261:4,18 316:4 hoping 29:19 96:15 29:15 31:8 42:19 hillstepper 245:21 137:2 226:14 302:2 74:12 76:18 88:15 197:21 198:11 hints 135:15 310:4 312:9,20 92:19 102:9 105:15 216:15 252:8,17 hired 145:6 321:6 322:16 324:4 106:14 107:3 112:7 307:8 308:13 historical 302:16 horizon 68:12 112:11 114:16 321:18 322:6 **history** 277:15 horizontal 110:19 116:14 165:20 332:12 333:2,3,17 hit 59:19 171:20 217:13 170:6,20 181:13 352:10 173:15 202:16 hosting 3:14 182:10 188:10 hydrography 196:6 234:18 hot 103:20 112:5 189:6 191:18 hitting 54:8 251:8 192:19 194:19 ICC 108:3 111:4,15 hold 115:19 147:7,9 hotel 177:12 195:14 197:1 112:18 224:8 257:1 hour 19:14 220:21 203:20 204:4 219:2 **ICMTS** 183:17 holds 7:5 hours 124:7 125:3 315:17 320:3,6 ICOOS 306:2 Hollings 250:3 139:17 225:1,1,1 321:3,10,18 322:13 ICOSDRMI 287:15 home 8:11 17:5 25:3 229:16 332:8,11,12 333:2 ICS 107:5 109:16 house 15:3 60:10 333:16 345:3,9 49:5 124:1 139:16 idea 9:16 20:15 22:7 200:7 310:19 337:1 100:6 127:20 235:6 HTKG 352:2 25:18 49:10 56:10 354:4 235:19 240:8 huge 164:15 172:6 65:3 103:10 115:10 homeland 76:11 243:17 247:15 179:21 248:21 149:21 162:6,15 81:16 105:17,20 258:3,7,15 259:6,8 262:6 193:17 194:16 126:8 153:13 259:13 hull 39:3 195:1,6,21 201:11 154:14 155:16 Houston 33:3 38:2 human 21:9 249:20 228:9 230:19 263:3 156:1 163:12,20 41:13 87:1 96:17 250:4,11 257:5 291:19 303:10 164:16 183:20 97:17 98:18 99:13 263:16 318:9 319:9 327:5 99:14 101:17 humble 210:4 192:5 333:9,10 homework 331:3 103:13 104:9 hundred 37:16 69:18 ideal 69:10 honest 152:13 109:10 112:4 113:6 83:15 201:4 211:8 ideas 29:2 31:17 65:5 honestly 29:11 53:1 212:1 213:7 346:17 113:7 114:4,13 88:3 93:9 95:5 honey 19:5 115:15,17 119:4,14 hundreds 21:17 133:7,15 134:18,19 120:2 121:4,4,9,14 hung 349:2 honeymoon 61:6 150:5,14 151:21 honeymoon's 50:1 122:8 124:3 126:2 hurricane 44:16,20 158:16 182:3 183:2 honor 96:2 127:9 129:20 149:1 74:2 87:3 99:19,19 185:16 206:8 226:1 hope 27:20 28:1,12 151:6 165:2 176:19 100:7,9,14 102:7 226:11,19 312:16 29:5 34:5 42:17 184:16 189:1 192:9 121:6 282:19 283:1

39:6 166:19 314:12 337:17 19:17 22:14 24:10 individual 11:1 338:12 342:5 27:6 29:12 32:9 inapt 137:17 identical 259:7 36:1 42:17 43:8 incident 64:5 100:19 251:14 45:3 47:3 48:6 50:8 100:20,21 106:20 individuals 115:1 identified 26:10 38:8 130:17 160:11 51:21 57:1 60:2 107:4,11,17,19 117:20 123:11 109:15,21 110:10 industry 56:21 78:12 195:7 212:1,4 339:3 77:16 79:14 80:20 109:18 110:8 identify 56:5 105:12 81:4 83:10 84:17 156:1 90:21 99:21 101:11 incidents 2:10 146:1 114:12 116:5 112:7 113:18 104:9 112:1 118:6 include 106:19 117:10 118:3,3,4 116:16 117:11,14 118:4 141:9 179:10 149:18 175:2 138:3 163:14 122:20 124:15 183:19 236:3 247:7 217:5 228:9 125:8 126:4 128:11 204:10 255:6 identifying 129:8 133:11 134:3,17 included 219:3,7 276:21 277:13 140:13,13 141:13 includes 24:6 71:9 293:16 310:10 183:10 ignorance 57:18 143:12 153:7 100:18 314:20 illustration 210:10 156:13 158:14,15 including 72:13 inefficient 198:15 **immediate** 170:7,21 164:6 165:6 185:8 197:19 231:14 inertia 345:7 312:16 322:3 immediately 14:12 187:19 206:16 infancy 239:19 167:19 210:7 216:13,18 333:15 infinitely 240:17 immigration 66:14 224:11 228:3 242:4 inclusion 193:4 influencing 285:4 IMO 42:13 197:4 inform 242:4 243:20 244:13 incorporate 126:17 209:13 245:15 249:3 261:8 127:6 163:7 260:16 informal 102:3 informally 98:15 264:4 266:3 269:3 305:1 322:15 impact 187:3,11 215:9 235:19 239:9 283:13 287:16 incorporated 112:18 information 36:10 288:15 292:5 298:1 186:19 251:14 251:10 252:8,17 48:14 72:14,15,15 330:3,9 301:4 321:8 325:4 328:20 330:6 82:12 84:1,5 85:7 **impacts** 204:10 326:11,17 331:9 increase 72:18 87:3,16 92:8 97:3 215:20 251:20 333:1,4,17,18 107:21 140:8 120:3 130:2 135:9 135:17 140:5 145:4 implement 6:19 346:20 350:15 241:10 242:13 269:12 272:11,13 imports 40:19 254:14 257:14,16 148:19 152:21 273:2 293:19 impressed 14:12 287:6 298:14 299:2 155:21 156:5 165:4 294:10,15 16:15 increases 107:20 190:15 191:14 implementation impressions 16:6 255:15 256:6 193:3,10 195:19 26:21 196:4 199:5 56:3 298:10 198:18 203:15 200:8,12 209:1 impressive 32:21 increasing 241:7 229:1 247:12 211:19 217:16 127:9 254:4 256:1 257:12 272:20 273:6 276:9 244:1 272:12 improve 43:1 145:4 increasingly 331:12 277:8,10,12,21 implemented 217:19 incredible 121:7 278:17,19,21 279:1 273:16 274:6 275:19 282:19,20 252:5 268:11 288:9 incredibly 123:7 279:2,20,21 280:7 implementing 100:19 284:6 incumbent 232:1 280:14 281:12 106:13 129:14 improved 85:17 incurred 112:9,12 282:16,21 283:4,19 157:19 imploded 251:11 independent 20:6 283:19 284:3,5 Improvement 2:12 independently 162:1 **importance** 27:7 35:5 285:3 288:6 289:8 46:20 73:1 78:10 INDEX 2:1 294:14 301:16 157:17 97:13 124:19 improvements indicate 3:6,11 302:19 314:6 155:15 210:18 349:15 indicated 122:8 316:10 341:11 improves 227:15 175:14 236:17 informational 94:8 245:9 249:16 improving 276:15 355:7 infrastructure 33:14 273:12 282:9 important 9:3 11:3 inaccurate 82:15 indicates 327:4 109:7 141:15 186:9 12:17 13:7 16:14 inadequate 37:13 indifference 166:18 188:4 235:1 243:14

297:6 300:20,21 245:10 249:6 250:8 introduced 243:10 300:10 255:1 infrastructures 131:1 308:15 260:17 319:21 ingenuity 124:10 **integrated** 2:17 25:13 326:20 introduction 2:5 ingrained 62:20 interested 18:13 19:3 47:13 26:2 32:2 40:4 inherent 28:18 50:17 51:2,3,8 52:1 25:20 32:1 57:17 introductory 123:5 327:12 97:2 244:16 251:2 174:17 205:8 invent 29:16 inventory 194:21 initial 13:5 16:6,6 266:14 272:2 247:12 250:21 274:18 280:17 195:2 219:1,3 94:3 101:16 103:8 301:11 319:3,6 281:5 284:13 291:2 325:10 invested 308:14 110:12 120:15 interesting 22:5 investigated 221:17 178:11,13 181:13 306:21 integrating 24:11 investing 207:20 313:6 315:3,9 100:2 186:6 302:6 317:21 318:6 47:19 48:3 50:19 interests 28:17,19 **investment** 53:17,18 340:12 344:4 143:13 266:16 36:18 65:11 187:14 88:18,20 90:5 267:13 291:1 296:6 initially 240:2 248:20 315:19 241:15 266:9 initiative 124:9 308:10 interface 119:7 184:5 investments 49:4 242:16 250:5,12 integration 24:20 interfacing 111:9 274:9 256:5 257:5 314:20 interim 232:9 55:21 240:3 261:9 invite 336:16 initiatives 2:14 270:3 274:12 interject 5:6 252:6 invited 31:3 142:20 314:18 intern 6:7 277:20 280:19 185:7 337:3 inland 82:6 98:12 internal 103:21 104:2 281:8 286:16 involve 269:11 input 57:14 73:17 288:16 298:2 130:17 172:11 involved 9:2 52:16,21 134:4 181:18 300:18 305:14 internally 314:1 65:8 68:15 110:11 184:14 218:7,8,12 306:11 307:18 international 114:19 115:4 140:15 155:2 269:7,11 320:1,4 308:1 327:9 351:11 179:5 183:9 184:21 350:6,10,15 Intelligence 15:11 Internet 97:19 194:20 210:4 inputs 222:18 intended 124:6 interoperability 244:12 265:9 268:3 insert 328:12 intensive 190:4 274:12 286:21 271:17 287:5 291:8 inserted 253:21 intent 73:16 94:13 288:17 291:1 314:19 325:6 inside 111:12 120:18 148:1 214:18 300:18,21 306:12 327:15,16 338:6 135:9,17 267:16 intention 172:13 307:18 308:2 in-house 196:18 269:6 278:5 279:5,8 330:3 interoperable 266:16 **IOOS** 25:15,16,20 269:4 274:17 275:2 286:2 290:20 305:5 interact 111:4 180:6 32:8,16 33:8 47:21 insight 209:12 334:1 280:16,20 281:7 48:5,7,18 50:3,5,16 insights 222:17 interaction 110:7 282:13 284:13 51:8,10,10 52:6 insisting 191:9 114:11 121:8 137:7 286:16 289:21 54:8,12,21 55:8,13 instance 229:5 interactions 24:5 291:3 297:7 300:19 55:20 56:4,11,12 instances 193:13 interagency 145:3 304:16 87:21 95:7 161:3,10 231:13 265:14 269:9 287:7 interpreted 272:9 176:11 195:6 219:8 Institute 97:12 290:10 292:15 interrelationship 220:7 245:7,10,15 283:18 284:1 299:10 144:15 245:18,21 246:5 institutions 238:17 interdependent interruption 253:6 260:14 261:20 63:19 instrument 83:14 interstate 10:20 264:13,15,19 265:5 insufficient 204:1 interest 66:17 94:10 Intertanko 39:21 265:17,18 266:10 insurer 39:1 94:12 132:17 41:5 266:13 267:2,3 integral 33:8 153:13 154:14 Intertanko's 39:14 268:5,7,11 269:12 integrate 15:8,9 155:16 163:13 interval 71:19 269:12,15,19 270:1 246:14 251:20 175:14,17 176:2 intricacies 233:16 270:3 271:9,12,16 261:11 266:10 178:17 182:9 187:3 **introduce** 5:20 7:9 271:17 272:15,20 282:14 292:20 236:13 239:11 74:8 96:15 273:2,9,11,13,15

286:15,15,16,17 37:5 46:8 54:12 100:2,10 101:5,14 274:2,11 276:15 63:13 83:8,10 85:4 103:3 104:1,15 287:9 288:12 277:19 278:6,20 89:16 92:1,16 95:7 107:15,16 114:21 291:21 293:13 279:9,12 281:3,3,6 281:7 282:12 284:6 95:8 96:18 108:17 115:15 116:20 294:7,7 297:4,5,8,8 297:12 298:2,5 126:4 127:7 129:21 121:17 122:3,9,13 284:8,14 285:11 155:2,21 157:16,18 123:7 125:4 128:7 302:12 305:7 286:4,7,15 288:4,14 306:11 309:4,13 288:16 291:11,13 158:7,20 159:7 128:16,21 129:1 314:4,16 315:14 162:6,17 163:8,8,20 132:15,19 137:20 291:14,14,16 292:7 138:1 139:9,10,10 316:7,20,21 319:8 168:17 171:10,12 292:10 293:19 320:11 321:4,7,8,12 294:7 295:16 296:5 179:21 180:1 184:3 139:14,19 141:1 324:10,10,13 329:8 296:11,18,21 297:4 184:10 189:3,5 142:2,8 143:14 144:4,9,14 145:15 330:15 331:8 332:1 298:17 299:5,9,12 196:4 209:17 300:1 301:5 302:7 237:13 238:7 259:2 147:2 153:18 154:7 334:2 336:10 154:11 155:3 304:5,10,11,15,21 264:2 265:4 292:9 339:10 341:3,18 305:4,6,11,13,20 295:16 301:1 325:7 157:10,11 159:1 342:3 344:11,16,16 307:4 309:9 316:6 326:8 331:5,7 341:2 160:18 161:19 346:12,20 347:3,4 343:18 345:13 347:11,15,16 348:5 351:15,15 163:15 164:3,5 349:8,10 350:15 **IOs** 12:15 351:12,12 352:19 165:13 169:18 171:19 176:13 iron 325:15 353:4 352:11 **ISGOO** 302:3 **issuing** 194:11 177:15 178:16 **IUOS** 278:11 Island 75:2,4 item 24:10 160:6 180:7 186:2,3 IWGOO 265:14 isn't 33:20 46:16 235:12 242:16 187:15,20 194:14 267:1 268:1 272:10 66:20 83:4 103:8 246:17 248:9 195:10 197:13 287:13 292:15 170:14 185:2 249:19 199:8,21 206:3,17 294:9 295:3 I'd 3:4 14:12 16:17 195:20 212:17 **itemize** 118:13 206:19 208:16 items 233:12 257:10 211:1 214:15 17:19 20:12 26:8 213:2,19 225:16,16 248:10 262:17 308:12 352:8 353:4 30:6 45:6 52:20 215:15 216:17 65:10 74:7 76:16 326:13 it's 3:15 5:12 7:9 8:9 217:2,9,16 218:4,5 **ISOS** 278:9 8:20,21 9:1 10:19 218:10 219:20 78:1 86:2 91:16 issue 11:1 23:9,10 11:11 15:3,6 18:11 220:10,10,17,19 98:4 99:3 102:12 27:7 47:3 95:2 20:15,21 22:2 29:5 222:18 223:12 103:2 124:13 30:5,15,19 32:21 100:9 117:21 141:1 224:19,19 228:11 125:13 156:2,16 146:12 147:16 33:9 34:2,18,20 229:21 230:14 161:20 165:7 35:1,8,10 40:4,5 175:12,15 176:6 154:16 163:19 231:1,20 232:2,12 176:20 185:19 42:2 45:1,9 46:6,15 232:14 234:11 197:14 200:13 201:5 203:3 205:20 186:7 189:1 190:21 47:2 48:3,5 50:10 236:1,16 239:9,20 197:13,14 199:12 51:2,3,11,11 52:2 239:21 240:8 242:4 219:12 227:6 206:1,4,17 213:20 53:3,3,21 54:6,16 242:11,17 243:15 229:12 237:13,14 214:9,19 216:6 57:1,8,20 58:9,9,11 243:16 244:20 238:3 265:6,20 221:3 225:12 59:8,8,21 60:6,8,9 246:6 248:20 307:9 310:16,20 234:21 243:13 60:11,11,12,14,16 249:10 250:1 311:18,21 312:3 315:4,9 318:4 319:5 251:8 252:7 323:16 64:21 65:7 67:8 252:18 256:13,17 331:9 344:19 72:10,10,14 73:20 256:20 257:11 335:3 337:14,17 346:21 347:5 352:1 74:9 75:4 77:8,15 266:2,6,14,18 271:3 338:2,11 352:5,8,16 issues 2:10,15 4:14 78:8 79:2 80:5 83:1 272:7,8,12,13,16 353:13 I'll 4:7 7:11 13:4 11:19 12:11,18 13:7 85:8 87:5,8,17,21 275:8,18,21 277:9 14:11 17:18 23:7 88:8,17 89:20 90:20 280:11,19 282:3,4,4 31:14 37:6,9,9 46:7 24:18 27:10,11 90:21 92:12,14 283:12,20,21 52:9 66:12 74:5 78:7 99:6 100:16 28:14 30:3 35:18 93:18 94:6 95:13,13 284:10,11,19 285:4

172:13 181:6 183:6 101:5,9 102:18 277:17 280:9 jump 63:15 78:1 290:15,19 292:1,12 185:20 201:4 202:4 91:16 119:13 112:2 119:2,13 205:8 211:4 227:7 132:14 177:6 292:13 295:1 148:10 162:18 176:2,12 184:15,15 297:10 298:4,12 230:6,8 236:17 180:21 183:12 214:5 217:6 237:7 198:21 203:19 302:2 312:9,20 260:2 267:19 269:17 311:7 jumping 158:18 214:1 218:18 220:7 313:4 316:14 319:6 312:12 314:3 328:4 June 243:16 255:7 238:11 240:21 321:11 322:11 260:1 288:7 290:17 249:8 260:4 275:15 326:5 327:7 328:14 328:21 329:5 342:13 348:2 329:3 334:13,16 330:20 332:7 jurisdiction 190:2,9 337:16 341:5 190:20 221:19 349:10 336:3,11 337:19 I'm 3:2 5:14,20 7:11 340:7,18 342:4,9 353:14 236:15 259:2 iurisdictional 243:12 8:3 9:7 17:15,15 343:19 346:10,19 Jack's 61:6 136:10 18:5 21:11,11 23:10 347:21 348:21 169:14,16 327:21 justify 164:3 298:14 24:4,5 26:12 27:4 352:3 338:5 348:19 K 27:13 29:16,19 36:4 I's 122:10 Janet 48:12 Kathy 329:17 I've 8:8 9:9,10 13:10 January 7:1 70:13 36:4.15 40:8 43:18 Katrina 104:3 108:10 44:12 46:10 49:11 14:17 17:18 20:11 203:18 208:21 110:16 116:1 126:9 50:18 54:17 57:3,17 21:19 26:10 28:4 jargon 104:7 185:5 127:16 138:17 58:16 61:2 62:18 29:20 30:18 33:15 Jersey 76:1 Katrina-Rita 128:6 66:10 71:2,13 72:5 35:4,16 39:8 49:2 job 11:5,21 34:1 keep 4:21 8:6 19:6 83:13,21 88:11 90:1 54:2 55:7 56:3 35:19 44:7,9 54:11 50:19 58:21 65:3 91:12,12 95:15 57:20 59:3 66:15 59:2,2 65:3 68:10 67:13 89:15 101:18 96:15 103:15 68:12 80:18 83:20 69:17 76:6 88:16 173:18 193:12 108:11 109:7,13 85:5 89:10 98:1 115:5 122:9,21 200:12 202:9 219:8 110:5 113:8 114:13 100:15 101:2,2 124:15 141:11 243:13 246:1 264:6 115:4 116:11,19 112:17 123:2 142:4,21 173:18 301:11 327:15 117:5,8,12 119:5 129:19 130:20 187:16 241:19 keeping 47:4 120:17 123:1 125:6 131:14,17 147:12 275:17 287:12 keeps 212:21 125:11 133:20 159:17,18 178:20 291:14 292:1 345:6 **Kelly** 63:7 134:4 135:17 137:1 181:2 189:17 jobs 88:5 **Kennedy** 325:14 140:7 142:7 145:7 198:21 234:7 John 2:7 6:1,1 77:21 329:16 150:8 151:9,13 263:15 268:1,13 78:6 81:11 348:3 kept 303:8,11 153:20 154:9,15,17 286:14 290:9 352:4 key 6:12 281:7 154:19 156:7 322:12 346:4 Johnson 267:5 keynote 2:5,6 5:20 169:20 172:4 175:7 349:12 351:15 join 8:8 245:12 kick 141:4 342:5 177:19 178:6 352:20 joined 6:21 **kicking** 159:16 181:21 195:19 joining 247:12 J kickoff 158:17 197:18 199:8 joint 102:9 265:10 J 1:13 kids 17:4 200:17,21 203:13 268:2 Jack 7:9 30:15 31:6 killing 353:1 ioke 95:20 205:21 206:9,9 31:10,16,20 36:11 **kind** 19:2,19 28:12 207:5,8,19,21 Jon 130:13 163:9 37:6 40:8 49:16 31:18 35:2 37:3 211:18,21 213:3,21 221:1 226:5 348:15 61:8,16 65:13 71:5 49:17 69:13 78:14 214:2,8 215:12,20 Jones 351:11 72:13 73:21 74:10 79:9 86:18 92:1,6 223:11 227:4 234:6 Jon's 225:12 90:17 95:1 117:4 94:11 95:19 96:7,15 244:15 257:20 journalism 318:21 132:15 134:13 98:15,16,20 103:16 264:13,13,17,18 Jr 1:21 355:3,10 136:19 152:4 156:3 106:9 112:5 113:20 266:12,20 268:17 **JSOT** 265:10 157:4 166:7,16 116:3 118:20 119:4 269:20 271:19,19 **July** 102:6 347:5,6,10 167:13 171:5 119:21 120:18 274:10 275:14 347:14

38:16 64:15 99:20 307:11 313:12 124:6 130:10 132:6 55:5,16 58:17 59:11 167:20 245:3 60:4 63:5,21 64:2 315:20 316:11 134:4 141:1 142:5 249:17 322:21 64:17 65:12 75:3,5 317:14 318:19,20 142:16,18 143:6,15 319:7,15 320:13 144:3 148:2 154:15 75:18 76:9 77:21 larger 33:13,13 111:16 161:5 154:18 155:20 80:2,13 84:8,14,15 321:11,13 322:19 324:4 327:4 328:10 308:15 156:5,9,11 159:7 88:7 92:1 97:18 330:11 331:8,15 largest 40:16 246:18 160:13 161:3 99:4,12 100:10,11 332:9,9 333:17,21 Larry 337:18 338:18 172:14 177:19 100:12,15 102:7 337:2,10 338:3 345:1 350:2 181:18 185:12 103:5 106:12 109:10,18 111:3,3 340:1,3,5,16,17 Larry's 340:2 186:5 187:19 188:8 188:21 189:4 113:3,12 118:7 343:8 347:5 348:2 lately 48:10 latest 82:21 193:17 204:14 121:12 124:8 348:11 352:11,11 205:9,10 206:7,20 127:11 128:4,18 353:16 Lautenbacher 63:6 211:1 216:10 129:4 131:3 132:12 knowing 25:20 92:10 66:13 78:16 93:17 219:15 222:15 133:16 135:11 156:21 280:5 100:5 160:9 173:13 224:18 225:18 137:9 139:2,9,15,20 knowledge 39:7 178:11 184:18 230:4 233:9 235:11 140:8,20 141:14,19 49:19 144:21 262:13 323:15 238:13,20 239:19 142:14,20 147:11 180:14 193:18 334:19 241:14 245:8 151:14 152:3,15 198:17 law 7:2,4 9:9 131:16 246:20 248:15 153:4,5 154:2,16,20 knowledgeable 57:6 157:20 200:3,9 251:7,11 254:15,21 155:7 164:13,15,16 known 39:11 41:18 216:17 324:2 346:3 66:15 180:4 193:21 laws 45:14 255:9 258:7 259:9 166:12 167:17 259:10 274:6 277:6 169:8 173:3 175:11 knows 141:3 169:12 lawyer 9:8 11:14 lay 121:18 281:20 295:3 302:1 179:2 180:3,11 282:6 313:18 352:4 304:9 308:8 313:13 184:5 185:2,10,15 Kurt 267:6 layered 107:16 141:4 313:20 315:18 laying 221:8,9 222:3 185:21 186:21 L 318:10 322:11 187:2,6,7,13 188:14 lead 13:18 14:6 23:19 la 345:1 337:15 338:19,20 190:12 192:12,14 23:20 61:21 65:16 labeled 62:16 265:9 342:5,18 343:4 193:8 194:9 195:5 65:17 66:3,5,8,9 laboratories 84:19 348:18 353:3 73:6 77:13 140:11 197:3,9 201:3,19 laboratory 84:21 kinds 23:1 172:7 202:7,13,19 203:6,9 158:1 186:17 lack 39:6 130:1 331:14 211:4,6,10,10,12,17 201:21 214:5 laid 40:12 168:18 kitchen 263:4 212:3,7,12 214:12 215:15,19 240:3 Lake 97:11 119:20 knew 33:1 103:16 218:14,21 219:5,11 267:11 270:13 land 200:9 114:21 219:17 220:3 221:3 353:6 language 106:10 knocking 142:19 221:8,13 222:13 leader 11:5 69:1 112:20 149:19,21 knots 19:15 223:12,15 224:9 186:8 152:10 174:3 know 4:20 5:8,18 227:10,19 228:16 leaders 69:2 216:15 218:14 9:11,16 10:3 11:2 230:12,14 231:20 leadership 20:8 244:18 245:1 12:13 14:20 16:2 231:21 232:3,5 64:16 72:13 80:18 250:18 262:16 18:18 20:4 21:14 233:3,4 234:9,12 92:11 158:21 215:6 327:21 328:3 23:14 27:12 28:8 237:5 249:15 253:9 215:8 217:17,18 331:17,18 218:2 225:11 29:20 30:18 33:18 262:10,12 263:17 lap 311:12 34:1,14,17 35:15 263:17 264:16 266:21 287:14 **LAPINE** 135:8 295:6 297:21 314:1 37:19,21 39:10,10 265:6 273:5 274:1 174:15 207:16 40:6 41:10 42:19 275:12,16 276:20 leaderships 291:18 344:18 43:7,15,19 44:19 276:20 282:4 **leading** 11:20 50:5 Larabee 340:7 295:11 298:14 287:19 45:15 48:11,15,16 large 19:1 33:16 300:1 303:10 leads 67:15 68:1 52:19,21 54:3,4

304:12 310:7 311:6 69:15 70:1,8 54:12,13 74:13 328:6,13,17 lead-in 123:5 100:8 107:12,18 lines 32:5 51:18 313:8,9 314:14 116:21 222:10 320:4 323:13 129:1,21 130:2,6 learn 14:14,19 33:2 267:8 346:7 35:4 53:4 300:14,14 144:6 145:8 152:11 328:21 329:13 336:3,12,14 338:19 link 304:1 303:9 178:19 183:6,14 195:18 198:5 248:3 linkages 110:18 350:17 learned 49:2 58:6 111:21 140:18 live 8:14 25:7 68:5 100:4,15 101:6 269:21 273:5,10 141:6 254:20 119:10,10 126:2 279:21 281:12 lives 239:9 290:10,11 301:15 links 315:21 316:2 264:17 319:20 levels 69:8 82:19 **Lipitor** 263:19 living 35:11 84:20 learning 114:6 LNG 23:8,9 333:7 leave 88:4 139:16,16 105:6 123:10 160:8 list 117:16 118:14,18 load 55:11 215:1 151:1 160:12 177:4 165:15 167:3 168:5 125:14,20 158:16 223:3 227:9 297:10 172:21 216:21 181:14 182:1 188:8 loaded 69:13 331:1 341:16,17 234:14,16 298:20 228:3 313:8,16 loading 199:9 344:13 331:14 338:15 **listed** 32:3 106:21 lobbyist 42:9 local 37:20 109:6,14 liability 39:2 41:7,7,9 220:10 265:12 leave-behind 316:3 leaving 16:20 210:19 147:7 198:16 listen 45:16,17 89:11 109:18 110:8 lectures 52:9 liberty 336:16 89:13 111:21 123:12 Listening 232:21 led 6:18 library 316:14,17 137:11 138:5 139:1 left 318:3 325:11 licensing 71:12 listing 105:14 118:20 139:4,7 141:10 legal 147:10 169:21 **LIDAR** 283:5,8,9,10 literacy 238:18 144:6 193:7 285:10 253:10,16,17,17 196:3 lies 217:4 293:17 **legislation** 7:4 160:2 life 20:13 47:14 53:13 literally 69:2 locally 111:10 161:3 240:6 245:5 224:20 248:2 little 4:12 5:1,6 7:16 locals 310:1 245:15,16 250:11 254:21 313:9 316:9 7:16,18 8:1 13:4 located 317:16,18 253:15,19 254:1 lifetime 248:18 24:13 30:9 33:2 location 161:11 258:1,2 **light** 18:12 61:11,16 36:20 43:18 44:15 logical 184:5 legislative 157:8 126:1 144:17 51:13,18 65:11 logistically 347:16 legitimate 75:6 196:21 217:20 68:21 71:4 74:17 logo 318:9 legitimize 318:10 likelihood 211:10 **Lolich** 102:4 82:1 93:16,20 94:6 length 195:8 284:9 likes 173:13,14 94:7 96:11 103:16 long 10:3 19:9 20:7 336:1 188:19 323:15 109:8 111:10 36:3 45:15 54:2 lengthy 5:17 Likewise 234:16 112:17 116:7 122:3 75:2,3 93:11 94:2 letter 332:15 333:10 limitations 94:1 124:4 128:9 131:9 94:17 117:1 128:16 333:10,12 335:4 limited 37:12 68:5 132:15 133:4 137:6 137:2 150:2 157:2 letters 243:1 247:13 297:10 298:10 138:15 140:9 167:17 177:6 243:4 limits 70:7,7 243:8 284:21 325:3 334:18 141:12 144:10 let's 37:4 50:1 60:16 line 36:7 60:21 67:3 147:16 152:7,15 325:3 326:4 longer 92:5,18 63:5 81:10 131:20 67:12 68:8 85:11 156:8,10 159:14 133:18 134:8 91:17 93:6 105:5 161:9 177:21,21 149:10 167:12 171:19 107:13 111:18 182:1 183:3 184:8 longs 222:1 178:15 201:13 112:21 117:4 157:3 186:8 198:14 213:3 long-term 6:18 22:21 170:19 181:18 213:1,1 237:15,17 222:11,14 225:19 67:16 309:16 238:2,8 298:7 192:13 201:1 202:2 226:6 233:9 240:13 327:14 311:16 325:2 329:8 202:3,14 203:20 257:20 258:9 look 18:9 19:16 23:3 329:9 235:12 248:9,17 264:14 269:21 26:7 40:11 44:16 Leutenbacher 179:20 254:16 257:10 273:4,20 274:5 49:3 56:2 62:11 level 22:19 40:5 296:2 301:9 308:12 275:3 280:1 283:11 67:4 73:16 79:19 316:5 318:5 322:8 284:15 297:11 80:5 83:5 86:8 46:14,15 51:12

89:13 92:18 96:19 332:1 337:17,20 146:6 147:6 212:8 309:12 312:18 98:11 103:17 105:5 320:18 330:6 352:8 338:12 343:20 331:19 105:19 106:1 lookouts 252:14 344:12 345:14 maintenance 39:17 111:19 116:17,19 looks 133:21 242:16 347:7,8,8 349:4 196:2 221:7,13 254:12,15 341:3 lots 19:13 23:7 28:4 222:2,7,13 125:1,7,19,20,20 36:9 44:10 66:19 major 4:13 8:2 11:10 126:17 128:13 looped 109:16 130:15,19 131:20 loose 342:20 344:16 70:7 95:14 172:18 12:17 17:18 22:13 24:10 25:1 26:9 lose 140:18 345:7 236:1 268:7 292:2 132:8 147:14 149:5 32:15 35:14 47:18 149:15 150:7 151:7 loser 255:19 305:8 314:20 151:10 157:3 losing 214:1 Lou 3:20 345:17 74:2 85:15 92:7 157:15 243:4 249:5 159:21 165:10 loss 110:1 Louisiana 33:4 lost 51:15 221:15,15 175:12 176:3 love 18:14 141:20 250:16 256:3 200:21 202:5 222:8 250:4 187:9 319:5 352:15 majority 344:9 lot 4:14 12:11 17:16 214:21 225:18 low 214:13 makeup 141:13 227:14 230:18 18:1,19 20:5 24:9 lower 19:12,15 41:12 making 13:8 55:13 231:19 244:6 251:1 24:19 25:14 26:17 178:14 58:2 66:11 77:16 251:10 252:3 256:3 32:6 41:19 43:15,16 loyal 36:4 115:17 119:5 45:17 47:6,16 49:2 267:13 270:8,16,20 luck 62:8 122:10 206:10 272:10 273:6 274:7 51:17 54:11 56:13 223:11 248:16 lump 305:20 275:3 280:13 64:6 67:3 75:4,16 lunch 3:9 36:17 249:15 260:21 281:14 294:16 76:4 81:8 82:12,14 53:14 74:10 95:20 266:15 269:4 295:13 296:9,11 83:1,3,11 84:10 96:2.3.11 148:8 286:13 288:18 298:7 302:3 304:5,6 85:11,12,17 89:11 175:17 177:8,15 291:2 343:2 305:11 307:2,9 91:21 99:17 104:6,7 180:21 323:5 mammal 252:14 Luncheon 177:17 309:17 316:18 109:7 117:10 118:2 mammals 251:7,9,10 L&D 47:15 324:4 329:9,10,21 127:20 128:19 251:21 252:4 253:3 277:15 132:18,20 137:18 333:20 342:19 M 343:15 345:3 138:3,9 140:5 man 19:5 225:17 Madison 242:11 348:10 353:19 141:19 145:13 manage 51:3 110:19 **magazine** 316:1,2 looked 56:7 82:15 146:1 147:20 334:16 319:1 92:7 104:5 126:2 150:16 155:4 managed 67:10 magenta 202:14 127:2 232:9 273:19 167:19 183:18 341:21 magic 194:17 285:16 294:18 184:3,6,10 198:7 management 6:9,14 magnitude 140:8 346:9 351:17 202:9 207:18 6:20 9:20 10:7 12:3 Magnuson 12:14 352:11 213:14,16 217:8 34:19,21 55:10,12 Magnuson-Stevens looking 13:3 27:13 223:7 230:11,16 57:8 64:7 82:5 6:13 10:1 12:2,9 29:16 54:4,7 86:5 234:2 239:11 242:1 100:19 145:17 168:10 250:17 89:7 92:4 95:15 242:21 244:13,15 189:11,21 250:13 259:17,19 104:4 111:14 131:9 245:10,17 250:14 250:19 251:5 266:4 main 42:9 82:4 131:10 134:4 256:18 257:13,16 269:3 279:5,14 325:20 135:18 142:9 145:8 263:13 264:17 288:10 290:11 maintain 77:16 145:17 152:3 266:8,11 268:12 295:1 300:10 145:16 202:6 204:3 167:11 176:6,16 272:8,8 273:1,18 306:13 307:14 204:5 177:1 179:17 274:13 275:18 317:19 319:14,19 maintained 38:10,11 197:15 202:10 278:1 281:1 283:21 320:17,18 321:16 41:18 76:3 189:10 248:17 251:16,18 284:15 285:13 321:17,20 322:13 190:2,6 191:21 255:9 256:5 271:20 286:5 288:21 289:1 323:9,10,20 326:6 192:7 274:5 280:11 295:18,20 293:1,5 300:8 308:9 327:13 328:10 maintaining 145:14 305:17 307:3 309:21 321:18 331:5 333:4,18

316:8 334:1 343:7 maritime 21:16 26:18 McFarland 194:2 mechanisms 113:12 manager 25:16 32:4,9,17 33:11 235:18 123:21 264:13 48:11 65:11 109:13 McGOVERN 57:15 medal 4:3 267:3 325:12 109:17 110:8 64:8 131:8,14 media 242:5 meet 29:10,21 63:7 managers 68:14 114:12 116:5,9 138:16 141:8 69:21 109:11 111:8 118:3 121:6,17 146:13 154:6 162:9 199:5 204:6 139:7 291:8 323:1,6 138:2,3,4 141:15 174:14 182:17 229:1 231:11 186:14 192:2 193:8 247:16 285:20 324:9 186:10,21 187:10 managing 25:12 32:2 187:12 235:2 208:2 218:13 230:7 292:8 293:5 300:2,4 50:19 51:10 188:18 236:14 320:1 332:4 231:6 232:6 315:11 305:8 328:8 331:4 325:4 mark 125:18 127:19 317:7 329:3 330:12 347:6,12 348:4,12 mandate 157:8 178:4,13,15 179:17 332:16 334:9 339:5 351:8,18 mandated 106:18 180:10 327:20 339:10,16 340:15 meeting 1:4,10 4:20 197:10 marked 243:15,16 346:2,17 354:1 5:18 29:18 30:19 mandates 155:11 255:5,7 259:19 McGovern's 115:10 31:11 37:3 46:15 mandatory 204:6 market 233:7 242:8 192:3 57:13 87:1,4,5,9 manmade 112:11 marketing 242:10 mean 57:10 60:5,6 92:12 93:7,18 94:3 125:4 markets 48:8 233:1 65:20 66:4 117:5 96:17 97:17 98:18 manner 170:11 171:3 marks 201:7 118:15 125:1 101:16,21 103:13 280:8 290:5 333:11 markup 243:8 259:3 137:12 153:18 103:18 113:7 114:4 334:6 Marouski 303:20 177:9 192:6 197:21 115:17 120:3,5 mantra 242:21 married 241:16 198:4 214:13 225:7 132:9,13,19 142:17 manual 100:21 **Maryland** 355:1,4 226:21 227:3,4,12 142:18 147:21 map 239:2 Massachusetts 228:2 230:14 287:8 149:1 158:19 mapping 235:3,20 324:17 290:15 293:17 168:15,16 176:19 273:8 298:20 massage 156:10 301:16 320:17 178:8 179:7 189:2 **MARAD** 77:11 225:19 331:20 346:21 206:8 225:18 226:4 186:10 massages 226:1 meaning 321:19 229:3,15 230:3 March 244:3 323:2,6 match 162:10,10 meaningful 32:14 242:11 244:4 65:19 136:15 **margins** 323:17 201:13 256:20 264:21 Marinas 331:10 material 145:17 153:18 157:4 167:1 265:2 271:18 marine 6:3,4,21 7:4 306:18 172:21 179:10 288:16 291:3,7 9:13 10:10 11:12,16 materials 189:13 187:15 235:15 310:21 311:10,19 14:1 36:2 39:18 190:13 229:19 309:9 311:11 339:4 312:1,9 318:13,17 46:12 47:1 71:9,11 matrix 67:10 72:10 means 32:16 65:17 323:1 329:9,13 81:1 85:2 95:6 105:18 65:18 84:11 114:17 336:9,10,12,13 98:12 129:8,9 matter 1:3,9 84:14 125:11 132:7,7 337:20 338:1 90:18 107:14 167:4 217:5 220:8 339:19 341:9,16,18 153:11 163:21 184:11 217:9 218:5 176:9 181:9 183:5 220:19 255:18 342:18 343:1,9 218:6 236:3 321:6 256:18 264:15 184:6,20 191:2 344:13 346:16,19 198:10 204:21 349:11 274:11 278:1 346:21 347:2,18 214:11 234:12 matures 48:19 291:21 327:8 348:11 349:21 meant 47:1 69:12 251:7,8,10,21 252:4 Maxim 18:12 350:2,7,17 351:4,5 252:14 253:2 273:7 Mayport 194:5 measure 75:19 353:18,19 302:11 326:16 May-June 255:2 210:20 252:9 272:6 meetings 29:19 62:15 327:12,15 331:17 **McBRIDE** 31:20 measuring 278:13 78:15,19 86:12 89:7 351:7 33:4 97:10 120:9 meat 135:10 106:17 132:21 mariners 37:17 193:6 228:16 229:11 mechanics 86:12 133:3 175:21 180:9 198:19 277:9 303:1 230:6 312:5 mechanism 224:12 200:6 223:6,7,15

missing 135:8 207:12 129:1,10,12,14 228:17 256:20 315:2 314:4 315:1 322:20 messages 76:19,20 227:4 135:14 144:3,4 349:4 352:14 met 183:12 mission 6:17 9:1 153:2,15 154:17 meets 148:3 299:18 meta 280:6 14:15 15:7 20:10 164:10,10 168:11 198:4 202:6,9 212:5 46:19 79:16 81:19 mega-vessels 75:1 metal 38:17 member 7:7,7 11:15 methods 85:19 82:4 112:15 125:8 212:16,20 213:9 246:21 248:3,8,21 47:15 166:13 207:3,4 190:10,12 204:13 Mexico 15:1 23:21 254:5 261:14 members 3:4,19 238:14 269:20 24:1 44:21 129:16 270:2 271:5 275:21 273:20 275:15 12:21 31:15 40:6 91:21 95:2 97:20 239:1 285:14 286:2 290:16 293:9 288:16 300:4,5,6 296:13,15 301:20 103:4 104:17 microphones 31:18 middle 203:11 284:1 306:8 307:10 309:7 107:13 150:5 301:8 162:20 204:17 284:20 351:4 missions 63:18 79:21 309:12,14,18,21 160:11 191:15 324:13,14,15,17,18 241:11 242:6,10 mid-August 339:8 254:4 269:16 262:1 265:17 292:7 Mike 31:10 32:21 324:21 313:11 314:15 48:16 61:3 154:2 270:12 money's 333:8 315:6 352:21 353:3 184:17 189:3 214:5 Mississippi 41:12 Monica 96:5 membership 262:4 216:11 267:5 moniker 72:14 115:16 memo 290:21 291:6 Mike's 269:21 mistake 337:9 monitored 98:15 291:10 297:21 mile 253:3 mix 333:5 monitoring 14:3 miles 19:14 38:7 **Mobile 194:5** 32:15 192:20 memorandum 290:14 military 79:15 mockup 314:11 194:10 million 39:1 51:1,18 memos 297:15 318:12,15 319:4 month 44:18 114:21 mockups 317:21 mention 152:17 56:4 60:4,5 210:13 251:16,17 292:9 207:7 230:7 319:16 248:10,12 261:5,10 modal 313:16 months 13:10,11 266:9,12 294:6,21 mode 345:3 22:16 23:3 29:21 320:12 295:2 296:1,2 306:1 model 49:13 89:15 44:18 50:1 156:4,4 mentioned 31:21 47:12 52:10 73:21 308:6 324:19 195:18 197:4 156:5 168:15 93:2,4 145:5,13 Minas 218:15 282:17,18 323:20 276:12 338:8 208:14 230:9 mind 32:12 71:13 324:7 morning 3:2 5:9 7:10 modeling 266:5,17 7:15 34:2 36:14 264:12 268:13 75:14,15 184:4 269:17 289:14 232:21 324:3 55:15 88:13 89:2 268:18 280:21 291:8 299:8 302:10 minds 29:3 62:21 281:2 288:2 91:4 177:16 178:21 306:14 314:3 mine 146:17 models 82:12 83:2,4 183:3 195:21 206:7 319:17 320:2 350:2 mined 194:4 268:19 280:12 321:9 281:5 282:2,9 motion 174:7,9,10 352:1,2,2 mining 194:12 mentioning 183:7 minor 153:6 328:11 modern 38:12 76:2 206:10 310:20 196:20 344:21 348:21 **Modernization** 82:19 311:19 322:17 merely 185:7 349:8,14 83:10 188:12,20 353:21 213:19 215:7 352:2 merges 245:1 minuses 28:16 motions 103:1,5 merit 216:6 minute 17:19 100:17 modified 276:1 223:20 156:6 161:4 175:15 mom 78:18 80:14 motivated 124:10 message 43:9 54:9 58:3,4 64:2 66:1 266:13 moment 20:11 79:9 motivation 154:15 72:5,21 125:10 minutes 78:2 87:4,8 momentum 349:4 motor 124:1 224:6,6 237:17 140:16 143:13 Monday 37:2 **mounted** 125:12 money 44:13,15 45:5 move 3:9 7:12 8:12 160:16 167:15 311:14 336:2 169:2 170:14 misinterpreted 217:3 59:20 64:6 73:19 10:5 13:2 15:20 171:14 234:6 239:7 **misleading** 201:1,10 74:9,15,18 75:11,17 16:8 18:2 22:4 33:9 missed 146:2 224:10 44:1 45:1 46:4 245:13,14 289:5,10 113:18 127:15

55:17 59:3 83:12 209:18 224:13 nature 12:13 28:18 46:3 56:7 57:2,17 85:9 90:4 120:4 228:11 232:18 92:6 145:10 338:14 72:16,16 75:7,8 133:19 148:14 nautical 147:9 77:11,14 79:20,20 N 234:13 253:3 273:7 160:1,1,4 161:11 82:18 85:20 86:14 N 3:1 86:15,17 88:20 90:4 162:3 174:4,5 177:4 navigate 126:6 **NAB** 109:11 111:8,8 181:20 186:5 224:2 **navigation** 2:6,9 5:16 90:10 96:3 110:9 123:21 139:6,15 243:19 244:18 66:1 75:10 97:13 113:1 122:10,11 293:6,13 304:2 112:9,16 123:8 245:4 250:19 125:7 126:20 127:2 name 5:4,5 111:5 126:16 129:10 252:11 255:3 130:11,15,18 253:20 266:10 258:21 259:15 186:18,20 187:18 135:10 146:15 284:19 286:15 268:11 272:21 191:20 193:5 149:10,19 156:17 320:12 322:1,3,4 195:15,16 196:2,5,8 157:19 166:9,11 286:12 291:16 named 267:2 292:10,18 294:2,17 196:10 198:18 168:12 171:18 names 5:3 253:19 200:4 204:1,4 219:2 174:4 177:11 180:9 295:2 312:3,20 naming 116:4 325:18 327:1 345:9 219:18 221:5,20 188:21 191:12,16 NASA 64:17,18,20 349:16 222:9,12 270:8,13 196:7 207:1 216:20 239:4 253:19 254:3 moved 8:17 55:9 293:16 326:11 218:9 222:10 254:5,8,12 255:6,12 navigational 2:16 227:16,18 234:12 104:1 174:12 257:11,12 283:3 178:10 262:4 268:4 5:14 42:6 75:6 81:2 243:6 246:11,12,13 301:7,8,19,21 285:16 311:20 100:13 195:2 198:1 254:7 261:9,9 263:1 nation 32:4,10,16 212:11 232:10 312:2 349:1 354:1 264:6 265:1 268:21 40:17 115:13 215:8 movement 48:5 296:19 269:13,13 274:14 249:17 movers 182:15 navigationally 38:7 278:14 281:10,10 national 2:10,18 6:1 moves 72:14 107:21 Navy 54:18 120:14 281:12,14,16,17,19 13:16 14:10 15:11 moving 26:7 45:6,7 241:18 248:5,12 281:21 282:2,8 16:8,10,21 20:3 54:13 82:13 166:10 249:3,9 254:14 284:3 285:3 288:11 22:14 25:2 26:17 166:16,18,21 Navy's 249:6 288:14 290:3,3 39:11 80:21 81:1 167:12 169:12 NDBC 279:21 294:20 296:13 85:2 99:18 100:18 230:9 258:17 276:5 near 22:15 132:8 298:2 301:5 302:2 100:19 104:5 107:1 287:14 289:4 185:11 277:8 306:13 307:13 107:19 122:4,13 286:20 317:8 334:12 343:1 308:10 325:16 128:18 149:20 nearest 189:14 341:5 343:16 349:13 154:14 159:19 needed 120:19 136:4 MTS 40:1,2,3,3 71:10 nearing 248:2,18 186:14,15 242:20 nearly 40:20 170:9 252:4 323:7 71:15 74:12 75:10 244:9 249:12 252:3 195:1 215:9,20 **NEC 286:9** needs 33:7,8 48:18 253:19 255:21 necessarily 42:2 55:3 57:9,11 69:17 314:19 258:4,10 262:20 MTSNAC 102:1,5,9 104:17 111:3,7 70:21 71:2 72:17 264:12 267:16 183:18 136:11 166:12 81:19 85:18 108:2,4 279:11 302:11 multi 82:20 197:6 231:1 122:2 136:2 140:20 313:15 322:7,9 multiple 161:2 necessary 109:1 143:20 144:1 147:1 323:1 328:18 multiple-party 117:6 166:14 175:1 157:9,9 165:21 351:16 352:10 209:15 228:12 166:6 167:2 181:16 341:20 nation's 6:21 153:13 multi-beam 38:3,19 necessity 15:6 185:6 196:17 155:15 163:12 82:3 190:1 need 4:9 9:5 10:4,5 197:19 198:1 239:5 15:17,20 19:20 21:1 201:20,21 202:12 multi-level 235:11 natural 72:1 112:10 multi-year 6:18 21:6 24:2 25:4 216:18 291:3 293:6 125:4 215:5 251:19 mutual 10:4,17 26:16 28:6,7,9 295:3 299:18 317:4 352:17 mutually 67:14 29:10 36:6,6 43:20 323:11 324:8 naturally 263:20 326:12 351:17 **MYRTIDIS** 207:19 43:21 44:7,8,14

needy 171:12 **nipped** 211:2 161:15 163:16 319:17 320:8 negative 287:8 nitty-gritty 138:11 164:17 166:5,6 321:14 322:7 167:15,18 170:7,20 nervous 330:8 NOAA 2:4,9,10,18 323:15 325:21 5:14,16 6:6,7,16,19 172:1 176:8 179:14 344:2 346:1 **NESBIS 267:7,12** 8:3,8,10 11:6,17 179:17 180:7 NOAA's 2:16 5:21 net 40:14 13:8,14 14:13 15:6 181:20 182:11,13 6:2,8,12 8:20 23:18 network 144:9 never 33:1 44:6 54:20 16:8 17:20 20:21 182:13,15 184:12 25:16 62:9 63:21 73:2 87:2 95:3 58:6 60:9,10 74:13 22:14 23:20 26:3,19 184:14,17 185:6,8 185:14,20,20 96:20 98:9 100:16 77:10 90:9 131:14 27:1,6,15 28:6 186:16 187:5,6,8 101:12 104:3,11,20 131:17 179:8 225:2 32:12 34:1,7 38:19 106:2,19 107:7 231:9 298:5 330:17 39:9 40:6 44:10 188:10,15,17,18 189:6,21 191:1,18 110:11 112:9 new 1:12 5:8,10,11 46:12,16 50:16,20 8:15 14:11 16:19 50:21 51:10,15 192:4,19 193:3 123:12 126:10 145:6 155:21 178:9 20:7 27:3 30:20 54:16,18 57:4,6,20 194:19 195:1,5,14 180:17 187:16 37:10 38:1 49:18 57:20 58:4,5,6,9 196:14,17 197:12 58:14 76:1 93:7,17 59:9,10 60:13 62:3 197:13,19 198:1,13 190:1 198:19 204:2 62:12,16 63:2 65:5 198:17 199:10,13 205:7 206:2 211:7 121:8 176:20 216:16 261:7 65:19 66:15,17 67:4 199:15 201:6 204:4 181:19 205:6 67:9 68:3 69:17 204:7,13,16,21 262:10 264:13 216:15 243:9 71:8 72:13 73:1 206:5,19,21 209:3,3 267:17,17 268:5,6 249:21 265:10 210:4 211:12 297:20 311:3 76:15 77:1,9 78:17 286:7,9,21 297:15 312:11 324:15 80:17 87:16 93:21 212:15 213:13 301:20 311:9 325:14 335:9,14 94:14 95:5 97:2 214:5 215:5,7,14,18 312:14 313:11 337:12 98:1,10 99:14,21 216:8,20 217:4 319:13,19 321:15 218:1,21 220:13 340:19 349:13 news 31:5 45:8 100:8,20 103:19 224:15 227:8,19 353:8 238:21 104:10 105:4,11,12 233:1,1,4 235:4,15 **NOAA/CORE** 4:2 newsletter 114:20 105:16,18 106:15 newspapers 116:1 107:3,6,12 108:4,13 241:18 243:6 NOAA/NOS 37:9 NGOs 241:9 109:19,21 110:14 246:17,18,21 247:4 38:8 39:7 111:5,12,14 112:7 247:9,10,19 250:7 NOAA/NOS's 42:1 NGS 55:10 97:4 123:17 152:8 112:11 113:15 252:20 253:20,21 NOC 289:16 292:5 254:15 255:7,12,13 155:15 116:6,15 118:13 NOCS 84:20 nice 8:7 17:3 23:4 119:6 120:10 256:8,10 257:1 nod 317:5 **nodded** 317:7 57:12 85:10 89:13 121:11,14 122:2,9 258:18 260:13 149:21 318:9 122:19 124:10 261:4,16,19 262:3 noise 18:18 nonlegal 171:5 nicely 253:13 125:19 126:7,16 263:13 264:3,15 night 8:19 232:18 127:6,15,18,20 265:5 266:20,21 nonvoting 11:15 320:5 130:9 131:11,21 267:10,14,16 noon 175:11 335:16 nightmare 240:10 133:6 139:4,6 140:1 268:10 269:6,16 335:18 140:6,13,18,20,21 270:14 278:6 279:5 normally 277:14 347:16 nightmarish 240:17 141:18 142:2,4,5,10 279:8 285:14,19,21 **NOS** 2:6,8 6:21 13:10 13:19 17:14,20 20:4 NIH 250:7 142:11,19,21 286:3,9 290:10,13 Nina 50:3 237:9,14 143:10,14 145:18 290:20 291:3 20:8 23:19 24:12 32:3 44:11 47:13,17 237:18 238:6,8 147:2,8,8,14 149:3 292:13,20 294:5,7 49:2 52:13 55:2 260:5 263:11 149:5,15,18 150:14 296:8 298:18 150:19 151:13 301:19,21 305:17 59:10 60:12 66:2 268:14 Nina's 295:19 153:14 154:17 305:20 306:20 68:9 70:19 75:12 157:8 159:14,17,19 313:3 314:1,3,8,17 76:1 80:18 84:1,17 nine 285:12 85:6 90:16 93:10,12 Nino 285:6 160:6,11,14,21 314:21 316:1,5,12

numbers 21:20 129:7 289:18 297:1,3 oceanographic 1:12 94:14 128:21 301:5 306:2 307:17 249:17 129:11 143:13 188:9 200:18 146:20 159:14,18 228:12 236:8 256:5 308:16 oceans 21:6,9 54:13 64:20 239:9 240:20 160:15,17 180:5 257:4 263:7 295:20 obstacle 240:4 numerical 228:1 obstruction 221:16 240:21 241:10,17 187:7 211:13 nuts 83:6 obstructions 221:11 242:14 243:5 260:14 267:9,11 249:20 250:4,11,20 292:12 308:13 nutshell 72:5 222:3,4,9 obvious 106:14 251:1 254:8 257:5 317:18 340:19 0 187:20,20 258:14 263:16 NOSC 289:16 292:6 O 3:1 51:14 159:13 obviously 45:1 47:2 264:1 285:4 NOS's 43:4 68:11 oar 71:1 267:4,11 52:7 61:18 65:3 ocean-related 240:6 160:10 268:5 326:21 328:8 94:9 139:10 149:9 256:7 257:14,17 Notary 355:3,10 object 82:5 145:18 note 8:8 31:2 168:2 178:10 303:3 Ocean.US 287:3,4,9 146:4,7 287:11 294:11 notes 112:11 223:4 313:10 314:2 objection 157:2 347:14 299:11 306:12,19 223:11 objections 224:10 notice 193:5 277:9 occasion 75:21 odd 190:3 objectives 16:9 noticed 18:16 182:18 offend 287:8 occur 263:19 obligate 113:1 notices 236:20 occurred 15:1 79:7 offer 191:1,1 197:14 observation 25:13 99:16 104:18 112:6 227:7 311:8 312:14 no-brainers 149:6 34:5 59:8 256:4 NRT 120:11,15 131:3 244:2 314:9 315:3 317:3 261:18 269:19 NRTs 123:18 124:2 occurs 108:8 328:11 351:10 271:19 283:13 129:2 130:3 135:13 ocean 2:14,17 4:13 offering 208:5 292:19 299:7 303:9 office 3:15 5:12 6:15 135:14 6:1,3 13:16 16:8,11 322:14 11:18 14:9 16:17 NSF 241:18 242:15 16:21 20:4 22:14 observations 26:6 25:7,13 26:15,17 32:20 54:13 55:9 248:3,12 254:14 130:1 165:18 255:7,12 299:9,10 50:17 51:2,14,19 67:12 93:6 105:5 220:20 238:6 NSF-funded 299:7 52:1 56:6 57:8 60:4 111:18 117:5 137:1 265:15 266:3,6 **NSRP** 2:13 65:4 93:11 160:5 139:16 194:3 205:7 268:20,21 276:7 NTF 139:1 183:4 195:11 287:7 313:4,5,19 278:14 281:10,11 317:15,18,19,19 NTSB 313:15 238:14,17,18,19 284:17 288:1,11,13 325:13,15 number 13:18 16:16 239:2,5,8,12,13,17 289:19 290:3,4 officer 5:9 109:20 26:11 45:7 65:2,14 239:18 241:6,11,15 299:13 305:7 offices 3:14 67:3 68:8 71:7 72:18,19,19 242:8,15 243:21 308:13 322:2,3,6 244:10,16 247:15 86:19 93:6 97:4 76:17 105:14 108:7 333:3 108:11 112:4 114:8 247:20 249:5 107:13,13 113:1 observatories 242:15 250:16 251:21 152:1 267:8 304:18 114:8 119:16 256:4 126:18,20 129:16 253:8,10,16 256:4 313:17 316:5 322:8 **observe** 276:12 131:10,16 165:6 257:21 258:4,5,11 328:7,13,17 observed 82:16 196:14 197:11 259:5 261:5,8 official 5:11 104:15 **observing** 2:17 32:2 265:11,14 266:11 141:17,21 152:9 203:14 205:15 50:17 51:2 52:1 207:20 209:7 210:3 266:14,15 267:6,16 199:14 204:3 54:12 56:6 60:4 267:17,20 268:16 217:13 317:4 213:12 214:4 244:16 246:9,10 215:13 218:15,21 272:2 278:8,12 offline 130:1 258:6 259:5 261:5,8 offshore 47:15 48:15 219:4,6 221:2 281:4,5 282:10,14 266:11,14,15 225:10,15 228:4 282:15 284:17,18 Oftentimes 221:7 267:17 268:15 oh 134:13 146:15 288:1 289:16 290:1 236:15 245:4 271:11 272:2 278:8 254:15 263:1 291:2 297:1,3 299:7 152:17 173:20 278:8,10 281:4,5 288:11 322:20 301:4,13 303:9 174:20 231:20 284:11,19 289:17 322:14 332:9 346:20 347:14 306:2 322:7

196:11 197:7 oil 14:1 81:2 114:19 onset 140:4 330:19 345:17 191:10 192:16 on-scene 110:4 346:14 350:4 351:1 229:11 317:6 324:6 okay 30:11 50:11 140:11 opposed 164:4 175:4 351:7 56:7 69:6 81:9 OOI 299:9 226:9,10 234:1 ounce 59:15,16 266:9 312:2 outcomes 253:13 83:17 95:11 96:10 op 192:3 open 28:3,9,20 29:7 ops 101:7 outcome-based 185:5 118:11 125:4 optimism 248:3 132:14 149:20 30:20 31:14 32:12 185:12 optimistic 17:11 outdone 260:2 36:9 72:3 101:19 156:11 161:10 outline 313:2 322:12 103:4 106:8 114:1 36:13 163:5 175:2,20 optimize 19:17 288:1 322:16 177:15 182:1,2 121:13 124:4 outlined 71:5 192:16,18 200:5 148:11 151:13 300:5 optimum 6:10 outlook 30:17 36:13 201:5 210:17 224:1 204:17 206:12,13 238:2 264:8 266:11 216:3 295:9 325:5 options 158:20 163:8 outpacing 348:14 346:7 163:9 168:17 275:1 294:9 305:9 output 218:7,9 outset 140:4 311:16 312:2,4 **opened** 14:18 orally 169:9 320:20 322:14 opening 5:18 43:14 ORC 306:3 outside 3:5 9:10 50:7 63:17 101:10 121:7 order 60:19 91:1 69:6,16 73:10 121:9 324:10 328:20 190:2 233:2 279:19 313:20 183:20 193:13 339:19 340:12,12 opens 147:21 208:8 228:2 238:3 outward 304:10 353:11 old 2:19 21:18 40:11 operability 305:14 269:12 274:13 outyear 67:17 69:5 overall 96:20 122:7 operable 38:2 285:15 57:16 165:10 176:17 215:17 operate 20:6 252:21 organic 159:11,17 122:12 140:11 233:17 329:17 276:7 311:1 312:4 operating 100:21 160:7,12,13,21 108:21 112:19 overarching 179:21 OMB 29:1 31:3 243:6,11 258:18 287:9 overcome 246:7 179:15 214:3,7 313:10 overhead 99:3 182:5 242:1 314:9 326:1 operation 108:19 organization 10:12 123:15 172:1 10:20 16:11,12 overlap 152:10 339:14 operational 107:14 114:19,20 120:18 184:11 OMP 57:5 once 27:4 91:1 94:11 116:20 117:2 135:19 143:18 overlapping 187:14 187:17 114:21 142:8 299:15 301:4,12 155:9 265:8 305:5 overlaps 195:13 164:17 169:7 309:5 325:10 326:14 operations 26:21 overlooked 126:13 240:15 246:6 organizations 17:21 80:15 101:8 112:14 275:20 280:6 281:7 67:11 117:15,20 126:14,14 221:10 222:4 253:4 118:5 119:6 155:4 overly 94:6,7 282:13 283:16 284:6 294:8 300:2 301:19 164:9 250:8 overseen 6:8 organized 121:11 overshoot 125:18 operator 193:2 301:1,10 opinion 133:5 210:4 ones 50:12 53:14,15 186:3 179:17 180:10 159:18 219:7 240:7 262:10 331:1 orientation 11:7 47:7 overshooting 178:3 oversight 267:21 258:3 291:8 310:11 opportunities 7:18 original 127:17 269:7 one-for-one 201:12 30:21 159:9 308:9 153:17 oversimplifying one-liner 63:16 opportunity 3:9,17 Orleans 121:8 **Osborne** 120:11 125:6 one-pager 97:3 8:12,14 9:2 10:15 overview 2:17 260:6 one-sentence 165:13 13:3,5 27:13 30:1,7 **OSHA** 239:6 overwhelming 78:20 ongoing 92:14 97:9 30:20 36:16 61:8 **OSSE** 283:3 62:2 63:12 72:21 owe 34:10,11,12 100:3 101:14 OSSEs 282:11 77:19 91:5 96:1 238:16 295:12 91:18 102:8 150:18 ought 23:16 28:6 342:15 316:1 168:13 173:11 54:7 57:14 62:1 179:1 224:9 307:20 89:18,19 115:18 owned 18:11 online 130:6 118:4 159:3 196:11 owners 39:3 41:7 ONR 257:18 311:4 326:20

paying 35:17 329:18 342:1 owner's 38:21 232:7 271:7,8 o'clock 335:16 350:8 partial 202:3 payment 96:11 320:14 321:12 322:13 326:10 partially 231:16 pays 53:15 330:2 332:1,9 participate 107:6 peace 224:8 P3:1 papers 99:2 114:7 310:3 339:17 peanuts 53:3 PAC 306:5 182:2 344:19 participation 123:13 pending 2:14 224:5 pace 348:13 paradigm 133:9 particular 31:9 penny 8:6 Pacific 239:2 323:9 126:18 141:1 154:1 people 8:3 9:5,11 package 133:11,15 156:1 159:10 16:13,13 17:11 paradigms 18:8 148:2 161:9 181:6 paragraph 151:7 214:11 216:6 18:20 20:17,18,19 223:9 341:13 165:3,10,13 166:3 242:16 249:16 21:1,1,3 23:8 24:6 packaged 341:9 167:16 170:4,16 258:16 259:14 25:6,19 27:8,18 packed 5:19 225:2 226:5 327:3,7 296:9 300:9 322:1 34:12 36:8 39:8,9 page 2:1 109:20 328:6,7,12 350:16 42:7,19 45:15,17 117:1 154:5 170:5,5 parallel 67:11 199:16 particularly 3:21 5:4 47:17 48:7 52:17 170:18,18 228:15 284:14 93:1,8,13 155:19 55:6 57:21 59:10 paid 41:21 96:1 paraphrase 102:18 parties 170:8 174:18 60:14 63:10 64:17 235:9 294:5,6 parcel 172:17 **Partly 225:9** 67:11 74:16 77:19 pain 60:18 parlance 185:5 partnering 11:7 84:10,11,14 101:1 paint 245:20 246:5 partners 15:9,12 28:4 Parsons 3:17 4:2 106:12 109:16,17 panel 3:4,8,10 5:10 97:6 107:7 143:11 part 3:18 4:5 8:10 110:2,9 111:1,9,10 5:13 27:11 47:16 269:5 10:6 17:6 20:10.10 113:11 114:21 73:13 86:6 87:10 20:14 33:8 36:19 partnership 197:20 115:20 118:1 119:8 91:21 93:19 95:2 45:3 51:15,20 52:19 286:17 323:10 138:4 139:2,3,5 98:7 118:8 126:2 73:14 77:15 78:12 partnerships 26:4 142:14 144:7,8 148:4 149:9 156:11 82:7,14 84:6,18 274:3 155:1 167:19 176:4 157:7 159:5 162:9 119:14 121:5 133:1 parts 21:17 35:14 190:14 197:8 162:19 169:6,17,19 133:3 139:6,7 140:1 115:6,13 116:8 217:21 218:11 171:14 175:18 143:12 149:13 135:19 205:18 220:11 229:15 178:13 180:17 246:8,14 270:5 230:1,11,16,16 155:6 157:8,15 181:15 187:2,4 172:17 175:21 327:2 233:5 239:4 246:9 188:1 223:10 178:5,5 185:17 party's 134:12 252:10 261:17 260:12 313:10 213:16 215:13 pass 37:21 90:17 264:18 266:7 268:8 314:13,15,16 315:5 219:9 230:21 309:7 334:21 349:2 269:6 273:18 318:2 333:19 336:1 232:20 233:12,16 passage 245:6 274:14 275:12,13 337:18 341:14 264:11 266:2 267:8 passed 102:12 149:8 278:1,7 279:19,19 343:21 344:6,9,14 268:16,16 269:14 171:12 244:19 280:10 281:6,15 Panels 2:7 258:19 259:7 270:13 271:4,16,17 282:8,13 285:13 panel's 328:1 338:4 272:9 274:11 275:2 341:12 289:5 290:19 292:2 343:21 344:10 293:18 297:12 275:21 276:15 passing 319:16 320:2 349:16 278:20 281:4,6 passion 228:20 306:14,16 307:20 paper 37:7 57:8,10 passionate 17:8,13 308:7 316:9 324:1 285:5,6,9,11,18 86:15 87:18 98:17 286:3 287:1 291:12 163:16 334:6 335:19 340:5 102:16 105:11 293:14,18,20,21 path 211:16 283:9 340:9 342:2 347:7.8 109:9 112:18 294:2,3 295:13 284:1 347:10 348:7 116:18 133:20 patterns 285:9 299:9,10,21 307:16 350:13,14 147:17 158:16 309:11,19 322:15 Pause 150:12 people's 62:20 293:5 171:11 181:8 182:6 pay 35:10 53:5,16 perceive 162:11 326:11,18 327:1 189:18 201:13 328:6,13,16,17,19 96:3 350:20

69:7 92:6 98:13 perceiving 158:11 126:19 147:18 279:10 280:20 percent 21:19 40:18 148:2,9 176:7,9 100:18 104:6 111:1 284:7 286:4 289:13 40:18 41:14 43:4.6 178:4 179:2 223:8 111:12 122:4,14 311:14,16 353:5 60:3,3 69:18 83:15 233:14 237:19 141:16 160:5 183:4 pleased 5:15 185:7 84:12 180:8 201:4 301:6 302:13 185:11 195:11 299:3 211:8 212:1,9 213:7 327:20 337:18 199:17 201:6,14 pleasure 5:12 7:9 238:21 304:20 338:21 343:15 204:8 207:1,2 plenty 77:13 175:9 346:18 picked 235:5 220:10 239:13 plight 70:8 percentage 179:19 picking 95:19 125:15 250:21 251:19 plug 117:17 197:6 perception 83:2 130:13 226:15 272:3,12,13,15 plugged 115:3 perfect 69:11 190:21 325:15 277:16 287:16 **pluses** 28:16 perform 79:16 pictorials 246:4 290:8,11 292:17 point 12:6 24:12 **period** 12:5 31:12 picture 56:9 78:14 293:12,14,15,18 42:10 62:2 70:3 244:6 188:4 196:12 294:1,18 296:8 76:16 77:5 80:9 permit 194:1 252:21 245:20 246:5 260:3 300:11 309:4,11,14 98:6 108:11 116:11 permits 194:11.15 260:4 274:11 309:15,20 341:3 120:11 122:18 perplexed 213:3 pictures 33:16 277:5 352:10,12 126:1 128:15 person 13:13 27:1,2 piece 3:21 37:7 52:18 plane 229:14 131:13,20 133:15 86:20 87:12,13 64:21 74:17 87:8 planned 248:14,19 135:1 136:6 140:7 123:15 140:19 planning 65:18 66:6 110:16 111:1 124:9 143:8 146:21 138:8 160:2 234:10 143:5,6 226:19,20 67:17 69:5 278:3 149:11 150:15 229:12 236:21 250:6 311:3 331:8 287:7 290:15,19 153:2 158:18 163:5 325:12 326:3 331:15 332:8 292:11 164:13 169:3,7 pieces 49:10 56:13 plans 73:2 93:11 personal 124:1 172:10 173:5 330:15 336:15 111:19 198:7 101:3 103:15 174:15 177:21 personally 30:18 234:19 244:13 106:10 107:2 108:9 179:19 185:4 108:15,19 110:3 153:21 334:16 246:14 258:1 261:8 193:15 194:7 personnel 107:5 262:15 116:17 138:8 142:8 199:12 202:4 203:7 perspective 86:16 pier 193:11 277:1 206:11 221:12 105:21 211:15 piers 192:1,21 plate 50:17 166:17 224:1 233:1 248:16 251:2,3 297:11 pilot 48:6,12 307:19 plates 318:11 252:11 257:1 pilots 38:15 72:16 299:1 305:11 play 27:6 46:18 71:13 258:20 261:6 341:17 120:13 121:10 71:20 77:7 80:9 265:20 266:5 267:6 perspectives 353:10 136:6 193:4 100:2 111:20 267:12 268:10 pet 80:3 309:7 place 8:20,21 18:21 118:17 120:7 281:20 285:11,14 Petroleum 97:12 18:21 59:2 77:17 133:17 155:21 299:10 312:10 phase 296:9,10 111:21 124:2 185:15 197:6 203:1 329:6 339:15 340:9 phase-in 201:18 126:19 169:19 211:15 214:19 341:4,13 342:11 202:21 209:5 206:15 208:5 220:1 played 6:12 296:13 343:20 344:7 phenomenally 220:18 223:18 player 185:7 348:10 119:20 267:2 316:18 336:9 players 108:5 119:17 pointed 39:11 93:15 phone 136:21 237:2 336:10 137:18 269:13 163:15 190:9 211:9 346:5 placeholder 137:21 293:1 218:15 photogrammetry placement 196:8 playing 76:15 pointing 123:7 154:3 123:10 219:17 220:1 plays 68:18 216:21 159:13 places 41:12 44:10 phrase 114:12 pleasant 36:17 points 39:16 42:18,19 physical 280:13 272:7 347:17 please 3:10 15:13 133:2 134:2 147:13 322:3 plan 25:10 26:15 63:4 83:13 96:2 153:6 155:14 pick 51:19 99:11 62:12 67:18,19,19 127:6 237:15 253:8 202:17 303:20

309:11 312:6,10 303:3,11 322:4 preface 127:3 prevent 136:12 **Poland** 160:3 332:18 prefaced 182:11 prevention 58:15,16 policies 89:16 92:20 ports/national prefer 329:6 209:14 333:13 189:15 preference 329:8 policy 6:4,12,19 preliminary 321:15 posed 152:6,18,20 12:11 93:10,12,14 **position** 12:1,19 prep 89:5 199:19 237:11 23:18,20 31:16 44:6 preparation 132:5 238:15,18 323:16 75:1 150:2 158:1 162:11,19 326:9 159:2 167:21 prepare 204:8 265:3 policy-wise 213:15 168:19 169:5 prepared 22:8 103:6 **polish** 225:5 320:15 105:18 polished 314:12 positions 333:19 preparedness 100:7 politic 35:20 positive 36:15 235:19 100:7 political 63:10 possibility 230:14 preparing 71:14 politically 44:9 318:8,12,15 present 149:9 152:5 politicians 42:11 possible 59:4 88:2,3 189:18 202:1 poor 124:16 242:9 93:3 98:10 112:8 presentation 42:5 pop 78:18 80:14 151:8 193:3 195:13 97:2,10 103:12 population 119:18 206:3 236:19 237:4 119:20 157:18 189:14 254:1 261:11 163:9 176:10 port 32:20 33:7 35:7 313:21 184:19 220:7 263:5 37:20 39:14.21 263:12 295:19 possibly 103:11 44:21 48:14 60:7 226:3,21 230:10 302:5 304:9 343:5 71:18 97:11 119:19 259:21 263:5 265:1 presentations 89:13 124:12 129:15 337:3 98:3 119:16 353:1 136:5 138:20,21 post 40:5 87:2 121:21 presented 92:8 139:16 140:1 132:9 138:16,16 President 2:3 36:5 141:10,11,12,14 164:18 202:19 44:14 212:5,17 146:8 193:1,7,14 313:19 255:2 194:4,5 196:9,10 posted 97:19 104:13 presidential 127:18 232:16,16 176:20 President's 26:15 portable 130:6 potential 47:20 44:5,6,12 45:5,10 portfolio 13:16 54:15 198:16 204:11 45:18 60:15,16 71:7 73:19 74:4 222:9 252:17 61:12 200:16 179:18 201:12 296:12 331:18 202:15 210:12 204:3,6,9 206:21 potentially 209:2 242:17,18 298:19 299:3 presiding 1:14 222:5 252:8 **portion** 122:13 pound 59:16,17 pressure 147:20 ports 32:7,15 37:15 pounds 58:20 190:7 power 9:15 presume 151:9 37:17,19 41:17 44:16 47:21 48:2 PowerPoint 78:19,20 pretend 81:6 PowerPoints 89:14 50:12,15 51:7 52:7 pretty 11:21 16:11 **PPBES** 62:6 32:21 82:15 97:7 52:8 58:12 61:13 71:19 72:3 97:15 practical 86:3,14 107:1 120:20 161:9 121:7,13 125:3 160:20 161:16 195:5 220:2 229:9 129:14,15 138:17 302:10 241:16 247:17 138:19 141:10 praying 236:5 256:12 257:9 264:3 155:17 194:13 precisely 116:11 272:7 316:17 327:5 219:9 274:1 287:1 178:6 329:15 332:5

59:13,15,16 104:20 previous 4:20 31:13 315:1 previously 74:11 primarily 63:19 138:8 primary 96:18 110:12 112:15 140:14,18 142:13 155:3 182:14 190:12 230:2 principal 11:19 principally 67:15 principles 189:20 224:17 245:9 print 318:9 **priorities** 2:16 32:3 46:2 63:11 80:11 181:16 211:5,17 241:1,16 244:1 250:21 270:16,17 270:18,19 286:20 287:15 290:4,12 292:11,18 306:10 306:11 307:19 309:18 313:18 315:18 prioritize 79:21 298:12 priority 25:2 26:16 32:11 35:18 63:1 136:5 189:11 190:10 204:13 286:21 287:2 289:8 298:17 307:2 **private** 119:19 137:11 139:1 163:14 193:2 209:21 238:16 293:16 310:10 privately 169:5 privilege 8:9 30:5 privileged 14:17 pro 176:18 proactive 164:4 probably 74:5 136:8 137:8 139:18 150:4

155:5 157:14 179:14 180:4,6 prompt 85:3 **produced** 40:2 313:9 **product** 288:18 promulgate 200:3 163:13 178:14 185:8 187:11 188:2 production 198:3 188:11,19,21 195:7 208:21 182:14 208:13 209:11 214:17 199:3 201:9 211:13,16 219:3,7 promulgated 201:17 236:13,16 237:5 promulgation 202:20 221:5 224:17 productive 21:6,12 88:2 91:14 177:16 246:17 247:1 254:6 propagated 85:14,16 225:14 232:19 239:9 247:21 315:6 353:18 257:4 260:13 85:20,21 261:18 262:3,10 proper 109:1 137:15 249:21 251:15,16 products 48:13 253:9 255:7 260:7 194:21 197:21 269:16,17,18 270:7 216:9 271:2 280:18 269:1 310:12 270:14 273:12,13 properly 159:1 profession 17:10 288:13,14,19 291:4 191:15 216:8 281:18 282:4,5 337:9 347:16 348:7 professional 45:20 291:5,10,20 296:19 proposal 154:12 235:16 318:1 319:2 297:4,14 298:8,13 226:3 320:6 probe 91:13 professionally 313:9 300:3 304:14,15,19 proposals 98:5,8 **problem** 28:7,9 35:9 professionals 54:1 305:12,15 307:17 125:14 308:7 59:5 69:20,21 82:14 117:17 146:16 163:16 308:15 314:7 propose 136:2 165:7 160:21 179:8 profiles 283:6 315:20 316:5 172:20 219:12 program 22:9 24:15 322:14 327:8 330:5 224:16 334:14 208:14 210:11,19 229:5 231:16 24:16,17 48:19 351:17 proposed 95:5 98:19 233:10,18 246:7 52:12 53:15 54:3 project 25:16 47:15 98:21 102:20 345:19 347:13 55:4,11,12 56:4 48:12 79:5 80:1,3 105:15 113:21 192:15 196:5 problems 22:19 30:3 61:14 62:6 68:14 147:13 149:1 162:7 43:20 49:3 83:7 69:21 70:6 72:11 202:12 222:12 166:4,15 170:3 79:5 86:20 87:13 231:20 264:13 174:3 182:5 203:14 158:11 procedure 112:19 88:9 93:5 97:4 267:2 277:18 290:8 215:16,17 224:6 224:4 105:6 107:13,18 290:11 292:11,13 250:2 303:12 procedures 110:13 112:10 152:1 303:12,14 315:10 311:10 344:5 200:11 205:7 211:6 319:18 320:2,7,9 proposing 166:21 220:18 proceed 133:10 148:4 241:3 249:21 250:2 321:1 326:7,7 167:1 205:14,21 252:2,3 258:5 329:15 206:9 173:10 313:1 projected 202:2 269:21 270:1 273:5 pros 89:16 157:20 proceedings 150:12 355:6 273:10 291:7 297:3 204:11 296:3 162:16 325:8 process 70:15 73:14 299:5,7 303:18 projection 201:2 prosecute 123:17 305:9 309:5 323:1 projections 254:11 prospective 149:17 77:17 80:8 133:17 155:6 176:1 184:2 324:9 325:11 projects 48:6 78:21 150:14 151:12 protect 59:12 189:19 244:12 331:20 79:1 191:20,21 programming 70:2 195:15 196:2 221:5 protected 14:1 249:1 269:14 271:4 271:9 287:5 291:12 221:20,21 222:9 Protection 252:5 70:10,13 307:20 308:5,14 protocols 275:5 293:3 300:20 307:1 programs 5:17 6:10 309:8,16 313:5 279:14 310:3,10,13 314:5 13:19 20:6 24:19 325:5 327:17 47:17 61:7,9 63:18 317:15,17,19 **proud** 49:11 promised 4:21 proverbial 8:6 329:17 330:4 336:4 65:21 67:4,5 73:20 78:21,21 79:4,4,17 **promising** 250:2,15 **provide** 17:17 21:16 343:7 processes 92:20 93:12 96:19 101:11 promote 153:10,13 35:8,13 37:17 88:21 199:16 105:2,19 106:4 154:14 163:12 92:9 131:16 133:1 253:16 140:5 147:8 155:5 processing 85:13 108:14 113:14,19 procurement 113:9 132:17 141:2 promoting 6:9 171:1 178:16 produce 179:11 159:15 160:19 238:17,19 181:17 184:13 197:21 244:7 161:5 172:18 promotion 186:20 195:15 198:5 204:2

206:2 279:1 320:1,3 320:10 provided 193:3 195:3 203:15 225:12 263:5 317:21 322:7 provides 111:5 **providing** 34:3 81:2 170:9 191:14 provision 112:13 258:16 provisions 261:11 public 1:10 3:5,6,10 15:16 36:4 73:14 83:3 87:1 168:20 175:14,16,21 176:21 180:1 193:1 235:7 239:7 241:9 242:2,3,5 244:2,8 270:9 311:6 314:4,6 331:12,19 335:15 346:7 350:2,7,15 351:1,12 353:8,12 355:4,10 publication 318:1 publicly 104:16 169:7 published 193:5 217:15 346:6 publisher 319:1 publishing 192:20 pull 5:3 78:4 93:9 94:3 101:13 102:6 111:12 148:13 149:16 178:17 181:10 187:16 194:18 205:3 206:8 227:16,19 281:18 312:15 334:15,19 338:7 341:21 pulled 98:1,21 99:2 124:11 150:9,10 **pulling** 103:11 312:18 345:6 punching 246:2 purpose 7:12 214:16 301:3 purposes 192:5 pursue 215:5,7 315:7 332:7

pursuing 199:18 push 31:18 179:13 289:1 pushed 285:1 291:17 pushing 67:1 71:14 289:11 push-back 352:21 put 10:21 16:1 22:5 31:16 34:9 36:13 37:4 43:12 49:12 52:3 56:14,19 57:7 68:9 70:11 78:5 90:19 92:1 97:20 98:2 103:3 105:11 111:21 112:20 116:18 119:4 127:13 129:1 135:9 137:21 141:9 144:16 145:4 154:20 155:5 156:20 162:14 172:9 181:4 183:10 191:8,12 199:6 203:10 205:5 208:3 217:18 219:15 220:17 223:15 227:13 228:6 231:2 232:15 237:1 244:7 248:8 250:9 251:17 255:16 267:2 270:19 275:6,15 276:10,10,18 277:8 277:14 282:16 283:17 297:20 301:1 307:10,13,14 307:15 308:7 315:8 316:13 327:19 334:20 338:10 343:5 344:18 346:5 353:4 puts 301:8 324:15 **putting** 4:2 58:20 65:11 70:16 73:18 86:12 103:20 123:4 130:4,9 138:21 191:3 247:13 270:4

287:19 304:14

p.m 177:17 354:5

O quadrants 192:13 qualified 115:1 quality 274:20 275:4 280:2 quarter 43:6 question 25:9 31:20 32:12 33:14 34:21 35:3 41:1 46:2 56:16 65:12 68:19 69:13 73:3 78:14 80:10 83:18 86:3 116:13 119:2 121:16 132:12 137:5 150:20 151:4 151:14,16 153:8 156:3 158:7 173:10 174:3 175:4 209:18 219:12 220:2 260:10 281:13 283:14 295:18 296:4,8 299:21 304:17 308:21 309:10 324:1,5 327:3 337:8 339:21 questioning 84:2 questions 21:8 30:7 37:5 43:16 46:8 127:13 132:7 150:19 151:20 152:5 182:9 205:18 233:14 260:8,9 261:3 283:17 290:18 295:9,14 322:17 quick 3:12 31:2 95:19 113:20 122:17 148:7 162:20 260:10 330:16 334:20 345:8 quickie 346:18 quickly 14:14 99:6 140:6 143:8 148:10 181:15 182:3,10 188:7 240:21 255:4 quiet 19:10 quit 8:3

quite 42:2 53:1 98:2 112:4 169:7 221:3 229:17 249:11 257:7 322:19 327:17 352:20 quorum 311:18 340:11 341:4 quotable 87:8 quotes 278:1 quote/unquote 305:20 Q&A 2:7

R R 3:1 race 176:4 277:4 racing 178:1 radar 46:15 321:3 **RADM** 4:10 49:16 52:15 56:20 127:8 127:21 128:3,9 Rainey 1:14 2:2,11 2:13 3:2,3 4:17 30:13,16 37:1 63:15 77:20 91:16 94:20 95:18 96:10 116:10 118:7 119:13 122:16 130:13 131:7,13,19 132:11 135:3 136:1 137:13 140:3 142:6 147:11 151:18 159:8 161:20 175:9 177:10,18 183:1 188:6 204:20 205:21 209:9 210:8 211:3 213:21 216:1 221:1 222:15 227:6 228:6,13 229:9 231:5 237:7 238:2 260:5 263:9 264:8 295:8 308:20 310:14 311:16 312:8 315:13 317:9 317:13 318:19 319:6,10 327:19 334:13 335:5,7,9,13 337:13 339:21

340:16 343:18

348:9 349:9 350:12 277:8,21,21 281:7 217:4,20 220:19 reauthorizing 161:7 351:9 352:16 354:3 302:13 318:9,15 223:5,12 227:15 250:17 326:9 raining 84:12 320:10 344:19 231:9,21 232:2 rebalance 74:21 77:1 raise 46:8 147:15 345:8 348:18,20 235:14,15,19 236:2 77:1 200:14 realign 342:2 236:14 238:20 rebalancing 76:14 raised 48:9 171:10 recall 148:21 184:16 realistic 44:1 239:15 240:4 raising 24:13 147:18 reality 256:11 241:18 242:7 244:9 321:8 ramifications 97:16 realize 34:18 47:19 249:7,15 250:3,5 receive 103:1 149:4 range 14:2 82:17 realizing 218:3 251:3 253:20 254:5 156:5 261:21 92:5 really 3:15 9:2,5,14 254:8,10,16 255:17 290:13 ranging 36:13 10:11 12:10 13:15 258:4,8 261:7 received 7:2 90:12 **RASTER** 230:11,17 13:19 14:5,14,17,19 262:14,17 263:7,11 122:8 148:21 149:3 231:3 232:6,8 233:3 263:12,15 264:3 15:3,4,14,18 16:15 150:14 151:10,16 rate 256:18 265:4 266:9 268:10 18:14,17,20 19:2 151:21 153:2,15 rates 303:13 20:9,9,15,17,21 268:21 269:1 154:17 156:4,6 21:11 23:1,5 25:1,4 171:16 301:20 rationale 98:19 272:10,11 280:11 Rayfield 337:8,11 25:21 27:20 28:8,15 281:2 284:11,13,21 313:3 321:5 348:4 29:9,14 30:2 33:2 286:11 289:10 receiving 32:10 40:17 reach 15:9 34:19 39:19 40:1,12 295:3 301:4 302:20 152:21 reached 251:12 331:3 42:1 43:1 44:7 45:9 303:18 304:8,17 recess 95:17 177:17 react 43:15 46:8,11,11 49:5,6,9 310:11,19 315:7 237:16 238:1 reaction 59:19 91:11 49:21 55:8 60:6,8 318:11 319:1 311:15 127:1 317:4 62:4 64:4,7,14 65:1 320:10,13 321:2,6 recognition 63:17 reactions 91:9 65:17 66:18 68:2,15 322:5 323:14,15 **recognize** 26:2 35:4 read 99:5 112:2 69:17,18,20 70:2,17 325:19 326:4 332:8 77:11 80:11 81:5 116:1 151:20 165:9 72:11 74:6 76:9 345:9 348:2,4 349:9 90:21 94:4 140:13 174:16 191:17 78:9 79:19,20 80:16 349:21 350:10 142:10 166:7 193:20 200:17 80:20 81:18 82:4 352:13 353:15 178:12 327:11 203:19 213:11 83:21 84:3,7,15 realtime 37:15,17 336:4 217:14 222:5 226:9 85:11 86:14,21 165:18 282:20,21 recognized 61:15 recognizes 26:3 27:6 229:13 266:1,18 87:17 94:17 101:13 302:18 272:1,19 273:9 Rear 2:3 188:18 109:4,9 114:6,7,14 115:10 119:7 122:9 321:7 reason 16:3 29:9 40:1 recognizing 10:16 readiness 106:15 51:17 82:7 105:21 15:15 64:7 88:7 128:20 130:15 115:6 131:21 134:10 184:8 231:10 recommend 114:10 reading 113:21 138:10 141:6 143:5 325:20 340:20 126:15 165:14 196:14 199:2 322:5 ready 19:20 67:17 145:21 146:3 reasonably 328:4 reasons 36:19 52:2 212:2 223:19 224:1 149:12 152:12 recommendation 338:1 343:1 154:20 158:14 94:6 132:20 145:12 105:15 106:13 165:6 269:15 114:15 115:18 real 28:8 29:13 32:18 160:16 161:12,15 35:18 47:18 49:11 164:17,17 166:6 reauthorization 118:17 122:7 135:2 93:20 149:2 156:12 139:5 142:6 162:6 69:21 82:18 88:9 167:5 169:10,10 157:16 166:20 173:6 174:10 110:16 111:19 171:6,12,21 172:12 112:1 122:17 133:5 172:12,13,15 167:1,21 170:11 176:12 203:5,14,17 143:7 146:12 158:7 179:11 180:13 171:3 172:11,21 207:11 218:20 172:10 177:16 186:2,4,16 191:16 259:19 323:7 219:13 233:7 243:5 reauthorized 157:9 250:16 344:8 179:1 223:20 193:11,11,12 197:9 231:10 233:14 199:8 203:8,11 157:10 158:5.12 recommendations 234:21 235:8 277:2 28:21 31:13 90:8 205:17 208:1 216:7 169:18 323:11

91:10 94:14 95:3 red 248:16 256:16 192:20 221:6,13 remuneration 96:14 98:20,21 101:15 257:4 222:1,7,13 reopened 97:15 102:9,20 103:2,6 redesigning 117:21 regulation 12:15 136:7 104:2 114:1 118:10 reducing 85:21 34:20 206:15 reorganization 88:12 119:21 123:2 reecho 48:1 regulations 208:21 126:12 126:21 135:12 reechoing 47:12 regulatory 9:17 reorganizer 17:15 147:13 149:14 reef 219:13 rehash 113:20 repeat 232:20 172:8 178:19 181:3 reinforce 17:17 reefs 194:1,7 258:9 repetitive 36:16 182:6,8 190:18 reengage 312:14 reinforced 91:20 replace 248:4 reevaluation 195:16 312:6 314:6,14 reinforcing 129:13 report 16:2,5 23:4 315:16,17 318:2 reexamination 323:8 143:4 38:12 39:12,20,21 refer 106:9 316:9 333:14 334:12,17 reintroduced 243:11 40:3 41:5 46:5 334:20 342:11,16 reference 97:21 243:14 258:21 72:11 87:6 95:7 343:14 referenced 316:21 reiterated 187:12 127:11 128:4,7 recommended references 316:19 reiterating 165:5 129:8 132:10 149:16 174:4,11,20 referred 32:3 240:9 related 9:7 23:15 134:10 144:17 218:14 240:16 243:17 27:10 64:14 157:16 145:1 184:21 recommending refine 329:8 relates 219:18 225:11 224:15 243:5 213:13 refineries 124:20 308:13 251:15 279:16 recommends 105:16 reflect 229:14 260:15 relating 129:8 288:7 313:7 342:15 106:14 107:3 112:7 318:2 relations 242:2,3 Reported 1:21 170:6,20 182:10 reflected 105:3,8 relationship 28:12 reports 145:5 179:9 188:10 189:6 reflecting 155:13 35:5 73:7 133:8 221:15 222:8 228:19 191:18 192:19 144:13 182:21 239:13 194:19 195:14 reflex 284:10 299:17 300:7 represent 109:18 197:1 204:4 refusing 212:21 relationships 116:8 representation 93:5 reconvene 238:3 reg 201:16 141:5 143:9 144:11 representative 97:12 regard 143:8 216:16 241:20 286:17 311:17 119:18 124:19 record 96:9 136:6 304:14 Relative 2:17 192:10 336:17 148:13 161:14 regarding 101:1 relatively 22:15 representatives 223:3 342:20 102:10 106:2 153:9 release 31:19 110:14 115:12 343:15 344:3 relevant 219:8 326:8 118:13 216:9 247:8 319:18 recording 4:19 regards 182:20 215:6 relief 35:13,14 represented 18:9 recoup 112:12 regatta 277:4 relieves 147:20 106:4 245:11 recover 112:8 region 100:14 293:19 rely 125:5 314:15 recoverable 122:19 regional 9:20 22:18 remaining 337:15 reputation 241:4 recovery 87:2 95:4 248:13 253:12 remarkably 237:8 request 61:13 103:17 remarks 3:11 63:17 97:1,8 99:15 100:1 269:10 287:2 293:1 127:18 200:16 100:15 105:7,13 293:2,5 304:10 127:3 169:15 202:15 210:12 106:2,16 107:5,8 306:12 307:1 309:1 176:11 177:20 242:19 247:10 110:15 112:13 309:2,6 178:21 353:8 113:17 121:6 122:4 regions 279:20 293:7 remember 10:18 22:3 requested 262:18 293:8 57:21 58:15 146:14 137:20 139:1,8,10 requests 256:14 Register 346:6 152:18 178:7 140:2 141:10,14,16 **require** 191:19 143:10,12 144:6,8 Registers 217:15 295:21 333:13 192:20 197:2 200:1 registration 12:16 340:8 208:7 222:6 144:12 186:11 recreation 78:10 regroup 311:11 remote 71:12 123:9 required 4:8 348:11 regs 209:1 recreational 12:17 254:2 requirement 69:18 193:6 199:5 200:2 regular 29:18 120:20 remove 234:10,14 273:8 331:4,18

30:6 33:7 35:1,9 200:10,13 201:3,5 87:15 108:14 125:9 87:9 89:5,19 104:10 201:17 202:20 38:4 42:2 43:19 161:17 196:17 107:15 111:17 147:3 191:10 204:2 44:12 45:3 46:5 211:8 212:1 213:7 197:12,19 198:13 204:12 207:21 54:9 63:3 64:11,16 requirements 136:3 317:11 responsible 22:2 41:2 145:20 181:16 235:5 243:17 67:9,17,20 70:15 204:7 208:5 211:6 244:21 258:15 70:20,21 71:1 74:10 76:2,15 81:7 297:19 259:3,8,13,20 296:3 rest 41:19 267:15 81:11 85:14 90:20 restoration 14:2 91:15 100:14 108:7 requires 200:3 316:15 respect 161:12,15 24:17 221:14 118:18 134:18 reread 165:9 respected 241:5 restore 61:13 137:14 141:16 143:2 154:7 157:13 reroute 277:18 respects 227:2 restricted 252:13 respond 13:8 19:21 result 14:21 25:3 158:16 161:8 research 1:12 13:21 40:14 127:15 128:3 168:17,17 170:14 14:3 54:14 80:21 28:20 35:3 45:10 111:7 122:17 131:3 320:4 85:1,3,4 100:15 171:6,20 173:11,15 resultant 107:20 177:6 179:18 143:21 238:15,16 136:20 353:8 results 23:1 103:12 180:21 188:5 191:4 238:18 240:20 responders 123:12 241:11,15 244:10 responding 2:9 81:1 Ret 2:3 192:6 199:16 202:5 112:10 114:18 retirement 3:18 206:14 209:19 246:17,19 247:7,20 248:1,5,9,11 249:3 135:19 return 237:2 216:17 221:9,17 249:4,5,7,9,12,16 responds 113:16 revelations 196:19 225:8,17 237:19,19 239:4 244:5 253:8 249:17 250:20 response 14:2 58:16 review 1:1 3:3 5:10 251:1,17,18,19 59:14 71:12,21 77:6 27:11 105:16 280:19 282:16 252:2,3,16 256:7 90:10,11,17 91:1,9 106:19 126:7,12 283:12 284:4 287:20 290:15,16 95:4 97:1,3,7,14 149:18 150:18 257:6,17 284:2 299:14,16,18,19 98:9 99:10,16,21 151:12 156:15 297:9 298:4 299:14 301:2 100:8,13,14,18 157:6 166:12 244:4 304:4 305:3 309:12 researched 103:15 102:7 104:6 105:7 244:8 318:6,17 313:5 325:1 330:17 339:7 335:5,7,13 336:8,15 researching 145:21 105:10,12 106:2,15 reserve 80:21 243:21 107:2,4,8,10,16 reviewed 101:2 339:10 346:15 104:12 108:9 rigorous 281:16 301:18 108:6 110:15 reserves 13:21 85:3 reviews 129:4 rise 198:15 112:13 113:17 reside 352:19 115:1 120:21 Revise 351:3 risk 34:19,20,21 resiliency 25:2,7 121:16 122:1,4,13 revisit 337:16 36:20 64:4 126:10 177:18 189:11,20 resilient 124:21 122:14,19 123:8,11 revolving 8:5 resolution 174:11 125:5 126:10 reword 225:10 190:5 risks 35:21 224:5 229:7 130:12 132:1 rewrite 223:1 resolutions 229:4 Rita 104:3 116:1 137:20 138:6 **RFQ** 56:20 245:9 143:10,15 144:12 Richard 1:21 2:3 126:9 River 38:14 221:8 4:18 102:4 327:19 resolved 27:18 151:17,19 152:6 road 181:7 resonance 34:6 186:11 191:11 355:3.10 responses 108:11 Rick 49:15 54:9,11 roads 161:21 162:9 resonate 43:17 robust 116:17 resource 6:5 21:4 141:4 54:14,17,21 55:14 56:18 267:4 268:3,4 rock 234:18 24:7 55:10 90:3 responsibilities 88:6 137:9 198:20 317:2 Roger 151:21 153:20 96:21 100:17 268:7 101:13 105:1 Rick's 54:17 Roger's 95:21 100:4 325:15 resources 6:21 21:12 131:11 140:17 rid 165:19 170:4,17 role 2:9 6:12 27:6 21:15 22:1 24:6 262:14 170:18 232:6 46:18 66:2,5 68:8 ridiculous 60:6.8 77:7 89:6 99:21 25:11 45:19 68:5,10 responsibility 15:17 63:13 67:16 84:3 right 12:2 17:21 24:8 104:11,20,20 70:6,20 79:3 84:20

321:12 322:10 115:20 118:18 42:6 47:2 58:13 136:12 148:16 122:12 133:16 59:3 115:9,11,12,15 328:15 333:16 151:13 156:3 163:7 137:19 138:5,14 183:19 186:18,21 342:4 171:11 182:17 142:12 145:15 187:12 219:18 says 64:19 90:15,16 187:12 205:13 211:15 215:6,8 270:13 313:15 114:9 127:1,3 143:2 213:11 224:15 216:16,20 217:4,17 sail 82:11 232:16 149:17,18 165:13 225:20,21 226:8,11 217:19 218:2,4 234:15 166:3 170:6,19 226:14,17,17,18 225:11 228:9 267:1 sailboat 19:4 203:5 208:17,20 227:2 228:16 280:21 295:6 sailing 83:13 209:3 226:1 246:13 333:12 334:2,9 roles 80:9 96:20 sailor 78:9 234:11 266:10 284:9 339:5 342:12 345:6 107:8 147:2 160:10 sake 20:21 299:17 319:13 Scott's 98:16 102:17 roll 51:21 171:19 salary 306:15 322:14 332:10 114:8 188:8 roof 78:18 sale 192:3 337:2 348:7 screaming 303:16 room 53:12 75:17 salinity 279:2 scale 169:18 screeching 132:14 salvage 115:2,19 178:12 215:9 236:6 **SCAMPI** 242:7 screen 46:16 237:1 324:9 344:20 123:15,17 scanning 38:4 scribed 98:20 rooms 347:15 salvo 101:10 313:20 scary 256:17 scroll 152:14 ropes 53:4 **samples** 263:18 scenario 69:10,11 se 186:18 rough 133:7 sanctuaries 14:1 85:2 scenarios 350:19 sea 21:21 53:2,14,16 roughly 210:13 sanctuary 81:1 scene 113:11 143:17,17,18 144:2 route 275:15 302:11 Scheblin 267:7 144:7 252:13 routine 16:14 sat 29:3 115:21 schedule 29:19 176:6 301:13.14 rtGPS 85:19 satellite 254:6 276:8 177:5 237:8 311:5 seafood 21:10 RTK 130:7 283:20 336:19 337:5 seamless 232:17 ruining 64:4 satellites 301:8 340:19 seas 190:3 rule 53:13 96:2 save 78:1 schedules 156:19 season 100:9 117:7 rule-making 206:2 saviors 52:4 177:3 180:8 347:18 run 36:4 45:15 82:20 saw 50:18 66:19 scheduling 341:2 seat 184:12 93:11 106:8 133:12 78:19 108:10 schematic 248:15 second 11:1 17:7 148:10 162:1 169:5 110:16 128:5,11 schemes 302:18 24:10 47:18 57:3 177:12 181:2 182:3 school 9:9 143:20 151:14 66:13 132:8 149:18 234:16 261:19 304:9 306:10 science 6:4 84:1,4,20 154:5 164:21 167:6 running 64:4 109:4 saying 28:7 42:14 85:1,4,6,11 231:20 170:5,18 174:13,17 123:15 192:12 50:19 64:8 77:6 241:6 242:20 243:9 174:21 189:6 199:15 227:11 81:9,13 82:2,11 244:20 253:9,17,17 191:17 213:16 246:6 84:7,13 96:10 253:19 254:5,7 215:12 255:10 runs 349:21 112:20 115:5 117:5 255:21 257:12,14 268:17 272:16 rush 168:13 126:7 134:13 258:12,20 259:1 327:3 328:5,12 265:11 268:2 347:1 350:8 354:2 136:16,17,19 S Sciences 39:12 seconded 311:20 142:19 158:9 S 3:1 160:12 164:4 172:6 scientific 14:3 84:21 secondly 151:5 sad 238:21 174:20 187:5 191:2 111:5,6 140:21 330:14 Sadly 41:16 195:19 197:18 251:1 secretariat 183:7,11 safe 40:21 41:2 43:8 207:6 210:11 scientist 54:17 secretary 27:4 42:13 66:1 74:19 153:10 211:15 215:12 scope 264:2 331:7 46:14 63:9 145:7 270:7 354:4 218:1 226:6 272:10 Scott 1:13 2:2 3:2 9:8 222:19 223:21 safely 59:2,3 71:18 281:19 282:2 30:11 36:21 78:7 338:13 194:8 291:15 292:17 114:3 121:20 132:2 secrets 135:18 safety 39:15,21 42:5 293:18 298:8 303:8 134:16,20 135:4 section 148:9

secure 245:5 seeing 82:7 85:14 sent 99:6 102:16 263:15 298:19 securing 26:18 32:4 133:20 160:10 181:1,8 225:17 299:2 303:8 307:8 245:15 182:4 256:11 229:1 345:18 310:12 321:19 security 14:16 35:13 287:21 311:21 sentence 168:2 322:6 326:17 76:11 81:16 105:17 seek 73:14 219:16.21 332:12 333:3,3,18 105:21 126:8 seen 16:2 33:16 40:9 separate 84:19 96:12 serving 6:14 131:17 153:13 46:5,6 88:13 89:10 105:18 205:15 session 98:4 167:6,8 207:7 210:20 347:3 350:3 154:14 155:2,5,16 129:7 131:15 213:19 228:7 156:1 163:13,20 141:15 145:21 sessions 167:10 164:16 183:21 150:15 159:17,18 233:11 234:2 set 16:6 94:5 126:21 192:5 249:12 separately 205:16 129:17 134:14 224:20 259:12 sediment 221:9 222:3 272:3 313:12 206:5,14 201:6 234:8 237:18 314:21 341:6 separating 210:20 275:4 278:6 279:5 see 5:1 7:13,14,17 sees 133:4 separation 302:18 281:3 283:15 8:18 20:16,17 25:21 29:12 33:3 48:13 segment 96:16 98:13 September 167:4 290:11 294:13 49:13 50:18 65:21 segue 237:9 251:11 337:9 341:19 66:1 77:7 82:13 selection 27:1 sequentially 62:12 350:16 self-contained 130:8 serious 80:10 170:7 sets 20:5 287:1,2 83:4 98:7 101:6 112:19 115:3 126:3 selling 51:8 170:21 206:17 setting 113:9 173:16 126:5 127:5 135:12 Senate 127:19 129:7 264:1 268:10 237:14 seven 245:19 285:12 136:2 145:15 158:5 235:6,9,10 240:12 351:10 158:6 160:8 164:8 240:12 244:20 servant 36:4 severely 37:12 296:3 166:2 172:19 250:18 258:2 259:7 serve 5:13 68:3 90:2 severity 107:19 174:20 184:5 shake 11:14 259:18 208:8,11 287:11 194:14 200:18 send 162:19 171:14 301:3 324:8 **shakers** 182:15 201:2 203:1 204:12 206:4 225:21 227:5 served 6:16 35:6 shallow 83:14 205:13 209:15,17 230:1 234:6 236:20 325:2 shame 14:20 244:8 291:6 334:9 service 4:19 5:14 6:4 **shape** 51:17 271:16 212:19 213:2 215:12 221:18 337:11 13:17 16:8,11 17:1 286:4 20:4 22:15 26:18 225:8 227:17 228:4 sender 233:5 **shapes** 350:10 sending 51:11 160:16 34:3 99:18 128:19 share 10:2,4 31:17 233:11 236:11 239:17 240:7 279:21 284:4 142:1 155:4 159:19 278:15,16 206:3 276:5 322:8 241:17 246:10 sends 140:21 348:3 **shared** 63:12 279:3 services 1:1 2:6,9,12 312:17 337:17 247:1,18 248:16 senior 27:2 291:18 254:12 255:15 sense 8:13 9:4 10:3 2:16 3:3 5:10,17 6:1 sharing 94:9 280:7 Shaw 189:3 256:1,13 257:4,8 15:19,20 28:1 45:2 6:3 21:15 22:11 49:7 64:11,13 99:20 27:11 34:16 52:16 sheet 175:13 261:7 258:1 262:8 268:9 270:21 271:14 108:14 113:6,13 71:7.16 72:6 73:9 sheets 96:4 246:4 97:14 100:2 112:10 261:1 274:19 283:10,10 118:18 125:15 132:3 133:5 179:16 112:16 122:13 shelf 313:8 316:8 283:11 286:11 291:19 294:19 180:10 213:14,16 126:16 128:1 She'll 4:15 142:14 144:20 she's 4:15 31:3 50:6,6 297:14 301:15 214:2 224:4 255:14 312:8 313:1 315:4,9 153:1 155:21 57:10 199:9 237:14 310:3 311:12 157:17 172:17 320:7,8 321:1 332:2 313:19 317:6,6 325:1 327:21 337:18 338:2,3,4 181:17 186:20 332:6 318:5,9,9 323:14,15 shift 18:8 140:17 324:2 330:15 331:6 339:2 344:1,5 187:3,11 194:21 sensing 71:12 123:9 342:21 343:4,6 195:3,12 198:11 148:7 209:16 254:2 219:2 234:8 249:14 shifted 19:7,7,9 347:5 349:12,15 sensitive 38:7 41:2 252:9,17 256:16 shifting 148:6 351:6

shifts 140:9 268:14 302:7 sit 13:1 28:13 29:10 soapbox 109:9 **ship** 38:21 41:7,13 **showing** 200:15 29:17 45:21 53:12 Social 35:13 58:20 190:5 191:8 267:14 87:18 91:12 94:4,4 societal 245:19 232:14 316:6 351:8 shown 75:19 198:17 136:14 310:6 246:16 285:13,20 shipping 40:17 42:14 218:1 site 104:17 280:5 285:21 190:14 194:8 shows 249:8 282:3 316:2 society 78:11 276:21 277:13 283:7,12 sites 280:8 soft 270:21 ships 42:8 47:5 58:18 shrinking 331:9 sitting 10:16 23:4 solid 28:21 59:3 71:17 72:19 shut 331:13 25:15 28:6 29:7 solidify 241:3 190:14 192:8 shuttle 254:4 49:20 53:7 69:3 solution 207:3 193:12,17 201:19 side 14:8 49:8,9 74:16 75:17 91:11 solutions 22:21 44:1 209:12 232:15 57:19 121:17 136:1 114:9 solve 28:9 ship's 38:15 277:13 144:8,12 196:19 situation 41:3,4 43:2 somebody 20:14 60:6 **shirk** 88:5 235:7,12,13,17,17 80:4 91:6 140:10 78:9 86:19 142:18 shock 192:9 235:19 239:14 226:4 147:4 196:11 258:12 304:1,2 shocked 13:15 situations 45:12 225:21 233:15 324:11 sides 15:2 114:18 255:18 280:4 shoestring 124:16 sign 3:6 96:4 175:13 six 19:15 67:1 168:10 296:18 350:4 shooting 256:9 330:10 333:2 248:13 324:15 somebody's 140:19 **shop** 70:14 146:3 350:14 sizeable 256:6 257:9 someday 299:15 shoreline 149:20 signal 51:11 SKINNER 47:11 something's 139:12 152:10 198:3 significance 2:10 somewhat 14:4 174:2,7,12 302:4 214:15 273:8 107:20 189:15 333:6 335:3 349:18 103:15 201:10 352:19 228:2 285:7 351:3 296:12 short 5:18 116:10 skull 163:14 significant 10:11 sonar 38:4,19,19 252:12 151:18 237:16 11:4 12:10 109:15 sleep 254:20 310:17 311:13 110:10 111:16 slide 18:3,10 20:3 sonars 252:10 321:1 342:3 112:8,12 189:13 22:5,7 26:11 203:8 soon 57:9 93:20 203:11 238:12,19 shortchange 125:12 232:2 252:8 264:3 139:12 211:2 shortchanged 109:2 274:2 239:10,18 240:3 247:17 283:17 **shorter** 336:14 signing 96:13 246:13 247:1 253:8 sooner 14:21 277:10 shortfall 202:5 302:7 335:1 277:11 signup 3:5 shortfalls 204:11 sign-in 175:13 slides 238:11 265:13 sorry 57:3 150:8 shorthand 101:7 silk 229:3 314:11 175:8 shortly 323:3 332:3 Silver 317:18 slight 47:1 sort 14:11,18 16:5 shot 311:6 similar 11:11 197:16 slightly 276:1 35:19 49:13 66:20 shouldn't 16:3 81:6 208:12,13 228:20 slip 285:17 67:8,10 68:15,16 89:6 114:16 124:15 278:14 284:14 slipping 159:14 70:9 77:13 80:19 155:7 161:14 192:9 simple 166:20,21 slow 271:3 92:15 94:8 98:12,17 230:3 slowly 257:12 168:1 283:7 98:18 99:1,17 shove 161:5 slows 279:7 102:15,17,18 103:7 simplify 62:2 show 89:10 155:1 simply 198:12 206:10 slush 309:7 105:13 107:17 201:5 238:11 209:10 313:20 small 3:18 58:5 139:2 116:15 118:9,19 248:15 249:8 simulated 283:4 232:20 120:2 124:14 266:13,19 274:10 simulation 282:10,11 smart 25:9 125:14 132:14 133:10 140:8 141:3 282:1 285:18 simultaneously 163:3 smooth 229:3 302:16 310:5 347:4 single 39:3 145:19 smoothly 349:21 148:15 152:5,11 348:3,8 sir 150:5 sneak 236:21 158:17 159:6 showed 9:15 194:3 sister 102:1 Snyder 184:17 176:16 179:7

180:11 183:14 specific 26:12 48:7 199:10 205:12 start 24:1 47:11 184:19 185:11 70:17 89:1 91:9 224:7 226:14 49:18 51:4,7 52:6 189:4,20 191:7,8 95:3 116:7 122:14 229:11 230:4 67:18 80:16 91:15 197:11 200:7 126:4,21 127:7 241:21 243:2,3 103:13 116:16 203:12 211:7,12,19 131:9 135:16 247:17 249:14 125:15 133:13 214:8 216:3,4 224:5 137:14 150:19 311:9 325:12 353:5 139:9 140:6 142:9 224:7 252:12 176:12,14 205:2 staffed 159:1 142:16 209:11 295:13 303:5 236:13 304:20 staffers 236:12,12 214:1 255:3 257:15 312:21 313:2,6,17 317:4 330:4 staffing 89:19 186:4 261:2 282:14,18 316:3,7 328:10 specifically 37:14 267:9 294:14 300:20 333:11 334:2,19 47:21 68:17 126:15 stage 128:8 243:21 336:13 350:3 351:4 337:15 338:16 129:17 184:9 199:1 started 51:9 80:17,18 staggered 149:11 205:11 214:21 341:15 342:1 stake 34:16 36:1 83:21 91:17 164:10 345:11,15 285:10 125:1 181:12 sorts 26:7 191:11 speech 238:14 stakeholder 143:8 starting 98:8 101:13 247:3 **speed** 336:11 144:11 322:21 163:4 189:12 soul 124:17 speeded 336:3,7 stakeholders 23:7.12 250:18 255:1 sound 75:2,4 90:2 spend 4:12 26:17 26:6 28:4 109:6,14 272:17 293:6 153:11 236:14 60:4 150:16 228:18 109:18 110:9,13 starts 20:18 79:5,6 251:7,10,21 229:15 236:18 119:19 137:8,12 171:15 254:10 244:15 264:14 **sounded** 173:18 138:4 140:16 169:1 starved 42:16 sounding 38:4 252:12 296:8 stakeholder's 245:7 state 7:6,8 15:12 41:8 soundings 131:4 spending 51:1 261:4 stakeholder-oriented 115:5 116:2 123:11 290:15 292:2 sounds 48:9 181:3 9:19 138:5 139:1 202:1,2 231:5 291:19 307:6 spends 324:17,18 stand 81:19,20 108:3 202:21 252:19 325:8 329:4 337:14 spent 10:10 32:6 109:21 110:3 253:1 273:19 74:19 266:8 286:6 source 204:18 249:4 139:11 221:10 293:17 310:1 323:9 sources 253:1,2 286:10 222:2,4 232:13 324:8,14 326:13 316:10 spill 14:1 38:13 282:7 355:1,4 south 8:15 15:2 114:19 115:20 standalone 160:2 statement 17:13,14 263:18 191:10 192:16 162:2 84:16 122:7 149:1 Southeast 351:8 **spilled** 155:16 standard 112:19 151:6 165:12 sovereign 10:19 **Spinrad** 52:3 54:9 232:12,14 278:6,14 223:10 251:17 sovereignty 11:1 260:20 268:3,4 279:16 326:10 space 22:6 72:20 Spinrad's 267:5 standards 275:4 statements 87:2 144:5 239:4 254:4 split 353:6 279:4,15 289:20 138:9 187:13 spaces 194:18 **spoil** 81:2 standers 208:7 251:14 315:19 speak 186:8 209:21 **sponge** 91:12 standing 55:2 70:20 316:20 224:8 314:11 100:17 138:17,19 spot 237:1 states 9:12 10:10,14 336:17 350:14 spotted 253:3 183:8,14,17 184:3 10:19 11:4,16 15:13 speaker 2:5,6 5:20 spread 80:3 109:11 307:7 15:15 25:5 26:5 237:8 **Spring** 317:18 standpoint 66:12 40:16 53:20 193:21 speaking 175:15 77:8 160:20 161:16 square 38:7 285:5 289:9 309:21 stab 227:13 255:14 281:3 speaks 203:2 324:12,14,17,20,20 staff 11:15 27:1 39:7 292:12 308:1 325:10 326:14 spearhead 205:1 special 94:5 96:13 40:10 70:19 86:17 stands 109:20 stations 129:13 130:6 113:9,10,12 313:5 88:12 89:6 96:5,12 star 139:14 statistical 84:15 317:15,17,19 98:1 100:16 150:19 stare 100:9 statue 160:14 species 144:5 168:8 stay 69:11 169:19 176:11,14 183:8,11 stares 112:6

170:16 202:11 storm 139:11 234:16 studies 40:9 144:1 suggest 102:21 312:12 storms 15:1 35:15 316:19 117:13 120:5 steal 237:17 124:13 153:5 171:8 story 16:16 34:7,8 study 39:15 144:4 step 50:16 60:20,21 36:7 42:3 46:4 281:17 301:9,10 191:13 220:2 328:2 90:8 92:19 108:12 52:11 62:7 63:4 stuff 4:15 18:15 328:5 330:19 109:1 117:6 118:10 64:12 94:15 121:15 38:21 50:20 51:6,19 suggested 140:4 51:21 52:3,17 79:1 118:12 119:15 121:18 179:16 152:8 180:20 185:6 147:4 191:13 216:3 195:5 330:21 340:5 180:14 200:21 82:10 89:12 164:1 232:9 242:3 287:18 203:12 205:11 170:17 178:2 185:4 suggesting 106:6 344:11 256:17 313:12 192:6 194:10,13 117:8 226:13 329:5 stepchild 161:15 314:17 317:3 213:6 231:19 suggestion 46:6 stepping 101:12 stovepipe 297:20 233:11 299:13 93:14 152:20 153:17 159:12 steps 289:14 312:15 stovepipes 66:21 316:14,16 323:18 317:1 341:7 straight 45:21 345:6 346:8 349:20 178:3 193:16 209:7 Steve 2:4 5:7 8:1 14:6 straightened 116:3 351:15 312:8 340:2 348:1 30:21 31:6 43:2 strategic 16:9 45:2 subcommittee 217:11 suggestions 98:10 49:17 54:3 57:16 62:9,12 63:1 65:6 104:12 119:5 152:2 265:11 268:2 61:17 65:13,14 66:9 220:3 222:21 65:18 66:6 67:7,8 **subject** 107:14 66:12 67:12 68:17 68:11 81:9 92:18 184:11 224:18 344:5 submission 224:6 69:2 70:21 76:7 189:14 204:8 205:7 suggests 345:17 339:7 80:8 86:8 87:18,19 207:2 suit 85:18 146:21 93:4 95:1 96:5 97:2 strategically 68:4 subparagraphs 353:2 100:12 101:4 strategies 273:3 117:1 **Suite** 1:13 subsequent 97:17 sum 296:12 305:20 131:15 134:7 strategy 186:14,15 142:17 146:13,14 204:10 244:1 272:6 113:7 237:18 summaries 98:3 straw 225:17 156:7 173:9 178:7 subsequently 102:3 summarize 349:6 streamlined 240:13 summarized 16:6 181:7 205:2,9 substance 186:4 211:20 270:13 strengthen 32:14 227:12 330:3 341:1 349:1 291:12 297:10 stretch 310:19 342:8 348:14 summarizes 321:5 strictly 73:8 139:10 substandard 40:20 298:14 303:20 334:11 311:7 317:14 strides 334:14 substantially 126:14 summarizing 334:2 334:15 353:14 strike 328:12 substantive 12:10 summary 87:6 132:9 strikes 125:17 191:5 95:8 99:8 172:10 176:18 258:8 Steve's 62:19 88:12 133:14 227:7 338:6 stripped 123:2 178:18 312:19 310:21 311:19 strive 179:4 312:1 336:6 349:5 stewards 21:4 323:16 338:7 stewardship 14:13 strong 9:4 11:7 18:2 substitute 297:1 summation 204:14 29:6 65:5 66:21 sums 164:15 49:9 146:10 subsystem 268:19 72:12 80:8 298:17 super 320:10 stick 11:14 subsystems 266:2 success 121:14,18 superior 200:1 sticker 72:8 stronger 35:7 124:9 211:18 213:4 supplemental 44:17 sticking 328:6 strongly 27:8 28:5 STOA 302:11 167:18 327:10 310:9 44:20 113:4 127:14 stone 350:16 350:5 successful 26:20 127:15 128:20 struck 13:20 16:21 27:17 121:5 262:21 164:17 307:12 stood 78:16 94:10 114:13 199:8 successor 183:15 107:11,12 178:9 supplementals sudden 146:16 128:15 281:15 306:20 structure 68:17 stop 42:13,14 52:9 109:16 306:13 suffering 81:7 support 4:5 33:15 164:21 270:20 structured 85:8 sufficient 199:4 45:18 55:3 61:12 structures 62:5,6 sufficiently 112:15 63:19 64:20,21,21 271:1,3,4,7 stuck 161:7 213:9 65:5 66:1 67:7 stopped 271:8 262:12

72:12 88:7,9 89:6 239:20 248:21 71:10 95:6 98:12 57:2 66:2 68:10,11 104:8,11 105:3,16 260:21 263:8 100:20.20 102:2 70:4 76:5 79:19 106:18 118:15 264:17,18 280:9,15 106:21 108:1 111:6 81:17 90:7 92:17 295:1 309:4 326:5 129:15 130:12 130:4,11 155:3,10 95:8 96:7,18 105:5 164:7 167:21 326:21 327:8,15 146:5 153:12 176:9 105:19 106:1,5 171:17 180:6,18 328:14 329:2,3 184:7 196:1,9 114:5 116:16 208:18,19 214:12 187:11 190:11 331:21 342:9,14,20 118:12,15 123:18 195:1 198:5 204:2 343:2,16 352:3,20 234:9,11 239:18 125:7 131:20 133:7 224:7 226:14 227:8 surface 71:11,20 244:16 246:9,15 133:12,15 134:5 229:6 230:4 232:4 278:8,12 284:16 266:14 267:18 135:13,14 144:7 247:9 248:6 250:6 301:13,14 272:2 273:21 147:14 149:13 250:11 253:12 surprise 144:19 274:13 277:1 279:6 156:15 161:4,21 260:12,15 261:9 surprised 13:15 164:5 168:12 171:9 281:5 284:7,11,19 32:19 193:9 174:8 175:15 176:8 264:6 267:10 270:2 289:17,18 294:4,13 289:1,6 292:4,6 surprises 32:19 301:5 303:4 305:16 177:20 181:4 295:17 299:12 survey 2:18 5:12 308:16 310:2 351:7 185:17 198:1 203:6 303:2 305:12,13 14:10,10 61:20 76:2 systems 32:2 44:21 203:19 205:14,21 311:9 312:15 313:3 76:8 97:5 121:12 46:12 59:1,8 130:7 206:14 216:2,3 218:2 227:13,14 349:13 353:16 131:12 140:19 232:15 246:10 supported 165:15 145:19 146:15,18 258:6 266:11,15 237:15 248:21 245:3 262:11 149:20 189:9 190:1 268:15 270:21 259:21 268:10 supporter 54:2 190:4 191:3 194:3 271:11,15,16,19 276:11 277:14 280:11 287:18 supporting 32:16 198:12 239:2 274:4 276:17 281:4 123:4 124:18 264:12 333:20 282:10 284:11,12 294:9,13,17 295:5 351:16 352:10 128:11 142:12 289:18 291:2 297:1 300:4 310:16,17 179:13 229:12 297:3 307:16 311:8 315:13 surveyed 38:8,11 242:18 247:5 249:6 276:4 Szabados 31:10 317:11 329:9 336:5 249:20 250:20 surveying 189:10 32:21 61:5 155:8 336:8 338:8,12 296:5 192:4 195:17 198:2 169:16 216:12 345:21 350:18,21 taken 42:14 66:9,17 supportive 67:14 198:6 276:2,4 S57 199:15 230:17 67:4 160:6 163:17 260:12 surveys 82:20 120:15 T supposed 71:3 80:9 130:5 131:4 184:4 164:14 193:13 table 23:4 49:20 52:6 195:2 223:4 225:1 119:8 160:13 175:6 190:11 191:15,19 57:11 65:15 73:11 175:7 243:15 192:12 194:14 239:3 266:14 298:2 91:11 104:5 105:17 196:17 222:6 317:1 325:9 333:19 304:21 320:7 105:20 120:3 336:9,10,16 336:21 351:19 suspect 176:3 125:19 126:8 127:6 sure 34:13 35:19 36:7 sustain 21:2 124:6 takes 111:16 147:8 127:7 134:19 55:2,16 58:2 63:13 sustainable 6:10,15 167:17 202:6,9 142:11 149:17 69:11 84:4 116:7 sustaining 21:13 268:12 276:13 150:9.10 181:4 120:18 121:2,15 sustains 20:9 305:8 325:3 336:1 185:8,11 206:9 sustenance 177:13 338:16 341:21 122:10 131:21 209:10 341:18 take-home 239:6 134:19 139:5,6 switch 5:5 199:14 344:19 345:14 140:1 142:5,21 synergies 274:7 talk 5:2 13:1,4,6 tables 126:17,19 17:19 18:5 23:12 147:3 153:20 154:9 synergy 286:19 304:6 tacked 160:3 24:3 27:13 28:14 system 2:17 9:18 10:1 156:16 158:21 tag 5:5 176:12 168:16 169:12 10:8 19:18 32:7,15 29:11 30:2 31:19 tags 5:4 36:17 43:20 50:1.4 172:4 187:4 188:1 32:20 33:7 35:7 take 26:12 40:11 45:5 51:13 55:15,20 57:9 194:11 207:1,19 36:2 37:15 40:1,2 48:14 50:2 53:11 57:13 63:9 70:18 208:1 211:18 236:8 48:14,15 51:9 52:1

			100
74:11 95:1 100:16	254:13 262:2	179:15 203:12	testifying 249:13
101:6 103:18	271:19 286:7 290:9	205:10 212:18	testimony 122:8
111:10 116:4	291:20 292:2	218:8 220:13	125:2 243:1
118:17 124:21	294:21 295:5 296:2	229:21 268:9 273:1	Texas 33:1
134:18 138:15	298:1,4 303:20	277:11 288:13,14	text 222:5
139:16 159:9 161:9	318:7 323:5,12	299:4 304:19	thank 3:13,19 7:10
172:19 182:8 184:8	325:8 350:5	313:11 314:17	30:5,11 36:11,12
187:16 192:3 193:8	talks 26:11 104:6	330:21 339:6	47:9 61:16 65:9
218:16 230:16	141:17 186:17	telling 17:12 51:4	77:3 78:7 90:20
233:10 244:17	207:13 340:18	57:20 94:15 125:19	95:12,16 114:3
251:6 262:8 264:18	tanker 38:13	134:7 135:11 169:8	157:5 175:16
269:20 271:18	tankers 39:3	265:17	229:18 230:6 238:9
273:4 285:14	target 231:11 296:17	tells 200:20 256:17	263:9 308:21
289:21 290:5,18	targets 233:20	272:4,19	318:18 320:20
292:9,17 295:11	task 47:18 118:16	temperature 281:11	328:1 335:8 353:13
297:2 299:21	tasked 145:14 146:6	282:15 301:16	thanks 4:17 30:13
300:13 312:15	tasks 81:15,17	temperatures 279:2	43:11 48:20 49:16
315:4 329:16 332:4	tax 35:12	temporary 130:4,10	53:10 61:2 90:19
332:11 335:11	team 6:17 13:17 14:6	ten 37:13,18 40:11,13	122:16 148:16
337:16 338:11,20	61:21 62:5 66:8,9	52:14 58:20 229:1	175:10,20 177:15
339:14 342:14	67:15 68:1 69:1,1,4	229:20 244:11	237:21 238:8 260:4
talked 17:1 29:4	69:4 70:1,8 71:1,2,6	265:8 318:16	260:5 295:8 302:4
31:12 37:2 42:9	73:6 86:11 138:20	Tenant 22:6	310:14,14 354:3
92:4 93:2,15,17	160:14 186:8,16	tend 22:19	that's 9:5 12:8,20
101:1 102:3 103:20	306:15	tends 108:15	16:11 18:4 21:10
106:12 124:19	teams 31:21 68:14	tension 300:8	22:20 24:21 25:19
143:9,16 147:11	69:15 113:10 123:8	tenure 133:14	26:16 28:11,12 29:8
159:11 160:8	124:8 126:10	term 10:3 22:15 38:4	29:12 30:11 34:3,19
179:18 181:20	tear 236:9	54:2 137:9 154:13	36:14 40:21 41:13
182:20 183:3,18	tease 257:15	166:13 185:12	42:3,17 43:9 44:3
195:8 199:8 200:5	tech 141:21	250:13 284:18	44:11 45:1,2,4,8
201:4 230:8 256:19	technical 12:12 137:5	286:20	46:19 48:17 49:19
258:18 271:21	323:18 349:14	terminal 39:14,21	49:20 50:8 51:14,20
290:17,21 291:1	technically 213:15	193:2	52:11 54:15,16
299:11 302:15	technique 38:9	terminology 216:9	55:18 56:18,21
312:17 317:20	techniques 37:11	terms 9:1 120:14	57:14 58:21 59:2,5
324:12 343:8	38:12	122:11 143:12	60:21 62:12,15
talking 20:8,20 21:11	technology 40:21	144:8,10 149:6,11	68:13,16 69:10,20
21:11 24:4,5 25:17	59:4 82:3 232:3	159:4 182:19	70:7,8 72:2,5 76:9
25:17 32:6 43:21	265:11 268:2	240:17 261:1	76:17 77:15,17
44:4 56:17 58:2	275:20 276:15	282:15 288:15	79:14 80:19 81:17
62:7,15 66:14 80:18	301:21	297:16,18 308:5	82:6,7,13 84:5,15
84:2 92:17 114:17	tell 4:12 7:16 8:3	343:6	85:10,16 86:4 88:14
		terrible 41:15	88:16 93:19 96:12
124:17 137:8,10	16:16,20 34:7 42:3		
142:15 147:13	46:4 50:13 52:6	terrific 8:11,21 18:11	98:12 99:2 100:1
164:21 180:5 182:9	53:13 64:12,18	53:17 88:10 124:15	102:17 103:21
193:15 219:8 221:4	72:21 83:13 89:10	territories 324:20	106:16 107:1
230:19 233:8	125:10 154:21	testament 8:4 12:20	108:13,21 110:15
237:12 242:7	166:19 178:6,13	testified 63:21	111:7 113:20 114:9

116:11 117:5,6,12 310:8 311:11 266:3,4 268:1,16,18 289:3,10 122:5,11 125:10,11 316:17 318:14 271:15 272:14 thin 80:4 124:20 130:14,16 131:13 319:7 325:19 326:4 281:18 285:12 thing 8:7 9:10 10:9 131:19 132:11 330:6,21 331:13,14 296:12 299:16,20 11:4 17:7 18:18 134:3 137:13 138:6 331:15,21 332:20 300:8 311:1,4 26:1 45:15 46:10 139:17,21 142:7 335:17 336:15,15 314:18 315:3,8 48:17 49:1,2 55:19 146:2,4,12,17 149:7 337:14 339:12 318:12 321:11,12 56:2,16 57:3 58:20 342:18 343:16 149:20,21 153:16 321:21 329:20 59:6 60:7 64:11 160:4,13 163:13 344:8 345:11 330:17,18 334:17 65:21 88:8 89:3 164:15 166:1 168:3 346:15 347:17 336:4 337:4 341:11 101:20 106:10 348:9,14 349:18 168:11 170:8 171:8 they'd 16:18 108:8 109:19 117:2 172:14 173:17 351:9,21 they'll 59:20 144:3 119:14 124:12 176:16,19 177:1 theirs 141:20 237:3 282:14,16,21 130:10 141:1 178:5,6 179:12 thematic 67:6,7 298:6 142:16,19 152:11 180:12,15 183:2,17 theme 47:19 308:1 they're 15:16 17:12 152:17 159:8 19:19 23:16 27:18 186:2 192:15 196:3 themes 92:7 185:1 161:17 164:20,21 199:19 200:13 there's 4:14 16:3 19:8 39:9 40:11 43:8 168:20 171:20 201:9,16 202:11,19 23:4 24:19 25:9,14 47:6 53:6,6,18 179:6 183:2 184:15 202:21 203:10,12 37:8 44:15 52:17 58:18,19 64:18 67:6 187:1 192:2 193:21 204:14 205:19 55:18 65:1 69:14 67:14,17 70:15 198:21 205:3,12 208:20 209:18 77:13 82:11 83:3,6 84:13 85:12,13 206:17 212:4 210:6,15,21 215:21 83:18 84:12 85:17 86:12 96:6 104:14 214:18 220:16 216:2,18 218:6 86:13,17 87:18 88:8 104:14,17 105:6,8 223:15 225:4 228:8 219:10 220:1 221:7 100:3 101:4 104:5,6 106:12,21 123:16 230:10,13,15 223:5,10,20 224:7 104:19 105:9 106:7 124:3 125:21 231:18 232:3 224:11 230:4 231:1 107:20 108:12 126:18 129:2 130:8 234:21 242:7 231:15 232:1 274:16 276:9,14 111:18 114:18 131:3 139:9 140:15 233:18 236:14 115:3 120:6 126:10 143:4 145:13,16 277:4 279:8 280:12 239:15,19 243:20 127:14 130:21 146:3,6,7 150:20,21 293:4 294:15 295:9 245:3,14 248:9,10 131:11 137:18 175:1 190:11 295:12 302:21 249:11 251:3,19 138:12 146:18 194:10 197:9 198:5 303:3,5,17 318:4 252:7 253:7,15,15 157:2 160:15 200:1 218:1 222:1 335:17,21 336:8 260:6 263:3 265:9 166:17,19 168:2 230:9 235:3,4 342:18 346:5 265:21 266:12 172:18 175:18 237:11 244:6 348:10 350:20 352:8,17 267:8 268:19 181:19 183:7,17 258:21 259:21 269:19 270:15,16 184:10 186:16,17 261:8 262:11 things 3:12 9:2 13:9 271:9,9,10 272:9,14 186:19 188:16 267:12 271:17 13:11 16:7 17:2,17 273:12,14 274:6 190:19 194:11,17 274:4,19 278:13 18:15 19:9,14,16 275:8,16,17 276:15 197:5 198:7 200:7 280:1 281:6 284:14 20:13 21:2 23:17 277:18 282:8,18 201:11,12 202:8,10 288:9 289:2 292:13 24:9.14 26:8.12 284:13 285:7,19 207:18 214:11,15 293:8 294:15 298:1 27:17 30:9 34:2,17 286:2,19 290:1,17 216:15 218:4 299:12,14 300:1,15 38:2 39:19 40:7 292:1,1,3 293:15 220:12 221:15 301:2 310:7,11 42:11,17 43:13 44:3 295:6 296:6 297:7 223:7 231:13 328:3,10 331:11 45:11 47:12 48:4,8 300:12 301:16 233:21 234:21 333:5,15 348:7 49:14 55:7,21 56:20 302:20 303:4,17 235:7,21 236:6,15 they've 8:11,17 41:21 58:12,13 61:6 63:2 304:2,17 305:2,11 237:4 250:2 253:10 75:19 152:3 198:6 64:13 66:19 67:13 305:16,17 307:2 254:2,13,17 255:18 200:2 258:20 68:7,13,13 71:9 308:17 309:10 256:8 258:8,10 262:13,18 267:11 74:8,11 75:8,11

76:12,14 77:10 78:3 316:20 317:1,2 117:6 118:2 119:15 242:4,8 245:14 319:4 323:4,5,21 81:20 82:8 83:5,20 120:2,5,6 122:18 247:11,18 250:15 85:5 90:10,14 92:6 329:7 330:4,16 123:7 125:7 126:1,7 251:3 256:21 92:18 96:7 99:11,16 333:15 336:19 126:20 127:2 258:15 260:8 262:2 99:20 102:21 338:9,21 342:15 128:10,13,15 263:11 264:2,15,20 103:11,14 104:4,8 343:8,10,16 344:4 130:21 131:8 265:5,18 266:7 344:12 349:2 353:4 268:14 269:16 104:13,18 107:17 132:16 133:3,11 109:7 115:2,21 353:10 134:3,15,16 135:8 273:1 284:10 116:2 117:11 think 3:16 4:3 7:19 136:17,18 138:6,7,9 287:10,20 288:2 118:14,20 120:7 10:6 11:3 12:1,19 138:16 139:21 290:18 291:16 121:21 122:1,4 14:17 16:10 17:12 140:12 141:13 293:6 295:15 296:7 124:20 127:5,10 17:13 18:4 20:19 144:13 145:12 298:1,3,6,13 302:12 129:4,17,20 130:16 22:12,17 23:6,8,18 148:10 150:2,4 302:20 303:5,17 130:17 131:1,20 23:19 24:1,3,10 151:21 152:12,21 304:4 308:9 311:5 153:7 155:20 136:14 140:8 142:5 27:5,15 30:6,19 311:10 313:4 156:10 157:6,13,14 314:18 315:6,10,13 147:17,18 149:11 31:9,14 33:6,7,9,10 152:2,15 157:19 33:10,21 34:4,9 158:9,14,15 159:3,5 317:4,9,13 318:10 158:17 159:20 35:6,19 36:12,14 159:16,20 160:2,5,7 318:12,14 319:8 160:17 162:14 37:7 40:6,9 41:17 160:15 162:15,18 320:11,14 321:8 165:16,17 166:17 42:1,1,3,4 43:4,11 163:14 164:1,5,14 323:6 324:5 326:5 171:16,21 172:7,18 44:8 45:8 46:1,7 164:14 167:14 326:10,18 327:5,10 183:16 185:1 47:2,7,8,18 48:3,5 168:3,12,14 169:4,8 328:3 330:5,11 48:10,18,20 49:4 331:2 332:1 333:9 186:11,19 187:18 169:11 171:9,14,16 188:4 191:7,11 50:11,16 51:4 52:5 172:4,5,14,15 333:10,11 335:17 196:10 197:5,9 54:6,8,15,16 55:18 173:15 177:5 178:7 336:2 337:7,14,16 200:11 202:8 55:20,20 56:1,9,10 178:19 179:1,12,16 340:6,10 342:6,13 209:10 210:7 211:3 56:14,19 57:7,8,10 180:2,9,18 181:1,10 343:13 344:15,18 344:20 345:2,5,11 212:11 215:15 57:13 59:10,10,21 182:2 183:1,12 345:12 346:3,11,12 216:14 217:17 61:3,17 62:8,21 184:4,7 185:14,19 63:4,12,20 64:8,11 187:19,20 191:1,12 346:15,20 348:7,9 218:13 219:4,15 64:11 65:7 66:17 193:16,19 195:9,20 348:19,19 349:3,7 223:14,18,20 67:1 68:19 69:5,7,8 196:12 199:12 352:13,16,19 227:13,15 228:20 230:2 233:6,19 69:9,15,19 73:4,4,7 200:18 201:10 353:17 235:3 236:2,15 75:12,20 76:13,13 203:2,16 205:17 thinkers 212:19 206:1,3,4,7,14 thinking 47:7 56:1,15 237:12,12,20 240:1 76:17 77:5,5,15,19 67:9 68:2,15 69:3 241:2 250:9 255:3 79:1,11 80:1,3,7 207:6,10 209:13 210:3,3,7 211:4,8 89:8 95:5 99:4 256:18 263:13,14 81:4,11,12 82:7 269:4 270:7,9,10 83:2 84:1,13 86:5 213:5 214:3,17 102:19 107:11 271:3,5 274:17 86:10 88:6 89:3,18 216:1,6,12,19 113:21 118:9 278:2 279:7 281:21 91:6,14 92:8,21 221:17 222:10,17 121:14 178:1 184:7 282:12 284:5 285:7 93:16,18 94:2,5,16 223:6,11,19 224:13 214:9 262:9 297:17 322:11,12 336:11 285:15 293:21 94:21 95:13 99:12 224:14,19,21 225:7 345:9 352:7 295:3 297:13 101:12 103:7 225:13 226:2,7,20 104:19 108:3,4,8,21 227:6 228:11 thinks 46:19 146:5 300:13 301:5 302:1 318:8 344:9 303:15,21 304:5,16 109:2,5,9,10 110:5 230:15,20 231:8,10 think's 162:3 231:13,15,16,19 304:21 305:18 110:15,16,21 third 25:1 134:12 307:7,21 308:4,8 111:13,19 112:6 232:19 233:9,10,18 313:13 314:20,21 113:13 114:18 234:2 235:8,14 246:18 315:16 316:1,10,12 237:9 238:9 240:2 thorough 332:5,6 115:3,8,13 116:14

thought 11:21 14:13 throwing 218:5 330:17,18 332:18 tool 33:9 145:8 16:7 58:7 59:9 226:10 335:20 336:1,8,21 218:10.11 74:17 101:14 103:8 thrown 208:15 337:6,15 338:16 tools 193:5 112:3 120:21 150:9 Thursday 1:10 339:6,11,13 348:8 top 4:15 18:10 100:8 152:19 153:16,19 tidal 215:19 276:7 349:19 350:16 154:5 170:6 200:21 165:4,9,16 166:1 tide 37:17 82:13,16 351:20 241:17 319:14 172:3 174:21 82:16 84:7,8 130:16 timed 339:8 topic 102:14 147:12 181:16 185:13 273:18,21 281:14 topics 96:17 98:16 timely 157:10 170:11 188:9 189:18 197:3 281:16,19 307:11 171:3 185:13 204:9 312:21 197:7,12 203:20 tides 85:15,21 161:11 238:10 334:6,8 tornados 43:8 239:6 260:3 315:16 tied 15:3 111:10 351:1 total 43:4 72:10 324:13 340:12 244:20 342:21 times 8:4,9 22:3 93:3 85:13,15,20,21 348:5 tight 177:3 112:5 138:9 183:13 170:13 228:17 264:18 thoughtful 179:2 till 170:19 totally 10:13 37:12 thoughts 31:18 32:5 Tim 103:19 120:11 324:15 347:6,7 39:6 52:11 32:13 69:19 70:5 time 3:8 4:12 5:3 348:12 350:13 touch 147:17 74:8 93:3 98:5,16 17:5 18:16 19:9 352:3 touched 120:19 156:3 time's 166:9 101:16 102:6,17 20:8 26:13,17 27:3 195:21 105:4 114:8 133:10 27:20 31:5,14 32:6 time-wise 148:5 tour 124:3 148:7,11 156:15 36:21 38:6 43:5 timing 184:9 185:19 tourism 23:14 310:1 158:13 162:21 55:13 66:7 68:12 tinkering 259:9 towers 276:8 168:19 176:7 181:9 79:2,11 81:14 91:7 tip 205:5 town 4:14 53:3 59:19 181:13 204:15 tissue 263:18 91:19,21 95:9 96:8 59:19 146:14 228:10 313:6 98:2 102:6 118:20 title 116:21 159:15 track 244:12 282:19 315:15 317:5 126:11 127:4,5 **Titus** 351:10 283:2,16 thousand 78:18 81:8 today 3:14 5:15,19 tracking 99:20 129:4 148:9 149:7 201:9,11,14 212:2 149:13 150:16 tracks 283:7 41:1 57:4 84:14 213:8 156:15,18 157:3,13 91:20 93:16 101:18 traction 25:19 212:14 thousands 190:13 160:3 164:18 167:5 123:16 150:2 151:8 213:4 thread 124:20 167:7,17 168:14 165:8 171:10,17 trade 21:21 71:15,17 threads 148:2 169:18 174:9,17,21 190:10 207:10 72:18 three 8:4 13:11 35:16 175:9,12,19 182:18 243:8,15 269:17 trading 40:16 50:13 53:11 62:17 182:20 186:5,17 traffic 41:14 302:17 312:9,17 314:4 69:2 114:8 119:3 187:8,21 199:4,18 315:4 319:15 324:2 tragic 41:4 125:5 139:18 200:12 201:18,21 324:7 333:7 341:7 trailable 124:17 183:13 202:19 204:6 217:16 222:1 343:14 345:13 125:6 210:13 212:6,20 225:16 228:18,19 346:12 352:3 train 107:4 278:15 221:8 229:16 238:4 229:2,7,13,17,18,20 353:14 training 108:2 240:9 241:17 232:20 236:19 token 89:9 110:21 125:21 248:13 249:21 242:11 243:4,8 told 34:8 41:9 43:2 141:2 197:2 201:20 244:15 255:2 260:7 52:8 55:7 70:19 255:18 283:7 207:21 208:11.12 294:12 337:4 264:14 265:19 127:10 180:14 209:15,21 210:5 344:19 347:6 266:8 277:2,8,16,21 269:5 218:17 231:5,6 threshold 295:14 277:21 284:9,21 tolerate 41:3 transcript 327:20 339:21 Tom 47:10 48:20 355:6 286:6,10 292:2,4 threw 103:10 194:15 298:3,6 301:9 50:3 174:1 323:4 transcripts 338:14 transfer 301:21 throw 59:20 125:9 302:13 305:8 tomorrow 34:2 260:4 162:2 163:2 204:15 311:13 312:4 318:5 tons 192:6 202:8 transformation 209:10 331:16,17 323:4 326:4 329:20 324:18 218:10

transition 16:5 31:12 168:3 171:8 178:5 148:18 154:10 151:3 165:6 179:19 301:17 193:10 231:16 155:6 164:3 170:2 188:5 219:4,6 220:3 translates 256:15 332:20 355:6 178:6 180:7,15 225:12 229:1,15,19 transmit 302:13 truly 223:16 245:21 181:14 190:18 259:6 263:16 288:5 transmittal 334:18 267:12 194:18 202:13 292:21 294:12 trust 15:16 39:17 transparent 28:3,10 203:12 214:4 328:11,16 337:5 314:5 325:5 196:2 274:18,20 220:16,17 228:14 344:18 345:2 transportation 14:8 275:8,9,13,14 332:6 232:13 234:6 346:21 347:6 23:13 24:7 34:15 332:7 236:18 240:10,17 350:10 36:2 46:12 49:8 trusting 275:10 242:3 244:17 245:1 two-day 350:7 57:19 62:1,11,14 truth 283:11 245:20 246:3 247:9 two-foot 82:17 64:5 65:16 66:3,4 try 3:8 4:21 5:2,3 248:5,11 250:9,21 tving 344:16 66:10 68:18 71:6,10 7:20 10:5 17:19 253:15,18 257:1 type 48:17 121:20 74:19,20 95:6 98:12 23:17 24:2 28:19 258:21 259:11 145:5 153:15 102:2 126:5 129:11 31:15 37:6 45:10 264:5 266:20 186:11 252:2 131:10 153:11 62:2 64:1 77:18 267:13 268:10 302:21 303:3,4,15 160:17 163:21 78:8 99:6 113:2 269:11 272:21 303:17 305:18 176:9 181:10 183:5 117:7 118:18 274:7 275:19 277:5 types 48:13 322:2 184:7,20 191:2 125:10 133:14 278:3 279:5 280:9 typhoons 43:7 214:12 234:5 235:1 138:1 161:21 167:7 284:6 286:8 287:11 typical 212:19 243:13 263:14 173:14 176:5 177:4 293:2,9 294:2 typically 44:5 270:12 271:13 296:17,20 297:17 T's 122:11 178:17 180:9,12,13 273:7 299:1 313:15 297:18 300:2 304:1 185:9 195:11 200:6 U 326:16 327:12,16 202:18 203:18 305:3,8,15 307:3 ugly 10:2 331:17 351:7 205:5 214:16 326:7 334:16 ultimately 67:20 travel 340:13 222:19,21 223:1,2 336:19.21 338:1 275:13 227:13 230:16 trees 56:7,8 340:18 341:2,6 unable 114:4 tremendous 16:12 233:15 238:15 343:19 349:2 Unanimous 175:5 241:6,20 243:12,19 TSI 139:10 92:21 108:12,15 unappreciated 138:7 125:3 138:13 189:5 250:8 253:21 269:7 tsunami 258:10 **unaware** 144:18 227:20 341:21 274:17 276:15 **Tuesday** 290:18 unbudgeted 112:9,12 284:21 286:12 turf 146:18 tremendously 101:11 unclear 152:7 222:17 287:18 294:15 turn 4:7 5:7 70:13 uncomfortable 156:8 trend 254:17 256:12 295:4 304:6 306:18 148:14,19 175:16 uncoordinated 23:16 triage 211:19 306:20 311:16 238:4 253:2 255:20 underfunded 113:14 315:2 317:2 326:14 256:2 264:8 268:8 tribute 4:4 128:12 tricky 341:1 340:19 341:8,12 280:3 319:10 undergraduate 7:5 tried 29:16 83:20 342:2 347:13,21 turnaround 342:3 understand 14:7 97:18 119:17 349:12 353:5 turned 345:1,8 15:14 20:21 21:3 trying 19:17,18 22:9 132:21 133:6 turning 280:1 331:11 24:3 35:21 52:18 147:17 223:14,14 53:1,2 59:20 62:7 twelve 37:19 39:9 63:10 73:5 74:6 64:9 81:8 83:7 twice 292:8 338:3 78:11 84:11,16 89:18 92:2 108:11 tries 241:3 two 12:5 15:2 17:2 89:16 94:13 100:3 109:8 110:5 116:12 trip 354:4 18:9 32:5 35:12 121:3,15 154:10 trivial 344:21 349:11 117:13 120:4 41:11 42:15 44:18 161:16 171:4 trouble 161:6 234:15 121:13,19 122:5 52:8,15 56:20 62:17 190:19 213:15 truckers 72:16 123:1 125:11,12 74:1,8 82:18 93:3 223:17 231:18 trucks 72:19 130:5 132:13 94:16 96:6 102:14 233:6 251:20 254:7 true 42:3 44:11 48:11 137:21 139:4 140:7 127:13 141:18

255:6 259:8 261:4 updating 195:17 248:19 249:1 V 265:2 300:6 305:6 282:18 vet 158:21 vacation 336:21 308:12 309:1 **upgrade** 278:20 vetted 152:4 156:21 347:9,9,10 315:11 325:7 326:1 upgrading 274:3 162:21 163:2 vacuum 136:20 328:14 329:10 307:16 **vetting** 134:15 vague 272:7 330:20 uphill 223:5 245:17 287:20 Valdez 22:9 understandable 246:21 vibration 18:18 valid 19:19 132:20 111:11 upland 15:5 vice 63:6 70:10 111:4 133:11 understanding 21:5 upper 19:11,14 278:9 167:16 173:6,13 validate 211:5 27:15 85:6 86:16 278:12 323:15 340:18 validation 314:7 104:19 105:9 121:5 uproar 261:6 342:14 valuable 119:11 121:21 122:6 151:1 **upward** 256:2 view 27:21 88:15 222:17 210:16 211:21 urged 39:16 90:3 116:11 136:6 value 22:1 29:13 213:7 231:12 239:8 **USCG** 193:7 158:20 178:5 80:20 223:7 291:21 304:13 use 7:11 19:21 21:6 180:16 241:9 262:7 values 21:15 22:11 understands 46:16 25:11 37:12,16 299:10 311:17 327:12 182:12 188:2 49:20 80:14 83:16 330:15 341:10 variables 272:5 understood 84:5 85:19 104:15 viewed 71:8 241:5 various 42:20 49:10 105:2 173:1 289:5 113:11 158:17 views 31:7 95:2 73:20 97:4 103:15 undertake 114:10 197:9 209:16 216:8 170:10 171:1 115:6 145:9 152:1 undertaken 97:8 217:3 218:11 209:13 227:15 239:12 240:11 219:1 228:12,12 268:20 316:7 344:14 241:8 242:2,6 243:3 275:7,16 276:8 underway 108:13 vigilant 309:4 245:2 246:14 314:19 343:8 281:6 283:13,18 violating 45:14 248:20 251:5,13 under-keel 189:13 288:3 290:4 299:17 virtual 316:2.14 256:16 262:15 190:7 306:4,7 315:12 virtually 39:5 313:16 316:19 undeveloped 41:20 useful 73:14 85:8 visibility 242:13 **vastly** 85:17 unfortunately 32:10 93:8 94:15 133:9 vision 20:16 25:21 vehicle 159:21 160:4 59:18 250:1 347:19 232:11 314:7 35:2 71:14 73:15 313:21 314:17 UNH 48:12 usefully 91:7 92:18 227:3 319:14 315:1 316:7 unified 65:4 66:21 usefulness 269:2 319:19 321:15 verbally 204:20 unify 107:16 users 191:12 310:5 322:9 326:6 327:9 260:11 unique 99:14 105:10 310:12 328:18 verbiage 167:11 107:7 142:13 uses 327:14 visioning 67:16 versa 111:4 **United** 40:15 285:5 **USGC 273:19** 327:13 version 11:6 155:17 289:9 **USGS** 15:10 218:11 visit 242:11 243:9 244:19 units 124:11 292:20 visits 242:1 243:2 258:19 259:18 universally 123:9 **USN 2:3** 249:15 316:4 versions 159:16 universities 293:17 usually 12:12 18:21 visual 199:6 200:6,18 259:6 University 7:3,6 46:19 221:14 203:2,13 228:7 versus 82:16 214:13 Utah 337:1 302:12 visuals 205:10 vertical 110:17 141:6 unpleasant 115:7 utilization 24:7 vital 14:15 42:7 46:17 217:14 **unsure** 43:18 **Utilize 288:1,4** 46:17 vertically 137:16 upcoming 264:21 utilized 107:9 vitally 32:9 vessel 113:2 121:9 **update** 145:20 utilizing 294:4 voice 65:5 241:5 208:9,11 248:5,10 148:15 257:21 U.S 6:11 37:16 289:6 343:21 vessels 33:12 75:1 **updated** 272:16 206:16 232:13 voices 245:13 208:17 221:16 352:11 272:2 **volume** 338:13 222:8 248:1,13,18 **updates** 145:18 volumes 203:3

voluntary 10:13 207:20 211:9 213:2 332:21 274:2 275:7 279:15 volunteers 223:14 217:5 218:2 220:11 waste 229:16.17 279:18 281:9 287:8 296:7 297:8 311:1 Volvo 277:3 222:13 225:5 226:5 watch 109:20 208:7 vote 103:1 175:5 226:17 230:13 350:13 314:12 320:9 325:2 206:11 207:11 232:3 245:12 watches 252:14 332:6 334:2,8 350:9 223:19 224:2,4,17 246:15 262:8 watching 296:18 ways 23:11,17 42:20 311:21 317:8 329:6 263:11 265:16 water 15:4 18:14 78:3 88:7 92:5 341:14 342:3 344:7 270:19 274:15 24:4 33:18 62:10,17 113:8 119:15 344:8 345:4,5 346:4 275:7 285:14 297:6 128:21 129:21 188:18 337:20 300:4,5,6 301:9,11 130:1,6 155:18 weak 135:19 346:16 voted-upon 223:10 301:13,14,17 303:9 192:21 195:18 wear 65:14 264:10 **voting** 165:8 304:12 305:10 198:5 214:13 351:14 voyage 351:12 306:4 310:6,6 234:13,16 252:10 wearing 86:8 weather 37:18 46:17 V-Datum 188:12,19 316:18 322:5 269:21 271:13 213:18 214:17 327:11 337:10 273:4,10 279:21 47:5 62:10,17 71:11 215:6 218:6 352:1 338:21 339:1 281:12 288:12,14 71:11,11,20 99:18 298:20 301:15 341:14 343:11 115:7 128:18 W 344:10,12 345:7 326:21 328:9 159:19 234:13,17 wait 59:19 321:2 349:10 350:14 waterfronts 331:13 271:13 278:17,18 waiting 350:9 waters 83:14 253:1 351:6 353:2,4,7,8,9 278:21 279:20 Waldon-Allen wanted 3:13,19 4:17 watershed 79:9 285:2,3,8 289:8 259:11 36:19 43:9 47:11 waterway 196:1 web 277:9 walk 26:13 89:12 62:4 68:20 82:9 waterways 41:3,18 website 97:21 247:19 98:5 99:4 103:3 82:6 126:6 189:12 91:21 101:10,20 263:6 316:2,16 123:1 240:21 195:17 262:20 137:6 159:8 163:11 341:19 walking 89:7 177:18 178:2,4 way 7:12 10:17 19:8 week 37:4 55:14,15 wanderlust 8:14 181:14 188:8 22:20,20 25:4,6,10 229:7,13 243:10 waned 249:7 25:10.11 27:17 46:3 247:18 259:20 201:15 205:3,4 want 19:5 23:1,5 29:1 47:8 53:21 54:10 276:13 331:6 345:2 206:12 220:2 228:8 31:9 42:11 44:8 285:18 295:8,13 62:13 63:3 65:19 weekend 18:12 48:1 49:1 50:2 55:8 302:6 313:7,16,17 66:20 67:2,8 68:4,6 weekends 340:14 56:2.11.13 58:16 313:19 315:17 74:7,21 80:3 85:5,8 weeks 16:1,18,19 59:12,13,14,16 61:9 320:11 332:8 87:19 88:10 94:3,17 42:15 58:14 83:11 70:11,18 74:20 348:16 98:17 110:18 144:17 151:3 229:2 77:21 78:2 79:12 wanting 333:1 117:21 124:12 229:20 258:14 88:5 89:9 90:1,2,19 334:7 wants 19:5 35:12 130:7 133:10,13,19 91:5 99:11 100:2 weigh 74:3 186:6 36:5 61:3 80:2 136:3,18 137:2 105:5 117:17 187:5,21 320:11 187:4 193:11 138:7,18 139:21 118:12,21 120:7 141:5 144:14 weighed 73:18 276:21 280:4 121:2,15 122:6 286:11,12 297:10 145:15 146:10 weighing 73:15 123:6 134:9 135:13 weightv 152:12 298:14 331:4 148:5 157:4.13 140:18 158:5,5,6,12 welcome 2:2 3:4 5:9 warmer 301:15 166:20 173:16 159:6 161:13 162:1 17:6 49:16 57:16 wars 35:12 74:1 177:6,12 179:2 163:17 164:5,21 78:8 81:12 245:11 wash 103:20 112:5 180:14 182:8 191:6 167:18 168:14 199:19,20 209:19 353:14 Washington 1:13 7:3 178:8 179:3,4 182:3 7:8 8:16 323:2 212:10,18 214:12 well-oiled 8:5 185:17 187:15 217:18 228:4,4,14 well-rounded 11:20 wasn't 19:2 34:1 188:1 190:20 198:8 went 8:1 18:17 19:14 38:20 57:4 146:17 233:21 234:18 200:6 205:19 207:7 264:7 270:6 271:2,6 46:14 50:21 79:10 153:3 175:1 226:13

99:14 101:8 103:14 121:19 122:5 327:6 330:10,14 what's 10:6 13:7 28:8 120:8 121:4 128:5 124:17 125:5,19 331:6 335:12 29:11 33:10 34:16 136:4 206:6 232:9 127:1,4 131:21 337:20,21,21 338:1 34:21 36:1,1 40:2 251:13 271:6 289:5 138:10 142:12 338:18 339:14 53:12 55:16 72:17 289:7 307:6 308:7 150:2,16 155:4,6 341:2 342:6 345:9 81:3,3 88:15 99:2 310:15 156:13,14 158:4 347:2 348:11 350:5 125:1 133:9 134:17 west 2:3 3:13 4:10 161:6,7,10 165:21 350:9 351:13 352:5 135:8 137:14 8:15 35:11 49:16 166:8,21 167:5 352:21 158:14,14 186:6 52:15 56:20 64:16 169:12 173:12 we've 19:8 26:4,21 190:16 193:18 93:15 127:8,21 175:11 176:3,16 29:3 32:5 34:8 200:7,16 204:18 128:3,9 159:10 177:1 178:3,19 42:19,20,21 49:5 225:15 230:13 233:9,20 248:1 179:18 180:4,10 50:8,12 52:7 55:9,9 233:3 245:14 260:6 260:11 262:6 182:15 184:10 56:12 58:8 59:1 271:10,20 272:5,6 319:16 185:2,3 190:4,13 60:10,19 63:3 66:13 281:9 288:15,15 we'd 20:16,17 37:5 192:18 193:14 75:15 80:17 83:12 306:3 309:17 310:8 60:5 76:13 81:8 194:12 196:13 91:10 93:5 94:2 325:4 326:5 329:11 157:3 172:19 197:15 199:13.18 117:16 118:1 126:2 329:16 330:20 261:21 304:19 199:20,20 200:10 132:6,12 133:16 wherefores 107:10 339:18 342:18 202:3,10,10,11,13 134:19 142:15 whining 303:11 we'll 4:21 5:1,2 17:19 202:20 203:6,12 145:21 156:4 white 66:16,16 98:17 27:8,20 28:13,13 205:5,8 206:7 168:16 191:6,7,8,11 99:1 100:6 102:16 31:15 45:4 81:17 209:19,20 210:1 193:21 195:8 105:11 109:9 90:16 91:15 102:16 212:3,9,9 213:3,9 196:18 197:3 199:7 112:17 147:17 106:8 135:6 148:13 220:16,17 223:4,19 199:13 200:19 181:8 182:6 189:18 156:20 158:20 224:1 225:10 227:1 205:6 211:17,18 302:14 320:13 230:5 236:5 237:7 162:10 163:6,8 212:4,16 213:6 330:2 164:4 174:8 176:17 239:19 240:2 242:3 223:3,13 225:1,9,13 **WHITING** 335:11 177:4 180:18 188:5 242:7,12,18,19 228:16 232:4 335:14 206:8 223:2 260:8 243:17 244:17 235:14 237:9 who's 8:3 25:15 27:1 272:18 310:18 246:3,21 247:5,9 239:11 244:21 27:2 87:17 93:10 311:5 312:20 326:2 248:5,11,17 249:19 245:8 247:3,14 102:4 142:1 152:9 343:4,11,15 349:19 250:6 252:19 249:11 253:11,20 268:3 349:19 353:18 253:18 255:2,9,10 256:19 258:12 who've 75:16 we're 3:8 4:14 5:6 255:19 256:1,8,11 260:18,19,20 whys 107:10 10:21 17:12 19:17 259:11,13 261:10 261:12 262:13 wide 14:2 36:9,13 21:14 22:1,9 24:14 262:2,3,9,9,16 263:17 264:1 276:3 widely 104:16 25:20 30:3 31:13 272:9,21 275:6,17 276:6 278:18 wide-open 157:21 34:3,13 35:11 36:7 276:8,13,14 278:3 287:13,14 295:10 wife 18:11 19:4 40:12 49:21 51:1,10 279:5,10 280:9,15 295:15,17 296:16 willing 10:21 90:5 51:16,20 53:1,2,8 281:20 284:15 311:18 314:21 156:14,14 162:14 55:16,17 58:4,20 285:19 286:13 316:11,16 317:1,1 335:3 333:15 334:2 338:3 59:5,6,17,20 60:3 287:17 290:7,14,20 willy-nilly 219:15 63:4 64:3,9,13 293:7,9 294:2,8 339:2 340:17 wind 283:5 70:19 71:9,17,18 295:5,20 296:1,2,14 342:10 343:2 344:8 window 321:1 340:4 73:5,8 77:12 81:4,7 296:17,19 300:16 346:21 348:12 wipe 64:6 82:7,20 85:14 86:5 300:17 301:13,18 350:19 353:17 wish 43:12 171:7 93:21 95:9,14 103:1 304:1 305:2,3,7,15 whales 276:19,20 206:5 225:6 113:2 115:17 306:10 310:4 311:5 277:2,6 302:15,15 withdraw 173:8 118:19 120:4 318:6 321:19 327:4 302:17 Woglom 31:3 319:17

woman 19:5 189:7 191:18 192:4 235:7 225:7 231:15 wonder 32:13 79:3 192:19 195:14 workshops 253:12 264:10 296:21 164:11 207:17 196:14 197:1,4 world 41:19,20,20 300:12 305:12,13 224:3,11 198:6 199:2,4 42:15,15 68:5 69:11 308:17 319:5 wonderful 30:19 33:9 207:17 209:6 75:6 77:9 88:20 339:12 340:15 52:11,12 53:6 296:7 213:13 217:10 115:6 232:12,16,17 year 14:20 19:11,12 wondering 151:15 223:14 227:16 284:12 21:19 25:3 26:9 152:18 153:14 234:9,11 240:14 worlds 40:16 38:1 51:1,16 60:9 207:9 215:20 245:2 248:11 250:7 worldwide 232:14 65:1 67:21 157:11 won't 126:11,19 254:6,7 269:6 286:2 worn 11:13 157:12 165:11 127:4 136:21 151:3 292:17 293:20 worry 33:18 109:1 167:4 186:3,7 188:5 193:20 236:10 297:16 298:10 219:19 225:9 290:1 240:19 242:16 word 21:7,7,8 26:1 302:2 304:3 306:16 290:2 255:10,12 256:13 34:13 209:7 212:15 309:11,14 311:11 worse 239:10 257:7 263:16 wording 166:11 315:9 317:13 worst 230:10 277:16 289:2 208:3,6 224:9,10 325:12 326:3 worth 56:5 59:15 290:13 291:4,18 225:13 333:21 334:15 123:7 153:3 333:8 294:20 295:2 296:1 words 19:4 20:12 342:19 343:12 worthwhile 312:19 298:1,3,4,5,5 318:7 42:4 106:3 108:16 353:6 315:10 322:21 323:12 109:17 118:3 133:8 worked 88:14 127:4 wouldn't 29:9 87:5 347:6,18 348:8,12 134:10 136:11 243:7 260:18,19,20 116:6 134:9 158:6 years 9:7,21 10:9,16 205:5 296:17 261:12 303:16 172:5 205:19 326:6 11:18 12:6 13:14 328:16 332:3 working 4:14 7:20 wrap 13:4 92:2 341:6 21:17,18 25:15 35:1 wordsmith 206:11 15:17 24:15,16 25:5 341:8 342:6 353:18 37:14 38:6 39:9 222:14 230:2 25:5 27:3 30:10 wrapped 67:19 40:11,13 41:10 50:9 wordsmithing 132:3 34:14 54:5,10 62:7 wrapping 72:6 339:1 50:14 52:8 53:7 write 209:5 226:7 134:20 224:19 65:6 72:9 93:9 57:5,21 67:1 131:18 348:21 100:14 101:5 102:5 230:2 168:9 179:10 work 4:3 10:5,17 111:19 124:6 writing 101:7 103:4 202:19 210:13 134:9 136:12 12:4 13:3,6 17:9 128:15 133:8 212:6,20 238:4 28:2 30:1,21 33:20 168:15 173:13 137:21 229:8 242:13 244:11 181:11 195:4 205:1 written 127:11 145:1 36:3 45:4 46:9 248:14 249:8 250:1 49:11 53:15,20,20 205:8 238:7 242:19 179:9 225:16 254:12 276:1,3 243:18 244:5 226:21 321:14 53:21 55:4,13,21 290:20 298:5 56:8 61:11,14,19 247:15 249:12 345:18 316:16 323:21 74:7 77:17 78:4 252:1 253:11.21 wrong 19:8 51:11,11 324:2,6,11 338:3 79:13 82:4 87:13 265:14 269:9,13 211:21 235:7 336:3 347:1 352:12 92:6 94:11 96:19 280:9 290:6 292:19 wrote 203:17 226:17 **vellow 202:3** 98:11,17 100:3 293:13 294:12,12 226:18 324:1 yesterday 36:17 42:9 294:14 297:19 43:3 44:17 95:21 108:6 109:5 110:6 X 114:10 118:13,15 299:16 302:11 100:4 196:20 X 84:7,9 265:9 120:15 123:10,21 306:21 308:3 319:20 320:5 132:21 133:18 319:18 321:1 **vield** 6:11 Y York 1:12 38:1 93:18 134:20 135:6 325:11,13,16 yeah 32:18 50:2 54:2 148:13,17 149:7 338:18 341:8 324:15 61:17 70:18 133:18 York/New 76:1 152:13 157:14 workings 31:8 135:7 150:8 163:6 young 17:11 50:3 158:20 163:6 170:3 workload 353:7 180:11 187:20 176:8 180:9 181:6 works 6:19 50:5 237:9 238:9 253:7 193:14 220:16 260:18 262:2 263:8 182:11 188:10 87:14 100:12 143:1

336:17 337:10	zero 129:5 257:6	213:12 215:13	2010 202:19 212:2
338:9 340:17 347:3	296:12	10 104:10 197:11	213:8
you'd 119:17 193:9	Zilkoski 2:18 25:15	304:20	2011 209:4
235:8	55:5 95:7 264:9	10th 276:3 340:3	2020 71:15
you'll 34:5 78:11	ZILKOWSKI 154:3	10:00 95:17	238 2:16
83:17 101:6 102:13	154:9,19 217:7	10:25 95:17	25 1:10 19:14 238:21
141:20 247:18	220:6 264:10	11 181:11 203:15	250 282:7
257:15 294:19	296:21 299:8	205:15 225:15	27 18:12
333:20 345:20	300:12 303:19	228:4 312:6	275 282:7
you're 9:4 20:18,19	305:2 306:1,9 307:9	11-point 171:10	29 41:10
33:6 34:17 52:4	308:17 309:10	11.5 248:12	
53:5 54:8 59:11	351:14	11:30 350:8	3
63:2 64:11 70:3,3	zone 109:14 137:7,10	110th 158:2	3 2:2 43:4 60:3 221:3
74:10 80:3,7,11,13	137:12 323:19	12 22:16 68:12	3.6 256:13
81:11 84:2,7 87:11	327:14	192:15	30 9:7,21 13:14 84:12
89:4 91:6,7,14		12:03 177:17	271:15,19 323:21
114:17 131:16	\$	12:50 177:17	324:2,6 330:1
136:17,19 154:10	\$1300 19:11	1201 1:12	30-second 238:13
156:7 158:11 166:7	\$15 96:11	13 20:12 67:18 70:5	300 281:14,16,19,21
174:20 182:4 187:5	\$16 306:1	131:16	282:3,5
187:8 205:14 215:9	\$165 39:1	13-some 182:14	300-some 296:2
225:7 230:19	\$17.87 19:13	14th 255:8 340:10	312 2:19
236:10,18 242:20	\$18 294:21 295:2	149 2:14	33 159:15
260:15 270:3	\$2 294:6 324:19	15 10:13 104:10	39K 53:3
275:11 284:8 285:4	\$25 248:10	15th 340:11	
293:13 294:1	\$4 308:6	16 307:5	4
296:13 304:4,17	\$5 263:2	18 22:16 265:16	4 192:18 335:16
309:4,13 319:1	\$7 60:5	18-month 68:12	4.5 247:9 256:9 262:8
320:18 327:1	\$700 266:8	1807 276:3	262:16 296:16
328:15 330:6,7	\$740 51:1	1942 10:13	4:30 312:13
331:16 333:8 347:9	\$750 56:4 60:4	1972 6:8	4:40 354:5
347:9		1976 9:16	40 52:12 53:2 72:10
vou've 16:2 24:8 28:1	0	1991 60:7	420 1:13
40:8 49:21 52:4,5	05 257:7,10 296:1	1994 39:12 41:6	438 261:10
82:15 88:19 91:20	307:12	1996 39:14	44 69:21
99:5 116:7 124:4	06 231:9 274:9	1999 40:3	45 67:5 269:17
129:7 138:13	290:16 305:20	1999 40.3	48 125:3
148:17 150:15	307:10,13	2	
173:19 198:9	07 67:19 167:4,4	2 143:3	5
207:14,15 208:12	250:3 255:10	20 13:14 35:1 57:21	5 2:5 41:14 263:2
215:4 264:17	290:16	168:9 179:9	50 243:9
	08 67:18 70:15	200 21:18 276:1,3	55 212:9
270:10 285:13 286:15 298:9	290:17,19 339:7	2000 38:14	550 202:10 212:7
306:19 314:20	09 67:18 70:5,11	20005 1:13	
	290:15,19 298:4	2002 6:8 149:8	6
316:11 341:6		2006 1:10 7:1 272:15	6 194:17 210:13
242.11 242.12		1 - 0 0 0 TILO 1 1 T T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1	1612/0:025/:1/
342:11 343:13	1	2007 165:12 201:16	6.1 249:9 254:14
342:11 343:13 344:18 346:11	1 1 38:13 60:3 75:15,20	2007 165:12 201:16 208:21	60 329:21 600-some 296:1

61,000 38:7			410
01,000 38.7			
7			
7 2:9 195:14 243:16			
262:14			
7:30 55:15			
700 261:4 266:12			
8			
8 196:14			
8:10 1:11			
80s 284:20			
9			
9 207:20 209:7 210:3			
218:15 225:13			
350:8			
9-11 138:14,16 155:1			
164:18 192:5			
90 15:21 40:17 57:7			
320:8 325:20,21			
330:1	de la		
90-day 331:21 95 21:19 40:18			
96 2:12			
98 21:19			
	10.0	1000	